

Bylaws
Department of Educational Studies
University of Wisconsin - La Crosse

Article I

Name

Department of Educational Studies - University of Wisconsin-La Crosse.

Article II

Mission and Responsibilities

To conduct the business of the department as set forth in the UW-La Crosse School of Education Mission Statement, the provisions of Wisconsin State Statute Chapter 36, and University of Wisconsin Faculty and Academic Staff Personnel Rules.

Faculty members in the Department of Educational Studies support and ascribe to the School of Education mission. The mission of the School of Education is to develop within its graduates a commitment to the teaching profession, a profound respect for the dignity of all learners, and the professional competencies that enable them to be effective teachers and responsible citizens in a diverse and dynamic world.

Department faculty support student learning of knowledge, skills, and dispositions through quality teaching practices. Department faculty also develop, maintain, and supervise collaborative relationships with area PK-12 schools in order to provide students with meaningful field experiences.

The department chair is responsible for providing academic leadership for teaching, scholarship, and service activities; promoting curriculum development; providing written evaluations of faculty for retention, tenure, and promotion; making recommendations for hiring full-time and part-time faculty; promoting efforts to secure external funding; presiding over department meetings and providing leadership in planning, academic scheduling, and administering department budget.

Article III

Membership

1. All tenure-track and tenured faculty who have a 100% appointment in the Department of Educational Studies shall have equal voting privileges for the purpose of conducting department business.
2. Instructional academic staff who have a full-time (100%) appointment or who are continuing IAS and on the Redbook pay plan at 50% or more in the Department of Educational Studies shall have equal voting privileges for the purpose of conducting department business.
3. Instructional academic staff who have a 50-99% appointment and who are not continuing IAS or on the Redbook pay plan shall have voting privileges for the purpose of conducting department business, except for voting on department membership, department bylaws, and department chair.

Article IV

Voting and Operating Rules

1. An official department business meeting requires at least 50% of the eligible voting members (See Article III) to be present and is called at least five business days in advance with an agenda.
2. The department follows Robert's Rules of Order in all department decisions; exceptions will be stated in the bylaws.
3. A 2/3 majority of eligible members voting, excluding blank ballots and abstentions, may approve amend, or revise the bylaws.
4. The department allows electronic votes only when pre-approved by a simple majority at an official department meeting.
5. The department permits proxy votes in writing to eligible voting members on announced agenda items prior to a department meeting.
6. Only affirmative (yes) and negative (no) votes are counted. Votes of abstention are not counted, and therefore do not affect the outcome of motions.

7. Voting privileges may be granted to individuals not meeting designated Department voting privilege requirement by a majority of the other eligible voters of the department on the grounds that their university appointment is functionally part of the department's activities.
8. Unless specifically indicated otherwise, department motions, except for bylaws, must be approved by a simple majority of eligible voters.
9. Department chair elections require 60% or more approval of the eligible voters.

Article V Meetings

1. The Chair shall convene the first department meeting at the beginning of each semester. Following meetings will be scheduled on an as-needed basis. An official department business meeting is any meeting called with a minimum of five days' written notice of the agenda by the chair or any eligible voting member of the department.
2. Tenured department faculty shall meet when necessary for the purpose of dealing with personnel matters. Meetings will be called as necessary by the department chair and/or the elected Promotion, Retention, Tenure (PRT) Committee.

Article VI Departmental Structure

1. The department chair reports to the associate dean/director of the School of Education. Duties and responsibilities of the department chair are enumerated in the UW-La Crosse Faculty Senate Bylaws and also include those responsibilities described in Article II of these bylaws.
2. Program directors are appointed by the associate dean/director of the School of Education. Program directors will communicate with the department chair on curricular, budget, staffing, facility and future planning matters, and will represent consensus of the faculty within their respective programs.
3. The committees listed below are standing committees of the Department of Educational Studies appointed by the Department Chair, with the exception of the PRT committee, who shall try to have a combination of returning members and new members in each:
 - Faculty Development
 - Student Development
 - Curriculum
 - Admissions
 - Promotion, Retention and Tenure (PRT)

All committees shall meet during the first month of the academic year, elect officers and set regular meeting times. Committee members are expected to attend regularly scheduled meetings. If a committee member has more than three unexcused absences or is unable to serve, the committee member shall be replaced by an alternate, who shall be appointed by the department chair.

- 3.1. The Faculty Development Committee shall consist of six faculty members including tenured and non-tenured faculty who contribute to the merit pool and have completed a full year at UW-La Crosse. Members shall be appointed by the department chair to serve for three-year, staggered terms. Once a member's term expires, that person shall not be eligible to serve on this committee for one year. The purpose of this committee is to conduct merit evaluations and support the ongoing development and in-service of the department faculty in the area of teaching, learning, scholarship, and service. The duties of the Faculty Development Committee include
 - 3.1.1. Develop and implement procedures to conduct merit reviews of department faculty and academic staff consistent with policies of the university. Engage in periodic review and revision of merit procedures.
 - 3.1.2. Report merit decisions on faculty and academic staff to chair. Assist the department chair in preparing a faculty merit letter to include individual rating and any monetary reward.
 - 3.1.3. Develop and implement procedures to evaluate the department chair and report chair reviews to (department faculty? CLS Dean? both?).

- 3.1.4. Plan and provide in-service programs to department faculty in areas of their interest. The programs may be coordinated with the School of Education.
- 3.1.5. Review faculty research and IRB proposals if requested by department faculty. Review proposed research projects, including graduate theses, and consult with other committee members to determine whether or not the protocol of the proposed research contains procedures that place human subjects at a degree of risk. Provide comments to the faculty member to implement suggested changes prior to submission of the proposal to the UW-L Institutional Review Board (IRB for the protection of human subjects).
- 3.1.6. Review faculty proposals concerning grants, leaves and sabbaticals if requested by department faculty. Provide feedback and support in a timely manner.
- 3.2. The Student Development Committee shall consist of department faculty and academic staff, a graduate and undergraduate student representative, and a representative from the School of Education. Committee memberships should include members of all certifiable programs, if possible. The duties of the Student Development Committee shall include:
 - 3.2.1. Coordinate mentoring program for student portfolios. Assign students to faculty who will serve as their portfolio mentor and inform both students and faculty of these assignments. Provide faculty with assistance in the portfolio process.
 - 3.2.2. Coordinate the process for awarding student scholarships. Members of this committee will assume responsibility for the educational scholarships given to students. Members will develop and implement the process for faculty to review scholarship applications and recommend students for scholarships.
 - 3.2.3. Coordinate feedback sessions between students and faculty. The committee members will ask students to share concerns and goals they have related to their academic programs and program development. All feedback will be shared with the department chair, program directors and the Director for the School of Education.
- 3.3. The Curriculum Committee may be composed of faculty, academic staff and teacher education candidates. The committee must include at least two tenure track/tenured members, and the committee chair must be a tenure track/tenured faculty member. The committee chair is nominated and approved by the committee, serves a one-year term and may serve up to three consecutive years. Effort should be made to retain some members of the committee each year, and a reasonable effort must be made to have at least one teacher candidate participate on the committee. The duties of the Curriculum Committee include:
 - 3.3.1. To receive and review individual course and program overview LX forms containing the prefixes C-I, ECE, EDM, EFN, RDG or SPE, submitted by DES and Educational Unit faculty for approval.
 - 3.3.2. Approval consists of a majority vote of the quorum present; a quorum is reached if at least 50 % of the committee members are present.
 - 3.3.3. To receive and review umbrella LX forms and provide content recommendations.
 - 3.3.4. To periodically review existing courses for revision or elimination.
 - 3.3.5. Guidelines for submission of LX forms are as follows:
 - 3.3.5.1. LX forms for either umbrella courses or regular courses are initiated by DES faculty.
 - 3.3.5.2. Faculty must provide appropriate assurances that faculty from all relevant programs of DES (undergraduate and/or graduate) have approved proposed program courses and program changes prior to the submission of those courses and programs to the committee for approval. "Relevant programs" refers to any and all courses housed with the Department of Educational Studies containing the following prefixes: C-I, ECE, EDM, EFN, RDG or SPE.
 - 3.3.5.3. LX forms must be submitted to the committee at least one week before the regularly scheduled committee meeting to assure consideration at that meeting.
 - 3.3.5.4. Course and program proposals are subject to two (2) readings by the committee unless the committee waives the right to a second reading.
 - 3.3.5.5. Program faculty should attend the first committee meeting at which his or her proposal is considered, to present the LX forms and respond to questions

from committee members. The committee chair will communicate concerns and recommendations for LX changes immediately after the first discussion so that faculty members may submit changes prior to the second reading.

- 3.3.5.6 Approved LX forms will be forwarded to the respective university curriculum committees for their approvals as established by individual committee bylaws.
- 3.4. The Admissions Committee shall consist of members of the department who are either tenure track, tenured, or academic staff. Committee membership should include individuals whose primary instructional responsibilities relate to one or the other of our undergraduate teacher education certification programs. The purpose of the Admissions is to review applications for admission to the undergraduate teacher education programs in the department and to determine which applicants are to be accepted into those programs. The duties of the Admissions Committee include:
 - 3.4.1. To develop procedures for an appropriate assessment of candidate applications for admission to our undergraduate teacher education certification programs.
 - 3.4.2. To provide faculty and candidates with information regarding the criteria and process for applicant reviews.
 - 3.4.3. To work with the department chair in providing appropriate responses to applicants who are not accepted into our certification programs.
 - 3.4.4. To provide an appeal process for applicants who are not accepted into our certification programs.
 - 3.4.5. To review and revise the application criteria and process as needed.
- 3.5. A Promotion, Retention and Tenure (PRT) Committee will consist of all tenured faculty members with more than a 50% appointment in the department. The PRT Committee shall elect a committee chair and a recorder each academic year by a simple majority of the committee members voting. The Department Chair is not eligible to serve as PRT Chair. The duties of the Promotion, Retention and Tenure Committee include:
 - 3.5.1. Develop procedures consistent with those of UW-La Crosse for purposes of conducting promotion, retention and tenure reviews of members of the department, including tenure-track faculty and Instructional Academic Staff (IAS).
 - 3.5.2. Provide faculty with information regarding the criteria employed in decisions relative to promotion, retention and tenure.
 - 3.5.3. Make recommendations to the dean on renewal of appointments and granting of tenure.
 - 3.5.4. Develop policies consistent with those of the University for purposes of post-tenure review and development, and provide a five-year review cycle for the tenured faculty members to be submitted to the dean.
 - 3.5.5. Conduct faculty and Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) reviews as determined by the university and provide feedback to each department member reviewed.

Article VII

Retention, Tenure and Review Procedures

- 1.0. Procedures for Faculty Retention and Tenure Reviews
 - 1.1 The PRT Committee is responsible for reviews of candidates for retention and tenure. Candidates will be reviewed at three levels in the following order: 1) department; 2) college dean; and 3) chancellor (UW-L 3.06).
 - 1.2 The PRT chair will provide a schedule of PRT activities to all department members within fifteen (15) calendar days of receiving, from the department chair, the list of eligible candidates for retention and tenure.
 - 1.3 At least twenty (20) calendar days prior to each review, the PRT chair will give each candidate written notice of the review. At the same time, the Department Chair will provide candidates with an electronic template of the Annual Faculty and Academic Staff Review and Evaluation Report. The Department chair will provide each candidate with SEI evaluation scores and written comments.

- 1.4. At least seven (7) calendar days prior to the review, the candidate is responsible for uploading all materials into the UW-L digital portfolio format and submitting a completed electronic portfolio to the PRT Chair.
 - 1.5 The candidate's portfolio will be kept on the UW-L website accessible only by PRT members. Materials will be archived for each candidate on that site.
 - 1.6 Advance notice of the retention or tenure reviews will be published in the *Campus Connection* and/or posted outside the Office of Human Resources in Graff Main Hall.
 - 1.7 Retention and tenure review meetings will be convened in open session and attendance taken. When preceded by an open meeting notice, open sessions may go into closed sessions by invoking the exemption under law that allows the committee to convene in closed session. The motion shall be by a committee member, seconded, and a roll call vote taken, which if positive will result in the committee going into closed session. The motion would read, "I move to convene in closed session to consider the employment of [faculty member] in the [department] at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse as provided in sections 19.85(1)(c) [for retention] or 19.85(1)(b) [for tenure] of Wisconsin Statutes." A majority vote is required to move into closed session. The vote and nature of the discussion should be part of the PRT official minutes.
 - 1.8. Retention and Tenure.
 - 1.8.1 Retention. The PRT Committee will organize the review meeting for the candidate, including date, place, and time. PRT committee members will review in advance all written evidence submitted for retention by the candidate. The candidate shall attend each review meeting, make an oral presentation, and engage in a question and answer session with the committee about the candidate's record of teaching, scholarship, and service. Guests attending the meeting may not participate. All decisions are made on the basis of the evidence provided by the candidate. The committee may move into closed session for a discussion and a vote. If so, the candidate and guests will be excused from the meeting. The committee shall vote by a show of hands on a motion to recommend retention. A simple majority vote is required.
 - 1.8.2 Tenure. The PRT Committee will organize the review meeting for the candidate, including the date, place and time. The tenure candidate may ask that the meeting be conducted in open session by submitting a written request to the PRT Committee chair at least seven (7) calendar days before the meeting. The candidate shall attend the tenure meeting, make an oral presentation, and engage in a question and answer session with the committee about the candidate's record of teaching, scholarship, and service. All decisions are made on the basis of the evidence provided by the candidate. If the meeting is conducted in open session, all discussion and voting for tenure will take place with the candidate present. Guests attending the meeting may not participate. If the candidate does not request an open meeting, the committee may move into closed session and the candidate and guests will be excused from the meeting. The committee will vote by show of hands on a motion to recommend tenure. A simple majority vote is required.
 - 1.9. The committee shall inform the candidate and the dean in writing of the outcome of the vote within seven (7) business days. Within fourteen (14) business days, the committee shall submit a written report of the results of the review to the candidate and the dean.
 - 1.10. Copies of the PRT Committee and Department Chair letters will be placed in the candidate's personnel file in the department office.
 - 1.11. In the case of a non-renewal decision, the candidate may request reconsideration by the PRT committee in accordance with the procedures prescribed in the UWS 3.07/UWL 3.07 personnel rules.
- 2.0 Retention and Tenure Expectations and Evidence.
 - 2.1 Retention and tenure decisions by the PRT Committee are peer reviews of past and expected performance. Consequently, in making retention and tenure decisions, the PRT Committee

- considers all matters bearing on the potential of candidates in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Retention and tenure decisions are based on documentation provided by candidates as evidence of effective teaching, ongoing record of scholarly activity, and professional, college and community service. Results of reviews for faculty members since the time of hire shall be part of the basis for making retention and tenure recommendations.
- 2.2 A listing of accomplishments does not suffice as sole evidence of teaching, scholarship, and service. “Evidence” is defined as actual and/or authentic work completed in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, including documentation that contains a description/narrative of participation, the frequency and duration of time spent completing the activity, and contributions made by participating in the activity. Evidence must include copies of documents showing active participation and/or products/work contributing to teaching, scholarship, and service.
- 2.3 Candidates will provide the PRT chair with the following required documentation:
- 2.3.1 Electronic portfolios, which must include the following required documents:
 - 2.3.2 A completed Retention Report, with appropriate evidence hyperlinked with no more than 10 links in each section (teaching, scholarship, and service), drawn from UW-L’s electronic portfolio system inclusive of all years of employment at UW-L. (See 3.4) For second year and tenure reviews, relevant activities for all years at UW-L will be reported.
 - 2.3.3 A completed Annual Report, with appropriate evidence hyperlinked with no more than 10 links in each section (teaching, scholarship, and service), drawn from UW-L’s electronic portfolio system from the most recent year of employment at UW-L. (See 3.4)
 - 2.3.4 A completed Annual Faculty and Academic Staff Review and Evaluation Report.
 - 2.3.5 A current detailed career-long vita.
 - 2.3.6 Narrative statements including short term and long term goals and plans for goal attainment for each area of teaching (including administrative responsibilities as part of load), scholarship, and service as described in the JPC Guidelines (May 2007, p. 6 -11).
 - 2.3.7 SEI scores for all courses taught, candidate’s composite scores and departmental fractional median for the review period. The DES Chair will have posted the SEI scores on the department PRT Committee website. Candidates will submit all written student comments from the SEI Forms for all semesters in a word-processed document.
 - 2.3.8 Teaching Philosophy – A written, detailed, comprehensive statement of the candidate's teaching philosophy.
 - 2.3.9 Copies of letters from the PRT Chair, DES Department Chair, dean, and provost from all past retention reviews.
 - 2.3.10 Copies of all merit evaluation rankings and letters
 - 2.3.11 Any other material the candidate wishes to have considered
- 3.0 Teaching.
- 3.1 Expectations. Candidates are expected to demonstrate effective teaching. Candidates are expected to distribute syllabi in all courses taught at the beginning of the course. “Effective teaching” is defined by SEI individual course and composite scores, candidate-generated evaluations, implementation of university-approved curriculum and evidence of student learning, tenured faculty observations, and overall favorable student comments. It is expected that candidates will have a minimum SEI Composite score of 4.0 for 50% of the semesters since time-of-hire as a tenure track faculty member at UW-L.
- 3.2 Primary emphasis of the review will be on evidence of teaching effectiveness. Candidates are expected to demonstrate effective teaching. Effective teaching is demonstrated by positive SEI individual course and composite scores for all courses taught, results of candidate-generated evaluations, evidence of implementation of university-approved curriculum, evidence of student learning, positive tenured faculty observations, and overall favorable student comments on SEI

evaluations. SEI scores are only one source of evidence of effective teaching. Retention and tenure decisions are not based only on SEI scores. Candidates must submit the required documentary evidence (see 3.4) in order for teaching activities and teaching effectiveness to be considered for retention and tenure. Submission of only a list of course information does not satisfy the expectation for evidence of teaching effectiveness. Candidates must provide additional evidence of effective teaching in order to be recommended for retention and tenure.

3.3 It is expected that all retention and tenure candidates will schedule at least one classroom observation by a tenured faculty member each semester. The PRT Committee will choose the observer for the fall semester's observation. The observer for the spring semester observation may be chosen by the candidate. Each observation should include a pre-observation meeting classroom observation, and an observation report.

3.3.1 Pre-observation meeting: Prior to the classroom observation, the candidate and the tenured faculty member should meet to discuss pedagogical practices, course delivery methods, and objectives for the class period to be observed.

3.3.2 Classroom observation: Classroom observation should be at least one full class period in length (a minimum of 55 minutes).

3.3.3 Observation Report: The report should contain a summary of the observation, including the following: name of the candidate observed, date, course title, and description of the class content and activities observed, strengths, and suggested areas of improvement.

3.4 Required Evidence of Teaching. Candidates must submit the following required documentary evidence in order for teaching activities to be considered for retention and tenure. A list of teaching accomplishments does not constitute acceptable evidence and will not be considered for retention and tenure. Candidates must submit the following required evidence:

3.4.1 A list of course numbers, courses titles, course enrollments, and credit hours for all courses taught during the review period.

3.4.2 All course syllabi and subsequent changes to the syllabi, describing assignments and evaluation procedures during the period(s) covered within the review.

3.4.3 Tenured faculty member observation reports (minimum of one per semester) for the review period as designated.

3.4.5 Advising. List the following information:

3.4.1 Academic Advising: Number of undergraduate and graduate advisees

3.4.2 Portfolio Advising: Number of undergraduate and graduate advisees

3.4.3 Student Organizations: Name of Organization, role and responsibility

3.4.6 Administrative Assignments (if part of load): Describe the responsibilities, accomplishments, and any release time designated for this responsibility.

3.4.7 Additional Evidence. Candidates may submit additional evidence to document teaching effectiveness, such as:

3.4.7.1 Pedagogical Innovations. Provide a description of techniques used in course instruction.

3.4.7.2 New Teaching Materials. Provide a description of teaching materials developed.

3.4.7.3 Activities that Enhance Student Learning. Provide a description of activities used to enhance student learning.

3.4.7.4 Assessment. Describe involvement and responsibilities in the following activities.

3.4.7.4.1. Directed Student Learning

3.4.7.4.2 Graduate Students, Capstone Projects

3.4.7.5 Non-Credit Instruction. Describe any non-credit instruction in which the candidate participated as the instructor.

3.4.7.6 Grants – For the study of effective teaching practices; teaching improvement grants. Describe grants submitted and how the grant was used to enhance the candidate's teaching practices.

4.0 Scholarship (Intellectual Contributions).

4.1 Expectations. Candidates are expected to demonstrate an ongoing record of research and scholarly activity. Each year candidates must show evidence of scholarly activity. All

- candidates are required to generate peer-reviewed publications, such as journal articles and books, and presentations; higher preference is given to peer-reviewed publications and national and international presentations. It is expected that candidates will have a minimum of one peer-reviewed publication accepted/published by the second year review, a total of two peer-reviewed publications accepted/published by the fourth year review, and it is recommended that candidates have a minimum of three peer-reviewed publications by the tenure decision. By the tenure decision, it is also expected that candidates will have a minimum of either three international/national presentations or two international/national and two regional/state presentations.
- 4.2 Candidates must submit the following required documentary evidence in order for scholarly activities to be considered for retention and tenure. A list of scholarly accomplishments does not constitute acceptable evidence and will not be sufficient for positive retention and tenure recommendations.
- 4.3 Required Evidence of Scholarship.
- 4.3.1 Publications – Accepted, In Press, and/or Published. For all of the following types of publications, required evidence includes: Copies of letters of invitation or acceptance; copies of submitted manuscripts if not yet published; copies of published articles with acceptance rates when available; and copies of books and book chapters. For all publications, include complete APA reference information. For editorial/refereeing activities, include copies of letters of invitation/agreement and name of journal or publisher.
- 4.3.2 Professional Presentations – Accepted and Completed – International, National, Regional, and State. For all presentations, required evidence includes: Title and description of presentation, name of organization, copies of letters of acceptance, copies of program documentation. For all presentations, include complete APA reference information.
- 4.3.3 Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research. For all contracts, grants, or research projects, required evidence includes: Copies of research/grant proposals, including funding source, funding amount, approved IRB proposals, a description of the project, and description of project length and progress to date.
- 4.3.4 Works in Progress. For any scholarly works in progress (publications, presentations, research, grants), required evidence includes documents listed in 4.3.1-4.3.3.
- 4.3.5 Other Scholarly Activities, Artistic and Professional Performances and Exhibits
- 5.0 Service.
- 5.1 Expectations. Candidates are expected to demonstrate active participation in three levels of service including professional, university, and community service. Professional service is defined as the contribution of scholarly professional expertise within internal and/or external university activities. University service is defined as committee, task force, or special project work for the university, college, and/or department. Community service is defined as volunteer/civic work within the community (JPC Guidelines, May 2007). Candidates are expected to establish a record of service in each of these three areas that may be related to, but not identical to their teaching responsibilities (JPC Guidelines, May 2007). Candidates must participate in service activities in each category to be recommended for retention and tenure.
- 5.2 Required evidence of Service.
- 5.2.1 Professional Service: Documentation of membership and leadership roles in professional and public organizations; evidence of consulting describing responsibilities; evidence of in-service/workshops; documentation of coordinating lecture series, institutes, or conferences; documentation of participation in faculty exchange programs..
- 5.2.2 College Service: Evidence of participation in faculty senate and/or senate committees; evidence of participation in university, college, School of Education, department and/or program committees; evidence of advisor responsibilities for campus organizations.
- 5.2.3 Community Service: Evidence of participation in community service.
- 5.2.4 Additional Evidence. Candidates may submit additional evidence of service activities.
- 6.0 PRT and Merit Evaluations: Since merit evaluations are only one of several criteria used by the PRT Committee in retention and tenure evaluation, a candidate's merit evaluation and retention or tenure evaluation may differ. Differences in evaluations may result from, but are not limited to the

following reasons: evaluations are conducted by different committees with differing evidence requirements; the Faculty Development Committee bases its decisions on performance over one year, while the PRT Committee considers all relevant past activities, and the Faculty Development Committee evaluates past performance only while the PRT Committee also considers potential performance.

(See additional language on expectations and evidence for teaching, scholarship and service on the UW-L website for the Joint Promotion Committee at <http://uwlax.edu/hr/promo-resources.htm>)

8. Annual Review of Academic Staff.

- 8.1 For annual review decisions, full time academic staff will submit annually a portfolio of items, which should include information documenting past and present activities in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service for the past year.
- 8.2 Part-time academic staff will be evaluated upon written request.
- 8.3 Review procedures will be the same as those described above for the PRT Committee.
- 8.4 The time period for academic staff evaluation is determined by university schedule.
- 8.5 In evaluating an academic staff member's performance, the committee will weigh three areas with the corresponding activities as follows:
 - 8.5.1 Teaching 65%: Including but not limited to the following: Responsibilities of particular jobs/courses taught; curriculum and course development; innovative approaches to instruction; maintenance of academic standards and integrity; teaching workload; guided and independent learning; service on comprehensive examination committees; attendance at workshops and seminars on teaching effectiveness; additional college credit for teaching and/or knowledge growth or higher terminal degree; student advising and counseling; peer faculty review; self-assessment.
 - 8.5.2 Scholarship 15%: Including but not limited to the following: Presentations at professional meetings; grant application and funding; publications in refereed and non-refereed sources.
 - 8.5.3 Service 20%: Including but not limited to the following: Membership and/or leadership roles in professional and public organizations; consulting; in-service/workshops; coordinating lecture series, institutes, conferences, etc.; and active participation in university or School of Education outreach programs; active participation in university, college, School of Education, department and/or program committees and/or organizations; advisor to campus organizations; community service.

Article VIII

Review of Tenured Faculty and Professional Development

1. The purpose of reviewing Department of Educational Studies (DES) faculty is to encourage and support meaningful growth and development of faculty in ways that positively contribute to the university mission and goals and to the missions and goals of the college. This review is to be a collegial process to promote the achievement of value and meaning in the roles that faculty play in their relations with students, colleagues and local communities. The Review of Tenured Faculty in DES will be consistent with all UW-La Crosse directives and methods for evaluation of its teaching personnel.
2. Assumptions. Areas to be reviewed include: (a) teaching; (b) scholarship; and (c) service. The review process may include the use of both peer and student input. The review will be consistent with the departmental mission and those of the college and university. Observations and guidance regarding the teaching component will focus upon the areas of curriculum, instructional system, teacher-learner interaction, and management style. Scholarship and service will be assessed within normal UW-La Crosse expectations of a quality teaching institution. All criteria for faculty review are flexible to allow for shifts in professional emphasis and personal goals. Academic freedom shall be respected at every level of the process.
3. Procedures. Each DES faculty member's activities and performance will be reviewed at least once within each five-year period in accordance with the mission of the department, college and university.

The department will establish a review cycle for its members and submit this to the college dean. Each year the college dean will send to the department notification of those faculty members who are subject to review. The DES review cycle is attached to this document.

The DES Tenured Faculty Review and Development will be carried out as part of the merit determination process. Teaching, scholarship and service will be evaluated and the results may be used to facilitate and enhance faculty development. The department has clearly stated written criteria describing what constitutes satisfactory performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service within the context of the missions of the department, college and university.

At the beginning of the Tenured Faculty Review and Development process, the reviewee will select a peer (tenured faculty member) to be an integral member of the review process and forward the name of this person to the department chair, who will then call a meeting for the three of them prior to materials being assembled and reviewed. At this meeting the reviewee can discuss the materials which should be included for this review.

Once the materials have been assembled and reviewed by the department chair and the designated faculty member, the results of the review will be conveyed to the reviewee by the department chair and these results will be forwarded to the dean, who will forward them to the provost/vice chancellor's office as required by UW-La Crosse policy.

If a faculty member is judged to have significant areas of concern in performance, a list of these areas of concern will be presented to the faculty member by the department chair and the designated faculty member in a three-way structured meeting. This meeting should result in the development of a faculty development plan based on the departmental criteria to address the areas of concern within a reasonable period of time.

4. Accountability. At an agreed upon date, the department chair and the designated senior faculty member shall meet with the reviewee to discuss the results of the plan and how successfully the areas of concern have been addressed.
 - 4.1. If areas of concern have been addressed satisfactorily, the department chair will write the faculty member a letter stating this and the letter will be placed in the faculty member's file. The department chair will also send a letter to the dean and the designated faculty member involved in the review stating that the areas of concern have been addressed to the satisfaction of the review team.
 - 4.2. If the areas of concern have not been eliminated, either the faculty member shall meet with the review team (department chair and designated faculty member) to evaluate the need for additional steps which may be necessary to remove the areas of concern.
 - 4.3. Funds necessary to implement plans to remove areas of concern will be provided by the deans or the appropriate administrative officers.
 - 4.4. A confidential file of the tenured faculty review will be kept within the department. The file will contain all documents and correspondence involved in the evaluation of the faculty member and the resolution of any identified areas of concern. A copy of all items in the file of the individual faculty member will be given to that member.
5. Reconsideration. DES faculty members shall have the rights of appeal as outlined in the UW-L Faculty Personnel Guidelines 6.01 and 6.02 and may appeal department decisions to the CGAAF (p. 160, Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook).
6. Approval. This process for review of tenured faculty to promote professional development plans has been submitted to the dean who has been assured that all evaluation plans meet UW-La Crosse criteria.

Article IX

Promotion Guidelines

1.0 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion

The policy guidelines adopted by the Department of Educational Studies for promotion closely follow those written by the UW-L Joint Promotion Committee.

1.1 Scholarship

In the School of Education, scholarship is viewed as "activities in which faculty use professional expertise to discover, apply" or integrate knowledge. Scholarly activities are

characterized as using methods appropriate to one or more disciplines and having been subjected to peer review. As stated by the UW-L Joint Promotion Committee, “scholarly activities include basic and applied research, new applications of existing knowledge, integration of knowledge, creative endeavors or development and/or analysis of pedagogical methods” (Cited from A Guide to Faculty Promotions at UW-La Crosse, 2000 p.5).

Consistent with the policies of the UW-L Joint Promotion Committee, the Department of Educational Studies expects faculty to develop a record of on-going scholarly activity which includes evidence of peer review. The Department recognizes that the nature of scholarly activity varies considerable among faculty, “and so does not demand that all activities fit the same mold.” The Department also expects faculty to maintain a consistent level of productivity with regard to relevant scholarly activity and more importantly, evaluates this scholarly activity “as part of the candidate’s overall record (p.5).

EVIDENCE OF SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

1.1.1 Original Research

Original research includes activities which are “intended to advance basic knowledge within a discipline. The primary evidence of the success of such activities consists of the publication of articles in scholarly refereed journals; publication of monographs by a recognized academic publisher; and presentations at national and regional conferences. In general, articles submitted for publication but not yet accepted; monographs published at the author’s expense; and presentations before on-campus or general audiences are not considered evidence of successful peer review of original research. Other activities of an on-going program of original research which are likely to strengthen a candidate’s file include receipt of funded research grants and giving invited addresses at professional conferences.”

1.1.2 Pedagogical Research on the Scholarship of Teaching

“Some faculty may focus on studying or experimenting with ways to improve students’ learning. A candidate for promotion who submits this kind of work as part of their record of scholarship should provide evidence that the methods are well-defined and documented; that the student learning outcomes have been properly analyzed and compared to those using standard teaching methods of the discipline when that is feasible; and that the methods have been subjected to appropriate peer review. Publication of articles on innovative teaching methods and their effectiveness in appropriate journals and presentations at national or regional conferences frequently provide the evidence of peer review. Other examples of pedagogical scholarship include assessment activities to measure and improve student learning in academic programs. In these cases, the product of assessment should be a report or article that can be reviewed by peers. Pedagogical scholarship is not to be confused with the normal elements of good teaching such as course preparation, revision or development unless the additional elements of documentation, assessment, analysis and peer review are also present.”

1.1.3 Applied Research

“Some individuals’ scholarly work uses professional expertise to solve problems. Activities include serving as a consultant in a research project, collaborating with colleagues in other disciplines in their research activities, writing software that makes existing knowledge and procedures available to colleagues, conducting a program assessment for an academic department or external organization and conducting an oral history project for the community. As with the program of original

research, one source of evidence about the quality of this work may be refereed journal articles, scholarly monographs and conference presentations. However, other ways to demonstrate the quality of the work is through some form of review by the primary audience or beneficiaries of the work as well as peer review by experts in the field.”

1.1.4 Research with an Integrative Function

“Although these activities are not subject to peer review in the same manner as original research, the value is verified by a board of editors or a similar panel of judges. Examples include textbooks, publications and presentations that overview recent research. Published book reviews or abstracts for periodicals, and compiling and editing anthologies” (All quoted language under Evidence of Scholarly Activity is taken from *A Guide to Faculty Promotions at UW-La Crosse*, 2000 pp.5-6).

1.2 Teaching

In the Department of Educational Studies, teaching is viewed as including a broad array of activities that take place both inside and outside of the classroom. The primary aim is to stimulate, promote and advance students’ learning and educational development, based on the goals of the Conceptual Framework and program standards. The UW-L Joint Promotion Committee expects that candidates for promotion will be good teachers and will provide multiple sources of evidence about their teaching effectiveness. Evidence of quality teaching is a necessary condition for promotion.

Teaching is the most important of the three areas in which a candidate for promotion is evaluated. Since teaching is a complex set of activities, it is important to provide a range of evidence that fully explains the quality of a candidate’s teaching. The UW-L Joint Promotion Committee expects evidence provided from three distinct sources: Peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness, student evaluation of instruction and additional information on teaching methods and effectiveness provided by the promotion candidate (Cited from *A Guide to Faculty Promotions at UW-La Crosse 2000 p.3*).

Areas and activities to consider include, but are not limited to the following: Curriculum and course development; innovative approaches to instruction; quality of syllabi, assignments and student assignments; maintenance of academic standards and integrity; teaching workload; supervision of student research, guided and independent learning and service on comprehensive examination committees; attendance at workshops and seminars on teaching effectiveness; student advising and counseling; and improvement of instruction grant proposals and funding.

1.3 Service

In the Department of Educational Studies, service by a candidate for promotion is the fulfillment of his or her professional responsibilities, including educational responsibilities outside the classroom, active participation in professional organizations, committee work or other assignments within his or her department and/or university and activities that benefit the community at large. Service activities fall into three categories: Professional Service, University Service and Community Service. Professional Service involves the use of professional expertise in service activity that may be internal or external to the university. University Service involves work on Committees, task forces and special projects for the university, college and department. Community Service involves volunteer or civic work in the community.

The UW-L Joint Promotion Committee expects that any candidate recommended for promotion will provide evidence of service activities for the department, college, university, discipline or community. Service in the Department of Educational Studies includes: Membership and leadership roles in professional and public organizations; consulting; Inservice/workshops; coordinating lecture series, institutes, conferences, etc.; participation in University Outreach programs; participation in CEP Faculty Exchange

program; Faculty Senate; university committees; department committees; college committees; advisor to campus groups; and community service.

2.0 Review Procedures for Promotion

- 2.1 Eligible candidates who intend to pursue promotion are required to indicate their intent in writing (e-mail accepted) to the Department Chair during the first week of the fall semester of classes. Candidates must submit promotion materials within 30 days following this declaration of intent.
- 2.2 The Department Chair shall forward all names of faculty interested in promotion to the PRT Committee Chair no later than the Monday of the second week of classes, asking the Committee to set up the timeline for reviewing and evaluating promotion materials and to convey that information to candidates.
- 2.3 PRT Committee members who review and evaluate oral and written evidence presented for promotion by the candidate shall be at a rank higher than that of the candidate. At the promotion review meeting, the candidate will be excused before the vote is taken. The Committee shall vote (e.g. voice vote or show of hands) on a motion to support promotion. In the event that there are fewer than three (3) faculty at a rank above the candidate, the PRT Committee Chair will appoint additional members with related expertise from outside the department. A simple majority vote is required.
- 2.4 The PRT Committee Chair shall be responsible for submitting the evaluation by the committee to the Department Chair no later than seven (7) days after the PRT Committee meeting and at least two (2) days prior to the university deadline for submitting the promotion recommendation to the Dean.
- 2.5 The Department Chair holds the option of submitting a letter to the Dean in concurrence with Joint Promotion Committee Guidelines.

Article X

Faculty and Student Policy and Procedures

1.0 Communication Policy

- 1.1 The Department of Educational Studies in the College Liberal Studies recognizes the need to foster clear communication in order to build a healthy academic community. In this academic community there are essentially four relationships which involve rights and responsibilities. These responsibilities are:
 - professional to student
 - student to professional
 - professional to professional
 - student to student
- 1.2 When these responsibilities are marked by weak communication, problems occur and may require outside guidance. Consequently, to insure effective, open communication, the following is a statement of core beliefs.
 - Each person in the Educational Studies community is unique and valuable.
 - The community is only as strong as its individual members.
 - Each person should be treated with dignity and respect, and each individual in the community has the corresponding obligation to treat others in that manner.
 - The community must be founded on mutual trust. Therefore, communication at all levels should be direct and timely. Individuals in the community have the responsibility to avoid fostering rumors, gossip, and hostile and negative energy in the community. Conflicts between and among individuals should be resolved as quickly as possible. They should be resolved **directly** with the individuals involved.

- The community recognizes that to “search for blame” is counterproductive and works to destroy the atmosphere of trust on which the community must be built to achieve its goals. Communication should be focused on problem-solving to reach an adequate solution for all.
 - Our community commits itself to a sense of shared authority, responsibility, and accountability. Each community member is responsible for the overall image and welfare of the community. Each community member is also responsible for the welfare and support of every other community member.
- 1.3 These core beliefs should be used to guide discussions of communication conflicts.

2.0 Merit Appeal Procedure

Faculty members who wish to appeal a merit decision must submit their appeal in writing to the Department Chair within one week of notification. The Chair will ask the Merit Committee to reconvene within 10 (ten) days of the submission of the appeal to reconsider the member’s merit status. A two-thirds vote is required to override. Beyond this level, there will be no further appeal within the department.

3.0 Grade Appeal Procedure

- 3.1 To initiate a grade appeal, students must contact the instructor who gave the grade. This must be done during the semester immediately following the semester in which the grade was earned.
- 3.2 Complaints should initially be sent in writing (including email) to the Educational Studies Department instructor. The instructor should provide the student with a copy of the department’s student guidelines for appealing a final grade, and the instructor and student should find a timely, mutually agreed upon conference date to discuss the request for a grade change. If a satisfactory resolution is not reached as a result of this conference, the student may appeal the final grade by filing a formal written appeal with the Department Chair.
- 3.3 The formal appeal should be signed and dated and should include:
- (a) A statement justifying the request for a grade change
 - (b) Evidence supporting the request
- 3.4 The Chair shall distribute copies of the appeal to the instructor and to the members of the Grade Appeal Committee. The chair will convene a meeting of the Grade Appeal Committee as soon as possible and the chair will serve as a neutral participant in the deliberations.
- 3.5 The Grade Appeal Committee shall be a standing subcommittee of the Faculty and Student Development Committee and shall consist of three members appointed by the Committee Chair at the beginning of each academic year. The department chair shall appoint an alternate to the Grade Appeal Committee when necessary (e.g. if a member of the Grade Appeal Committee is the instructor involved in a grade appeal).
- 3.6 If the appeal involves the Department Chair, the person with seniority on the Grade Appeal Committee shall assume the role of the Department Chair to appoint an alternate, distribute the Grade Appeal, and convene the Grade Appeal Committee.
- 3.7 The Committee shall review the appeal and supporting material. After consideration, the committee may recommend that:
- (a) The grade should remain unchanged, OR
 - (b) The grade should be raised (Committee may not recommend lowering grade).
- 3.8 The Department Chair shall inform the student and the instructor in writing of the Committee's recommendations. The final decision will remain with the instructor. A written record of this Grade Appeal will be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file.

Approved May 2001

Revisions approved on: 7/03, 11/03, 4/05, 5/06, 6/06, 04/07, 5/9/08