

DES BYLAWS

I. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES

Language in *italics* is required by the University. Changes since the previously approved version as a whole (2014) are in Calibri (this font) with dates indicated. *These bylaws should be reviewed at least once every seven years, but once every other year is recommended.*

II. Organization and Operation

A. Preamble (last revised 5/18/18)

Department members are governed by six interdependent sets of regulations:

- 1. Federal and State laws and regulations*
- 2. UW System policies and rules*
- 3. UWL policies and rules*
- 4. School of Education, Professional and Continuing Education (EPC) policies and rules*
- 5. Shared governance bylaws and policies for ranked faculty and staff*
- 6. Department bylaws*

A.6.a Department bylaws provide procedures for conducting Department business. They shall not conflict with the policies of the School of Education, Professional and Continuing Education (EPC), the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (UWL) or the UW-System (UWS). In the event of such a conflict, the UWS, UWL or EPC policies or bylaws shall take precedence and the Department bylaws shall be amended accordingly.

A.6.b The Department faculty is committed to developing graduates who embrace global perspectives within the teaching profession, respect the dignity of all learners, and demonstrate professional competencies enabling them to be effective teachers and responsible citizens in a diverse and dynamic world. The Department faculty subscribes to the Standards for Teacher Educators set forth in the Association for Teacher Educators.

A.6.c The Department is comprised of teacher education programs including initial certification at the undergraduate levels (Early Childhood-Middle Childhood, Middle Childhood-Early Adolescence, Early Childhood-Adolescence developmental ranges).

A.6.d. Department Programs:

The department houses the following majors and is comprised of the following programs:

- Early Childhood-Middle Childhood (EC-MC)
- Middle Childhood-Early Adolescence (MC-EA)
- Early Childhood-Adolescence (EC-A)

The department houses the following minors:

- Special Education (SPE)
- Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)
- General Science Education (certification at MC-EA level only)
- Broadfield Social Studies Education (certification at MC-EA level only)

B. Meeting Guidelines (last revised 5/18/18)

Department meetings will be run according to the most recent edition of Robert's Rules of Order (<http://www.robertsrules.com/>) and Wisconsin Open Meeting Laws (<http://www.doj.state.wi.us/sites/default/files/dls/open-meetings-law-compliance-guide-2010.pdf>) summary at (<https://www.wisconsin.edu/general-counsel/legal-topics/open-meetings-law/>).

Department faculty meetings shall be called by the Department Chair, as needed to conduct Department business. A department meeting may be requested if a majority of the voting membership feels a meeting is needed to address department business.

B.1 Attendance

All voting members shall attend scheduled meetings.

B.2 Information on Minutes

Minutes will be recorded by a voting member or the departmental ADA and distributed in a timely fashion to department members. Copies of the minutes of department meetings and committee meetings shall be distributed to the department electronically and shall be made available upon request.

C. Definitions of Membership and Voting Procedures**C.1. Department Membership**

The Department Chair, tenured and tenure-track faculty, Academic Staff, Academic Department Associate (ADA), and University Services Program Associate (USPA) that provide support to Department programs are considered Department members.

C.2. Voting Membership

C.2.a. The Department Chair, tenured faculty, and tenure-track faculty in the Department shall have equal voting privileges in conducting Department business.

C.2.b. Instructional Academic Staff with a continuous contract in the Department and have at least 0.5 FTE appointment in the Department shall have equal voting privileges in conducting Department business.

C.3. Voting Procedures

C.3.a. Each eligible voting member shall have one vote on Department business matters. All motions require a simple majority vote of those present, unless otherwise specified. The Department Chair may request an electronic vote in conducting Department business. The Department Chair shall provide a deadline for electronic voting. All electronic motions of the Department shall require a simple majority vote of those submitting electronic ballots by the voting deadline for the motion to be passed.

C.3.b. Voting may be conducted by hand, roll call, or paper ballot. If a paper ballot is used the ballots must be signed by each Department voting member and shall be kept in Department files for seven years from the date of the vote. The ballot is returned to the Department Chair to be counted as valid.

C.3.c. Votes received after the set timeline, not received at all, received blank, or received unsigned (if required) will be counted as abstention votes. Votes received after the set timeline or blank will count toward quorum.

D. Definitions of Quorum and Majority

A quorum is a simple majority of the Department voting membership. An electronic vote quorum is at least 2/3 of the department voting membership responding to the motion.

E. Changes of Bylaws

Department bylaws may be amended by a 2/3 vote of the Department voting membership. Bylaw changes are subject to two separate readings.

III. Faculty/Staff Responsibilities (last revised 12/18/15, minor updates 5/18/18)

A. Faculty (Tenured and Tenure-Track faculty) –

A.1. Faculty responsibilities are referenced in section IV of the Faculty Senate bylaws entitled "Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons" (<http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/ABP/FacSenatePolicies.html>).

A.2. All ranked faculty have work responsibilities determined in consultation with the Department Chair to be consistent with this policy. Depending on courses needed for a given semester, qualified tenured and tenure-track faculty with graduate faculty status shall be given priority in teaching graduate course instructional assignments. DES guidelines for teaching, scholarship, and service activities are aligned with JPC faculty promotion guidelines: http://www.uwlax.edu/uploadedFiles/Offices-Services/Human_Resources/Faculty-Promotion-Guide%20.pdf

A.2.a. **Teaching:** All ranked faculty are expected to engage in instructional activities and advising to support student learning. For retention and promotion, ranked faculty need to demonstrate evidence of improving and developing their teaching. (see Appendix A for criteria.) Teaching is the primary focus for individuals in tenure track positions within the SoE. SoE affiliated faculty pursue this aim within the context of guiding students who intend to become teachers.

A.2.b. **Scholarship:** All ranked faculty are expected to participate in appropriate scholarly activities. For retention and promotion, ranked faculty will need to demonstrate evidence of appropriate scholarship (see Appendix B for criteria). The Department of Educational Studies defines scholarship as basic and applied research, new applications of existing knowledge, integration of knowledge, creative endeavors and the development and/or analysis of pedagogical methods. Scholarship in the Department of Education Studies aligns with and informs birth-21 education and our work as teacher educators.

A.2.c. **Service:** All ranked faculty are expected to provide service to the Department, School, University, and Profession. For retention and promotion, ranked faculty will need to demonstrate evidence of appropriate service (see Appendix C for criteria). This service can take the form of active participation in organizations, committee work or other assignments within the department, and/or the University, and activities that benefit the community at large. DES upholds the Wisconsin Idea, which values service to the university, state and nation in accordance with [JPC guidelines](#).

B. Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Responsibilities and Expectations (last revised 5/10/19)

B.1. Requests for IAS hiring will be presented to the EPC Dean. The request will indicate one of the standard titles from the lecturer or clinical professor series <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/classification/> and will outline specific duties including teaching and any additional workload. Total workload for IAS is defined as a standard minimum teaching load plus additional workload equivalency activities. <https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/offices-services/human-resources/ias-promotion-guide.pdf> (see also Faculty Senate Articles, Bylaws and Policies).

- B.2. Full-time instructional academic staff engaged in undergraduate instruction typically have a teaching load of at least 12 contact hours of group instruction per week. Full-time instructional academic staff engaged in graduate instruction typically have a teaching load of at least 9 contact hours of group instruction per week. The total workload for a full-time equivalency shall not exceed 15/16 contact hours (e.g., 12 contact hours teaching load plus up to 3 contact hours additional workload equivalency). A total workload that exceeds the 15/16 contact hour maximum will constitute an overload for payroll purposes. Full-time IAS in DES who participate in scholarship and/or professional development and/or service activities at a level that would be deemed meritorious will be awarded 3 workload equivalent credits towards their total workload assignment.
- B.3. Half-time instructional academic staff engaged in undergraduate instruction typically have a teaching load of at least 6 contact hours of group instruction per week. The total workload for a half-time equivalency shall not exceed 8 contact hours (e.g., 6 contact hours teaching load plus up to 2 contact hours additional workload equivalency). Half-time IAS that participate in scholarship and/or professional development and/or service activities at a level that would be deemed meritorious will be awarded 2 workload equivalent credits towards their total workload assignment.
- B.4. To fulfill the responsibilities of individual units and the mission of this institution, variations will occur in the composition of individual, departmental and EPC workloads. Composition of workload varies among individual IAS members and departments, depending upon the number of students in classes, number and nature of course preparations required, the nature of instructional patterns (e.g., lecture, discussion, laboratory, clinical and/or field activity), the nature of the students (lower division, upper division, or graduate), the extent of other assigned responsibilities in non-instructional duties (e.g., program direction, lab preparation and/or coordination), scholarly activities, professional development activities, and/or service activities (such as committee assignments, academic advisement, or assistance with student activities and organizations, public service, community service and professional service).
- B.5. IAS responsibilities are predominantly related to the Department instructional mission, but IAS members may also be expected to fulfill service and advising responsibilities as determined by the Chair and/or Dean.
- B.5. **a. Teaching:** IAS workload expectations are determined by the Department Chair in consultation with the IAS member consistent with the UW-La Crosse Instructional Academic Staff Workload policy ([see III.B.2 and III.B.3](#)).
- B.5. **b. Scholarship/Professional Development:** Scholarship and/or Professional Development activities may be part of IAS responsibilities. IAS are required to perform these activities for promotion. (See IAS promotion procedures; <https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/offices-services/human-resources/ias-promotion-guide.pdf>)
- B.5. **c. Service:** Service may be part of IAS contracted appointment responsibilities. IAS are required to perform service activities for promotion and/or as assigned by the Chair/Dean. (See [IAS promotion procedures: https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/offices-services/human-resources/ias-promotion-guide.pdf](#)).
- B.6. Evaluation of IAS is based primarily on their teaching activities, but also includes service and/or scholarship and/or professional development activities in accord with expectations outlined in their contracts. IAS in permanently budgeted lines with $\geq 50\%$ FTE appointments will also

participate in the standard DES annual merit review procedures (see section IV). IAS in non-permanently budgeted lines and/or with < 50% FTE appointments will be reviewed annually by the DES Chair.

C. **Non-Instructional Academic Staff (NIAS) Responsibilities and Expectations**

NIAS responsibilities are defined by their position description.

D. **Student Evaluation of Instruction** (last revised 3/31/17)

D.1. The Department will follow the UW-L SEI policy and procedure available on the Faculty Senate webpage

(<http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/Archived%20Documents/Archived%20Document%20Page>).

Results from the Faculty Senate approved SEI questions are required for retention, tenure, and promotion for ranked Faculty and for renewal and promotion of Instructional Academic Staff in the form of (1) the single motivation item and (2) the composite SEI consisting of the 5 common questions. These numbers will be reported using the Teaching Assignment Information (TAI) form. The department will add both the motivation item and the composite SEI fractional median for each course. In addition, the candidate's overall fractional median for the term on both the single motivation item and the composite SEI are reported. Finally, the department adds the departmental fractional median for both the single motivation item and the composite, the minimum and maximum composite SEI for the department, and the candidate's rank in SEI scores relative to all departmental ranked faculty (tenure-track or tenured) for that term (e.g. 3 of 15).

D.2 SEI ratings will be included in the faculty or staff member's SEI report for the semester in which they occur. Such SEI scores will be required for retention, tenure, and promotion in the same form as outlined in III.D.1. SEI evaluations may be conducted in an electronic format. SEIs will be collected and reported for Winter session and Summer session courses in the same manner as for academic year courses.

D.3 In addition to the standard questions specified by Faculty Senate, DES uses additional questions on the SEI form. The complete form is available in Appendix H.

D.4 For IAS review, contract renewal, and promotion, the same information as above is reported. The comparison group for IAS will be the department as a whole.

IV. **Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)** – (major restructuring 12/16/16; last revised 5/10/19)

The results of merit reviews for all ranked faculty who have completed at least one academic year at UWL are due to the Dean's Office on Dec. 15 annually. Merit reviews reflect activities during the prior academic year ending May 31. (2016 UWL Bylaws template)

A. **Evaluation Processes & Criteria**

A.1 **Faculty:** All tenure track faculty with appointments in DES will be reviewed for Merit, whether or not they elect to serve on a Merit Review Committee.

A.2 **Instructional Academic Staff in Permanent Budgeted Instructional Lines:** All IAS members with at least 0.5 FTE appointment in DES and in permanently budget lines will be reviewed for Merit, whether or not they elect to serve on a Merit Review Committee.

A.3 **Non-Instructional Academic Staff:** NIAS are reviewed according to the policies in Section VII of these bylaws.

- A.4 **Department Chair:** The Department Chair is formally reviewed once each year using a survey administered by the EPC Dean. The review must involve feedback from the membership of the department and from the Dean.
- A.5 **Merit review committee composition:**
- A.5.a All faculty and all IAS members of the department with at least 0.5 FTE (Full Time Equivalent) appointment are eligible to serve on the Merit Review Committees with the exception of faculty and IAS in their first year in the department.
 - A.5.b The entire membership of the Department of Educational Studies will be divided into three groups that will comprise Merit Review Committee A, Merit Review Committee B, and Merit Committee C.
 - A.5.c Terms on a given Merit Review Committee are 3 years, with starting dates staggered such that one third of each committee changes each year. Exceptions to this policy may be made to preserve diversity on a given Merit Review Committee.
 - A.5.d The members of Merit Review Committee A perform the annual merit review for members of Merit Review Committee B, and so on (B evaluates C, C evaluates A). The Merit Review Committee that reviews the Department Chair (for teaching, scholarship, and service activities as a faculty member) will rotate years.
 - A.5.e The Merit Review Committees are chaired by the Department Chair.
 - A.5.f The Department Chair will monitor and adjust if necessary the compositions of the Merit Committees to represent the diversity of the department in rank, gender, ethnicity, race, and program area in each committee as much as possible.
- A.6 **Merit evaluation criteria:**
- A.6.a Evaluations of teaching, scholarship and service should be performed within the context of the Statements on Teaching (Appendix A), Scholarship (Appendix B), and Service (Appendix C).
 - A.6.b Individuals should be evaluated within the context of rank and time in service, and FTE appointment, with the expectation of growth (on average) over time and experience.
 - A.6.c Evaluations should take into consideration the summary self-evaluation statements provided by members (defined in IV.A.1 and IV.A.2), which should highlight the achievements and growth of the member in each area. Self-evaluation statements may be in narrative or bulleted list form (defined in IV.A.8).
- A.7 **Merit scoring timeline:** The process involves several steps, which are outlined below and explained in greater detail in the following sections.
- A.7.a **Materials due** (uploaded to D2L or equivalent) at the deadline set by the Provost calendar for the Annual Activity Report (typically early June).
 1. **Annual Activity Report** (Digital Measures or equivalent on activities from the prior year June 1st – May 31st) - uploaded by DES member
 2. **Peer Evaluation Letter(s) (where required for retention and/or promotion review years)** - uploaded by DES member

3. **Summary self-evaluation (narrative – IV.A.6.c) in each area** - uploaded by DES member
 4. **SEI results** - by DES Chair
 5. **TAI form** - by DES Chair
- A.7.b **Pre-scoring portfolios** – performed through an electronic survey at any time from the due date of Merit portfolios to the close date of no less than 5 calendar days in advance of the first scheduled Merit Review Committee meeting.
- A.7.c **Score sorting/categorizing** – performed by the Department Chair and disseminated to the appropriate Merit Review Committee no less than 3 calendar days in advance of the first scheduled Merit Review Committee meeting.
- A.7.d **Meetings of the Merit Review Committees** – to be held during the week before the first week of Fall classes. The three Merit Review Committees may not convene at the same time.
- A.7.e **Final scoring** - performed through an electronic survey within 7 calendar days following the Meeting of each Merit Review Committee.
- A.7.f **Reporting out to department** – the Overall Merit Category score, individual Area scores, and supporting comments will be compiled by the Department Chair and provided to each faculty member and to the Dean of the School of Education within 7 days following the second scheduled Merit Review Committee meeting.
- A.7.g **Appeals** – Any department member may submit an appeal of their merit ratings within 7 calendar days of dissemination of their final Merit report.
- A.8 **Merit Scoring Areas:** Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff are evaluated based on the components of their position descriptions, which informs all retention and promotion decisions. Specifically, the merit scoring areas are as follows:
- A.8.a **Tenure Track Faculty:**
 - Teaching
 - Scholarship
 - Service
 - A.8.b **Instructional Academic Staff:**
 - Teaching
 - Scholarship/Service (Professional Development activities)
- A.9 **Merit Scoring Categories:** The following categories are used to classify the performance of each faculty and instructional academic staff member in each of the Merit Scoring Areas (as defined in IV.A.8).
- E **Exemplary** performance
 - G **Good** performance
 - S **Satisfactory** performance
 - U **Unsatisfactory** performance - submission of this score requires an accompanying explanation from the scorer.
- A.9.a **Teaching: Minimal expectations** - As articulated in Appendix A: *Statement on Teaching*, the minimal expectations of a faculty or IAS member in Teaching are: setting well-defined expectations, distributing syllabi (in electronic or paper format), staying current in their field (including aligning objectives with content standards), returning assignments

and communicating with students in a timely manner, holding regular office hours, implementing the approved course curriculum, and maintaining an appropriate professional disposition.

- A.9.a.1. A Merit score of “**U**” in Teaching may be indicated by the following evidence , but is not limited to:
 - A.9.a.1.i. Failure to meet the **minimal expectations** for Teaching as defined in IV.A.9.a.
- A.9.a.2. A Merit score of “**S**” in Teaching may be indicated by the following evidence , but is not limited to:
 - A.9.a.2.i. Indicators across multiple courses and/or semesters that suggest that the instructor is struggling with providing excellent instruction (e.g., a preponderance of student comments/SEI scores that highlight ineffective teaching practices or communication of content.)
 - A.9.a.2.ii. Documented evidence that the instructor may be struggling with positive teacher-student relationships (e.g., a preponderance of student comments on SEIs, or substantiated communications to the Department Chair or PLC director.)
 - A.9.a.2.iii. Peer observation letters that indicate the instructor has provided sufficient but not excellent instruction.
 - A.9.a.2.iv. Evidence that the instructor is not being self-reflective or contextualizing teaching evidence in their Merit narrative.
- A.9.a.3. Merit scores of “**G**” or “**E**” in Teaching may be indicated by a body of evidence that includes positive and/or contextualized student evaluations, positive peer evaluations, and a self-reflective Merit narrative. SEI scores below the department mean do not preclude Merit scores of “**G**” or “**E**” if there is sufficient supporting evidence.

A.9.b Scholarship: Minimal expectations - As articulated in Appendix B: *Statement on Scholarship*, Faculty members are expected to be actively engaged in scholarship. This could involve collecting and/or analyzing data, writing articles and/or grants, presenting, reviewing, and/or publishing results. Active engagement will take different forms depending on the individual and their area of scholarship. Thus Faculty are encouraged to articulate their activities in their Merit narrative.

- A.9.b.1. A Merit score of “**U**” in Scholarship may be indicated by the following evidence , but is not limited to:
 - A.9.b.1.i. Failure to meet the **minimal expectations** for Scholarship as defined in IV.A.9.b.
- A.9.b.2. A Merit score of “**S**” in Scholarship may be indicated by the following evidence , but is not limited to:
 - A.9.b.2.i. Actively engaged in scholarship, but no submitted or accepted scholarly products (grants, publications).
 - A.9.b.2.ii. Actively engaged in scholarship, but all activities reported fall within the “Tertiary Areas of Impact ” category (see Appendix B). This criterion should be only applied to faculty members who are at the Associate or Full Professor rank.

- A.9.b.3. A Merit score of “G” or “E” in Scholarship may be indicated for Faculty who are actively engaged in Scholarship, and who have one or more scholarly products submitted or accepted/funded. A score of “E” versus “G” should be supported by evidence in the candidate’s portfolio and by their Merit narrative.

A.9.c Service:

- A.9.c.1. **Minimal expectations** - As articulated in Appendix C: *Statement on Service*, Faculty members are expected to provide service to the Department, School, University, and the Profession. Faculty are expected to participate in service activities at lower levels of engagement and/or leadership at earlier career stages, and increase their involvement as they progress through their careers. Minimal expectations of Faculty and IAS for Service are articulated in Appendix C.
- A.9.c.2. A Merit score of “U” in Service may be indicated by the following evidence, but is not limited to:
- A.9.c.2.i. Failure to meet the **minimal expectations** for Service as defined in IV.A.9.c.i or IV.A.9.c.ii.
- A.9.c.2.ii. For Faculty at the Full Professor rank, failure to make service contributions outside of Category C as outlined in Appendix C: *Statement of Service*.
- A.9.c.3. A Merit score of “S” or “G” or “E” in Service may be indicated for Faculty or IAS who are actively engaged in Service. The Merit score should be supported by evidence in the candidate’s portfolio and by their Merit narrative, with consideration for the level of impact of the service activities and the candidate’s rank and level of experience.

A.10 Merit Scoring Procedures:

- A.10.a. **Area pre-score:** Each committee member assigns a score to each Area in IV.A.8.a or IV.A.8.b (as appropriate) for each departmental member. Scores are submitted electronically through an anonymous survey, and are due 7 days in advance of the first scheduled Merit Review Committee meeting.

Ex1: Initial evaluation of a faculty member “Juan Dewey” by 7 Merit Review Committee members:

Committee Member	Individual Teaching Score	Individual Scholarship Score	Individual Service Score
1	G	G	E
2	S	E	E
3	S	E	E
4	G	S	G
5	S	G	G
6	S	G	E
7	E	U*	E

** This score would need to be accompanied by an explanation by rater #7.*

Ex2: Initial evaluation of IAS member “Mary Montessori” by 7 Merit Review Committee members:

Committee Member	Individual Teaching Score	Individual Professional Development Score
1	G	G
2	S	E
3	S	E
4	G	S
5	S	G
6	S	G
7	E	U*

* This score would need to be accompanied by an explanation by rater #7.

A.10.b. **Score sorting/categorizing:** The Department Chair sorts the Area pre-scores within each Area from high to low for each departmental member. These scores are then compiled into a Merit Category (E, G, S, U) for each Area and an Overall Merit Score using the following rubric. Sorted individual Area scores and Category scores for each departmental member are made available to the Merit committee prior to the first scheduled Merit Review Committee meeting.

A.10.b.1. *Area Scores:*

- ≥ 67% “E” scores = Category of “E”
- ≥ 67% “E and/or G” scores = Category of “G”
- ≥ 50% “U” scores = Category of “U”
- all other scores = Category of “S”

A.10.b.2. *Overall Merit Score:*

See Appendix D (“Overall Merit Score Matrix”) for the relationship between particular Merit Area Score combinations and the Overall Merit Score.

Ex1: Initial Merit Scoring Table for faculty member “Juan Dewey” by 7 Merit Committee members:

Area	Sorted Area Scores	% E	% E or G	% U	Overall Area Category
Teaching	S,S,S,S,G,G,E	0	42	0	S
Scholarship	U*, S,G,G,G,E,E	29	71	14*	G
Service	G,G,E,E,E,E,E	71	-	0	E

Effective Category Scores: S, G, E ---> Initial Overall Merit Category: G

Ex2: Initial Merit Scoring Table for faculty member “Christopher Robin” by 7 Merit Committee members:

Area	Sorted Area Scores	% E	% E or G	% U	Overall Area Category
Teaching	G,G,E,E,E,E,E	71	-	0	E
Scholarship	U*, S,G,G,G,E,E	29	71	14*	G
Service	S,S,S,S,G,G,E	0	42	0	S

Effective Category Scores: E, G, S ---> Initial Overall Merit Category: G

Ex3: Initial Merit Scoring Table for IAS member “Mary Montessori” by 7 Merit Committee members:

Area	Sorted Area Scores	% E	% E or G	% U	Overall Area Category
Teaching	S,S,S,S,G,G,E	0	42	0	S
Prof. Development	U*, S,G,G,G,E,E	29	71	14*	G

Effective Category Scores: S, G ---> Initial Overall Merit Category: S

Ex4: Initial Merit Scoring Table for IAS member "Alexander Beetle" by 7 Merit Committee members:

Area	Sorted Area Scores	% E	% E or G	% U	Overall Area Category
Teaching	U*, S,G,G,G,E,E	29	71	14*	G
Prof. Development	S,S,S,S,G,G,E	0	42	0	S

Effective Category Scores: G, S ---> Initial Overall Merit Category: G

A.10.c. **Meetings of the Merit Review Committees:** The Merit Review Committees will meet to discuss the portfolio and pre-score table for each DES member assigned to their committee. Particular attention should be paid to cases with a broad distribution of pre-scores.

A.10.c.1. Meetings of the Merit Review Committees will occur within 7 calendar days of the dissemination of the initial scoring tables for all faculty and IAS. The individual Merit Review Committees may not convene at the same time.

A.10.c.2. Meetings of the Merit Review Committees will be held in closed session in accord with WI Chapter 19.85(1)(c).

A.10.d. **Final Scoring:** Based on the pre-meeting category scores and discussion at the appropriate Merit Review Committee meeting, committee members will submit final scores in all appropriate areas for each eligible DES member (defined in IV.A.1 and IV.A.2).

A.10.d.1. Scores must be submitted using an electronic survey within 7 calendar days of the meeting of the Merit Review Committee on which they are a member.

A.10.d.2. Each Merit Committee will provide a summary of comments to the Chair on Teaching, Scholarship, and Service for each reviewee based on the discussion at the Merit Review Committee Meeting (IV.A.10.c).

A.10.d.3. Within 7 days of the close of the final score survey, the Department Chair sorts the Final Area Scores from high to low in each area Category for each eligible DES member, and compiles the Final Area Scores into Merit Categories using the rubric in IV.A.10.b to create a Final Merit Table. This table and the (anonymized) submitted comments are combined into a summary report letter for each eligible DES member.

Ex: Final evaluation of department member Jane Doe (faculty) by 7 Merit committee members, after sorting and discussion by Merit committee.

Scored Area	Sorted Scores	% E	% E or G	% U	Area Category
Teaching	S,S,S,G,G,G,G	0	58	0	G
Scholarship	S,G,G,G,G,E,E	29	86	0	G
Service	G,G,E,E,E,E,E	71	-	0	E

Effective Category Scores: G, G, E ---> Final Overall Merit Category: G

This candidate may also have comments submitted from each category, which the Chair will compile into a final report.

A. 11 Reporting out to Department and Dean

- A.11.a. The Department Chair disseminates the summary report letter consisting of the Final Scoring Table and anonymized comments to each eligible DES member by Oct. 1.
- A.11.b. The Department Chair notifies the DES PRT Committee of all Merit scores as identified in A.10.e. by Oct. 1.
- A.11.c. The DES PRT Committee will meet to discuss Merit scores and provide appropriate recommendations and supports to the appropriate member(s) by Oct. 31.
- A.11.d. The Department Chair will submit the results of the final Merit scores to the Dean in accord with the timeline set forward by the Office of the Provost.

B. Distribution of Merit Funds

B.1 Definitions:

- The distribution model is based on a discretionary pay plan of **P%**.
- The total salary of all tenure-track faculty in the department is denoted **F**.
- The total number of tenure-track faculty in the department is denoted **N_F**.
- The total salary of all instructional academic staff in the department is denoted **S**.
- The total number of instructional academic staff in the department is denoted **N_S**.
- The salary of a particular faculty or instructional academic staff member is denoted **X_i**.
- The total dollars in the faculty discretionary salary pool (**T_F**) and total dollars in the instructional academic staff discretionary salary pool (**T_S**) are given by equations (1) and (2):

$$(1) T_F = \frac{P}{100} \times F = \frac{P}{100} \times \sum_{faculty} X_{i,F} \quad (2) T_S = \frac{P}{100} \times S = \frac{P}{100} \times \sum_{IAS} X_{i,IAS}$$

B.2 Implementation: The distribution of salary dollars according to the methods in this section will be implemented when there is an available pay plan of P=2% or greater.

B.2.a. Phase 1: All faculty and instructional academic staff who earn an overall Merit Category rating of Satisfactory or greater will receive an equal salary increase, determined by dividing half of their respective total discretionary dollars equally (equations (3) and (4)). This flat increase will in most cases account for half of the total discretionary salary pool ($T_F/2$ for faculty, $T_S/2$ for IAS).

$$(3) \text{Phase 1 raise (faculty)} = \frac{T_F}{2} \times \frac{1}{N_F} \quad (4) \text{Phase 1 raise (IAS)} = \frac{T_S}{2} \times \frac{1}{N_S}$$

B.2.b. Phase 2: All faculty and instructional academic staff who earn an overall Merit Category rating of Satisfactory or greater will receive an additional salary increase that is based on their overall Merit Category rating as follows.

B.2.b.1. Each Overall Merit Category rating will be associated with a weighting factor **m_i** :

E (Exemplary performance)	m_i = 2.0
G (Good performance)	m_i = 1.5
S (Satisfactory performance)	m_i = 1.0
U (Unsatisfactory performance)	m_i = 0

B.2.b.2. A weighted sum **W** will be calculated separately for Faculty and for IAS using equations (5) and (6):

$$(5) W_F = \sum_{faculty} m_{i,F} \quad (6) W_S = \sum_{IAS} m_{i,IAS}$$

- B.2.b.3. The Phase 2 salary increase is then determined using the merit weighting factor as in equations (7) and (8):

$$(7) \text{ Phase 2 raise (faculty)} = \frac{T_F}{2} \times \frac{m_i}{W_F} \quad (8) \text{ Phase 2 raise (IAS)} = \frac{T_S}{2} \times \frac{m_i}{W_S}$$

C. Appeals - Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff.

C.1 Any Faculty or Instructional Academic Staff member may request a reconsideration of his/her Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designation. This request must be made in writing to the Department Chair within 7 calendar days of the distribution of the Final Merit report by the Department Chair. The request should include written documentation to support the reason for the appeal. An appeal may be made if the department member believes the merit rating was awarded under the following conditions:

- C.1.a. bias
- C.1.b. conflict of interest
- C.1.c. lack of expertise
- C.1.d. factual errors

C.2 The Department Chair will assemble an Appeals Review Committee consisting of the Department Chair, plus 3 members of the two DES Merit Review Committee(s) that did not originally review that member's portfolio, plus 1 faculty or IAS member from outside of the Department. The appellant will be notified within 10 calendar days of the filing of the appeal. The appellant may request the replacement of up to one of the members of the Appeals Review Committee within 2 working days of receiving notification of the Appeals Review Committee membership. The Appeals Review Committee will meet to consider the appeal within 10 calendar days after final membership has been established.

C.3 The Appeals Review Committee shall consider the original materials submitted for Merit review and the additional materials submitted for the appellant using the DES Merit evaluation criteria and the procedure outlined in IV.A.9 and IV.A.10. The committee will express their findings in a report that is transmitted by the Department Chair to the appellant within three working days after the reconsideration meeting. To change the original Merit Category Designation, at least 60% ($\frac{3}{5}$) of the votes of the Appeals Review Committee must be in favor of the change.

V. Faculty Personnel Review

The Department will follow the policies regarding retention and tenure described in the Faculty Personnel Rules (UWS 3.06-3.11 and UWL 3.06-3.08 <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/unclassified-personnel-rules/>). Tenure/retention decisions will be guided by the criteria established in the Department bylaws at the time of hire unless a candidate elects to be considered under newer guidelines. The criteria outlined in Section V in these bylaws should be applied to all faculty with a contract date after May 31, 2017, and to any faculty that elect to be considered under these bylaws. Faculty hired prior to May 31, 2017 that elect to be considered under the bylaws herein must indicate their wishes in writing to the DES Chair and UWL Human Resources. The Department will follow policies guiding part-time appointments for ranked faculty and tenure clock stoppage available on the Human Resources website. (last revised 5/5/17)

A. Retention (procedure, expectations, criteria, and appeal) – revised and approved as a whole 5/5/17

A.1 *Ranked Faculty under review provide an electronic portfolio related to their teaching, scholarship, and service activities extracted from their date of hire to date of departmental review. Hyperlinked syllabi are required and the candidate may choose to provide additional evidence. Additional materials required for departmental review are indicated in these bylaws (see section V.A.7).*

- A.2 *Departments will provide the following materials to the Dean:*
- A.2.a. *Department letter of recommendation with vote*
 - A.2.b. *Teaching assignment information (TAI) data sheet that summarizes the courses taught, workload data, grade distribution and SEIs by individual course and semester (which are only available after completing a full academic year) and departmental comparison SEI data*
 - A.2.c. *Merit evaluation data*
- A.3 *The initial review of probationary faculty shall be conducted by the tenured faculty of the Department of Educational Studies in the manner outlined below.*
- A.4 *Tenure track faculty reviews:*
- A.4.a. *All first-year tenure-track faculty will be formally reviewed in the spring of their first year. A departmental letter will be filed with the Dean and HR. reviews resulting in contract decisions will minimally occur for tenure-track faculty in their 2, 4th, and 6th years.*
 - A.4.b. *In the years when a probationary faculty member is not being reviewed for a contract decision (i.e., a “non-contract review”) the review process should follow these department bylaws. The PRT committee review letter is due to the Dean on May 1 of the non-contract review year.*
- A.5 *Retention Review Timeline and Procedures*
- A.5.a. *The DES Chair will provide the schedule of DES PRT Committee deadlines, and a list of the DES probationary faculty members that are eligible for contract and non-contract review to all department members within five (5) calendar days of receiving the information from Human Resources.*
 - A.5.b. *At least twenty (20) calendar days prior to each review, the DES Chair will give each probationary faculty member written notice of the scheduled review meeting.*
 - A.5.c. *At least ten (10) calendar days prior to their review, the probationary faculty member is responsible for providing their materials to the Department Chair.*
 - A.5.d. *The Department Chair will make available electronic copies of the materials provided by the probationary faculty member, and required materials provided by the Chair (see section V.A.7) to the PRT Committee members within seven (7) calendar days of each probationary faculty member’s review meeting. DES PRT Committee members will review in advance the materials submitted for retention by the probationary faculty member and the DES Chair.*
 - A.5.e. *Retention Review Meeting:*
 - A.5.e.1. *Advance notice of the retention review will be published according to University policy and Wisconsin Open Meeting Law.*
 - A.5.e.2. *The probationary faculty member shall attend their contract review meeting(s), make an oral presentation, and engage in a question and answer session with the DES PRT Committee about their record of teaching, scholarship, and service.*
 - A.5.e.3. *Probationary faculty undergoing non-contract reviews will be given the option of attending their review meeting and making a similar presentation as for contract reviews.*

- A.5.e.4. Probationary faculty may bring guests to their review meeting (while the PRT Committee is in open session) if they so choose. Guests attending the meeting may not participate.
- A.5.e.5. Retention 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 for a discussion and a vote. The motion shall be read 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 [probationary faculty member] in the Department of Educational Studies at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse as provided in sections 19.85(1)(c) [for retention] of Wisconsin Statutes." A majority vote is required to move into closed session. The probationary faculty member and guests will be excused from the closed meeting. The vote by show of hands will be part of the DES PRT Committee official minutes.
- A.5.e.6. The PRT Committee will designate a writer for the letter describing the outcome of the review, *including the date of the vote, the numerical outcome, a clear indication of a 1 or 2 year contract recommendation, and departmental review of the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship and service*. All PRT Committee members will have a reasonable opportunity to give feedback on the letter, and the final letter will be shared with all PRT Committee members prior to sharing it with the probationary faculty member.
- A.5.e.7. The DES Department Chair shall *notify the probationary faculty member of the recommendation of the PRT Committee in writing within seven (7) calendar days of the review meeting (UWL 3.06)*. The review letter shall be shared with the probationary faculty member and the Dean as formal notice of the outcome of the review by the deadline set by the Provost.
- A.5.e.8. Copies of the DES PRT Committee and Department Chair (if applicable) letters will be *provided to the Dean, along with the review materials provided to the PRT Committee by the probationary faculty member and DES Chair*.
- A.5.e.9. In the case of a non-renewal decision, the candidate may request reconsideration by the DES PRT committee in accordance with the procedures prescribed in the UWS 3.07/UWL 3.07 personnel rules.

A.6 Retention Expectations

- A.6.a. Teaching, scholarship/creative work, and service *contributions from the time of hire* are evaluated as part of contract and non-contract reviews.
- A.6.b. Probationary faculty members are expected to provide evidence in support of their teaching, scholarship, and service contributions that align with the definitions in Appendices A, B, and C.
- A.6.c. Annual Merit evaluations (overall Merit evaluation scores and Merit area scores) from the time of hire are evaluated as part of contract and non-contract reviews.
- A.6.d. Teaching expectations:
 - A.6.d.1. Probationary faculty members are expected to meet the **minimal expectations** for teaching as articulated in Appendix A: *Statement on Teaching* and supported

by annual Merit evaluation scores in teaching.

A.6.d.2. Probationary faculty members are expected to be effective teachers. “Effective teaching” is documented by self-assessment of teaching, peer evaluation of teaching, and student evaluation of instruction, as outlined in Appendix A. Effective teaching should be supported by annual Merit evaluation scores in teaching.

A.6.d.3. Probationary faculty members are expected to document engagement in additional activities that advance their ongoing growth as teachers and maintains expertise, as articulated in Appendix A “Additional Teaching Contributions”, and this engagement should be supported by annual Merit evaluation scores in teaching.

A.6.e. Scholarship Expectations

A.6.e.1. Probationary faculty members are expected to meet the **minimal expectations** for scholarship as articulated in Appendix B: *Statement on Scholarship*, and supported by annual Merit evaluation scores in scholarship.

A.6.e.2. In addition, probationary faculty members are expected to demonstrate an ongoing record of research and scholarly activity that impacts the scholarly community, leading to the generation of scholarly, peer-reviewed contributions by the tenure decision. Examples of scholarship at different levels of impact are provided in Appendix B.

A.6.f. Service Expectations

A.6.f.1. Probationary faculty members are expected to meet the **minimal expectations** for scholarship as articulated in Appendix C: *Statement on Service*, and supported by annual Merit evaluation scores in service.

A.6.f.2. Probationary faculty members are expected to demonstrate an ongoing record of service in a variety of areas, and these efforts should be supported by annual Merit evaluation scores in service. Examples of different categories of service and their levels of impact are provided in Appendix C.

A.7 Materials and Evidence

A.7.a. Probationary faculty members undergoing Contract or Non-Contract reviews shall provide the following materials to the Department Chair according to the timeline described in V.A.5.

A.7.a.1. *A completed **Retention Report**, with appropriate evidence hyperlinked (teaching, scholarship, and service), drawn from UW-L’s electronic portfolio system **inclusive of all years of employment at UW-L.***

A.7.a.2. *A completed **Annual Activities (Merit) Report**, with appropriate evidence hyperlinked (teaching, scholarship, and service), drawn from UW-L’s electronic portfolio system from the **most recent year of employment at UW-L.***

A.7.a.3. A narrative statement summarizing and contextualizing the probationary faculty member’s contributions in teaching, scholarship, and service, with the goal of building towards the 7-page narrative required for promotion consideration (<https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/faculty-promotion-resources/>). The

narrative for retention reviews should also include (maximum 1 page): responses to recommendations from the previous review (if appropriate), and a brief summary of goals and plans for goal attainment in preparation for the next review. This narrative should be uploaded to the electronic portfolio and included as a hyperlink in the Retention Report.

A.7.b. The Department Chair will assemble the following materials and provide them to the PRT committee (in addition to the items in A.7.a) according to the timeline described in V.A.5.

A.7.b.1. *A Teaching Assignment Information (TAI) report for the probationary faculty member since their time of hire.*

A.7.b.2. Complete SEI reports (including scores for all SEI survey questions and student comments) for all courses taught since the probationary faculty member's time of hire.

A.7.b.3. Merit evaluation scores and rankings since the probationary faculty member's time of hire.

A.7.b.4. Copies of Contract and Non-Contract review letters from all previous reviews.

A.7.b.5. Peer observation of teaching letters since the time of hire.

A.8 Retention Decision Appeal—**Non-Renewal of Probationary Faculty**: Any probationary faculty member who is denied Contract renewal may appeal the decision of the DES PRT Committee according to Faculty Personnel Rules UWS 3.06-3.11 and UWL 3.06-3.08)

B. Tenure Review and Departmental Criteria (procedures, criteria, and appeal) – last revised 5/17/17

B.1. Tenure Review Procedures

B.1.a. Tenure decisions are made by the Department of Educational Studies Promotion, Tenure, Retention (DES PRT) Committee, considering only activities accomplished since the time of hire at UW-L.

B.1.b. Tenure decision requires a 2/3 majority vote of the entire PRT Committee membership. Attendance via phone or video conference is allowed. Proxy voting is not allowed. In accordance with Robert's Rules, abstention is appropriate ONLY under two conditions: insufficient information or a conflict of interest.

B.2. Tenure Review Meeting Procedures

B.2.a. The DES Chair will provide a schedule of DES PRT Committee deadlines, and a list of the DES probationary faculty members that are eligible for tenure to all department members within fifteen (15) calendar days of receiving the information from Human Resources

B.2.b. At least twenty (20) calendar days prior to the tenure review, the DES Chair will give each eligible probationary faculty member written notice of the scheduled tenure review meeting.

B.2.c. At least ten (10) calendar days prior to the review meeting, the eligible probationary faculty member is responsible for providing their materials to the Department Chair.

B.2.d. The Department Chair will make available electronic copies of the materials provided by the probationary faculty member, and required materials provided by the Chair (see section V.A.7) to the PRT Committee members within seven (7) calendar days of each probationary

faculty member's tenure review meeting. DES PRT Committee members will review in advance the materials all written evidence submitted for tenure by the probationary faculty member and the DES Chair

B.2.e. Advance notice of the tenure review will be published according to University policy and Wisconsin Open Meeting law.

B.2.f. Probationary faculty have the right to declare the deliberative part of the tenure meeting open (See s. 19.85 (1) (b); <https://www.wisconsin.edu/general-counsel/legal-topics/open-meetings-law/>). The tenure candidate may ask that the meeting be conducted in open session by submitting a written request to the DES chair at least seven (7) calendar days before the meeting.

B.2.g. The tenure candidate shall attend their tenure review meeting, make an oral presentation, and engage in a question and answer session with the committee about their record of teaching, scholarship, and service. Guests may attend the meeting while it is in open session, but may not participate.

B.2.h All decisions are made on the basis of the evidence provided by the candidate and the Chair, as outlined in section V.B.4 of these bylaws. If the meeting is conducted in open session, all discussion and voting for tenure will take place with the candidate and guests present. If the candidate does not request an open meeting, the committee may move into closed session as provided in section 19.85(1)(b) of Wisconsin Statutes, 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.

B.2.i . The DES Department Chair shall *notify the tenure candidate of the recommendation of the PRT Committee in writing within seven (7) calendar days of the review meeting (UWL 3.06)*.

B.2.j The PRT Committee will designate a writer for the formal letter describing the outcome of the review, *including the date of the vote, the numerical outcome, a recommendation for or against tenure, and departmental review of the strengths and areas for growth of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship and service*. All PRT Committee members will have a reasonable opportunity to give feedback on the letter, and the final letter will be shared with all PRT Committee members prior to sharing it with the probationary faculty member.

B.2.k. The review letter shall be shared with the probationary faculty member and the Dean as formal notice of the outcome of the review by the deadline set by the Provost.

B.2.l. 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.

B.3. Tenure Expectations

B.3.a. Tenure decisions by the PRT Committee are peer reviews of past and expected performance. Consequently, in making tenure decisions, the PRT Committee considers all evidence bearing on the potential of candidates in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, including materials submitted by the tenure candidate and Department Chair (according to section V.B.4 of these bylaws), results of annual Merit reviews, and results of Contract and Non-Contract reviews.

B.3.b. Teaching Expectations: Teaching is evaluated through peer evaluations of teaching (section D.1.b), SEI scores and comments, Teaching Assignment Information (TAI), annual

Merit evaluations, and documentation associated with the tenure candidate's electronic portfolio.

B.3.b.1 All faculty members are expected to meet the **minimal expectations** for teaching as articulated in Appendix A: *Statement on Teaching*

B.3.b.2 All faculty are expected to be effective teachers. "Effective teaching" is documented by self-assessment of teaching, peer evaluation of teaching, and student evaluation of instruction, as outlined in Appendix A.

B.3.b.3 All faculty are expected to be engaged in additional activities (as articulated in Appendix A "Additional Teaching Contributions") that advance their ongoing growth as teachers and maintain their expertise.

B.3.c. Scholarship/creative work expectations:

B.3.c.1 Tenure candidates are expected to demonstrate an ongoing record of research and scholarly activity that impacts the scholarly community.

B.3.c.2 All faculty are required to participate in scholarship that leads to scholarly products as detailed in Appendix B; higher preference is given to peer-reviewed publications and presentations with a national or international scope. Probationary faculty should have evidence of scholarly works that advance the profession in their research area as based on publications and presentations. Probationary faculty should have clear evidence of the potential for an ongoing and sustainable pattern of publication and other forms of dissemination (including grant writing and presentations).

B.3.c.3 By the tenure decision, it is also expected that candidates will have made multiple presentations at a variety of levels of impact and scope.

B.3.d. Service expectations:

B.3.d.1 Faculty are expected to meet the **minimal expectations** for service as articulated in Appendix C: *Statement on Service*

B.3.d.2 Faculty are expected to demonstrate active participation in service in a variety of areas, with evidence of growth in responsibility by tenure. Tenure candidates should also provide evidence for potential growth in level of responsibility and scope. Examples of different categories of service and their levels of impact are provided in Appendix C.

B.4. Required Materials for Tenure Review

B.4.a. Materials from the Tenure Candidate: The faculty member will upload all evidence in support of their activities into their electronic portfolio.

B.4.a.1. *A completed **Retention Report**, with appropriate evidence in support of teaching, scholarship, and service hyperlinked, drawn from UW-L's electronic portfolio system inclusive of all years of employment at UW-L.*

B.4.a.2. *A completed **Annual Activities (Merit) Report**, with appropriate evidence in support of teaching, scholarship, and service hyperlinked, drawn from UW-L's electronic portfolio system from the **most recent year of employment at UWL.***

B.4.a.3 A narrative statement summarizing and contextualizing the probationary faculty member's contributions in teaching, scholarship, and service, with the goal of building towards the 7-page narrative required for promotion consideration (<https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/faculty-promotion-resources/>). The narrative for retention reviews should also include (maximum 1 page): responses to recommendations from previous reviews, and a brief summary of including short term and long term goals and plans for goal attainment in preparation for the next review. This narrative should be uploaded to the electronic portfolio and included as a hyperlink in the Retention Report.

B.4.b. Materials from the Department Chair:

B.4.b.1. *A Teaching Assignment Information (TAI) report for the probationary faculty member since their time of hire.*

B.4.b.2 Complete SEI reports for the tenure candidate for all courses taught since their time of hire, including composite scores and departmental fractional median for each review period, and written student comments as available.

B.4.b.3 Merit evaluation scores and rankings since the tenure candidate's time of hire.

B.4.b.4 Copies of Contract and Non-Contract review letters from all previous reviews.

B.4.b.5 Letters documenting peer observations of teaching since the tenure candidate's time of hire.

B.5. Tenure Decision Appeal—Non-Renewal of Probationary Faculty: Probationary faculty may appeal a tenure denial decision of the DES PRT Committee and/or parties to the hearing committee established under UWL 3.08. (Faculty Personnel Rules UWS 3.06-3.11 and UWL 3.06-3.08).

C. Post-Tenure Review – last revised 5/17/17

The department follows the UWL procedure and schedule regarding post-tenure review
<https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/post-tenure-review-policy/>

C.1 Expectations

C.1.a Faculty undergoing post-tenure review must meet the minimal expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service as articulated in Appendices A, B, and C, respectively.

C.1.b Faculty undergoing post-tenure review are expected to be effective teachers, as outlined in Appendix A. Types of evidence documenting effective teaching may include, but is not limited to, Merit scores in teaching, peer evaluations, SEIs, self-assessment of teaching (narrative).

C.1.c. Faculty undergoing post-tenure review should have evidence of scholarly works that advance the profession in their research area, as outlined in Appendix B. Types of evidence documenting active scholarship may include, but is not limited to, Merit scores in scholarship, publications, presentations and/or grants.

C.1.d. Faculty undergoing post-tenure review should have evidence of participation in service activities, as outlined in Appendix C. Types of evidence documenting active service may include, but is not limited to, Merit scores in service, department/School/university committee work, and/or professional service.

C.2 Materials: Faculty undergoing post-tenure review must submit their electronic portfolio to the Department Chair within the timeline established by the UWL Post-Tenure Review policy (<https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/post-tenure-review-policy/>). Peer observation letters obtained according to section D.1.d should be uploaded by the faculty member as additional evidence in their electronic portfolio. The Department Chair will provide SEI scores in the form of a TAI report for the 5 year post-tenure review period.

D. Peer Evaluation of Teaching – last revised 5/17/17

D.1 Peer Observation Policies

D.1.a Probationary faculty in their first three years at UWL shall be reviewed at least once in two different semesters. In the Fall semester, the PRT committee will assign a tenured faculty peer reviewer. In a different semester (Winter, Spring, Summer), the probationary faculty member will arrange for a different member of the Department to serve as peer reviewer.

D.1.b Probationary faculty in their fourth year or later shall be reviewed at least once per year. In Contract review years, the PRT committee will assign a tenured faculty peer reviewer. In Non-Contract review years, any member of the Department may serve as peer reviewer.

D.1.c Tenured faculty who are eligible for promotion are expected to have at least 3 peer reviews included in their promotion portfolio from within the most recent 5-year period. A peer evaluator could include tenured or probationary faculty, instructional academic staff, and/or in-service teachers or other peers capable of evaluating teaching performance.

D.1.d Tenured faculty undergoing Post-tenure review are expected to have at least 1 peer review letter included in their electronic portfolio from within the most recent 5-year period. A peer evaluator could include tenured or probationary faculty, instructional academic staff, and/or in-service teachers or other peers capable of evaluating teaching performance.

D.2 Peer Observation Procedures

Each observation should include a pre-observation meeting, a teaching observation, a post-observation meeting, and an observation letter.)

D.2.a. Pre-observation meeting: Prior to the classroom observation, the candidate and the assigned faculty member should meet to discuss pedagogical practices, course delivery methods, and objectives for the class period to be observed.

D.2.b. Teaching observation: A teaching observation should be at least one full class period in length (a minimum of 55 minutes) .

D.2.c. Post-observation meeting: Following the classroom observation, the candidate and the assigned faculty member should meet to discuss pedagogical practices, course delivery methods, objectives, and questions for the class period observed as well as any recommendations for future instruction.

D.2.d. Observation Letter: 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.

E. Promotion – last revised 3/29/19

The department will follow the guidelines and schedules regarding faculty promotion available at <https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/offices-services/human-resources/jpc-guide-to-faculty-promotions.pdf>

E.1. Promotion Timeline and Procedures

- E.1.a. The composition of the promotion review committee is defined according to section VIII.C.4.e.
- E.1.b. The department shall follow the timeline and procedures outlined in the Guide to Faculty Promotions, Appendix B.
- E.1.c. At least twenty (20) calendar days prior to each review, the Department Chair will give each faculty member eligible for promotion written notice of their scheduled review meeting.
- E.1.d. At least ten (10) calendar days prior to their review meeting, the candidate for promotion is responsible for providing their materials to the Department Chair.
- E.1.e. The Department Chair will make available electronic copies of the materials provided by the candidate for promotion, and required materials provided by the Chair (as specified in the Guide to Faculty Promotions) to the PRT Committee members within seven (7) calendar days of the review meeting. DES PRT Committee members will review in advance the materials submitted by the candidate for promotion and the DES Chair.
- E.1.f. Promotion Review Meeting:
 - E.1.f.1 Advance notice of the promotion review will be published according to University policy and Wisconsin Open Meeting Law. The meeting may go into closed session according to WI 19.85(1)(c).
 - E.1.f.2 The DES Department Chair shall notify the probationary faculty member of the decision of the PRT Committee in writing within seven (7) calendar days of the review meeting.
 - E.1.f.3 The PRT Committee will designate a writer for the letter describing the outcome of the review. All PRT Committee members will have a reasonable opportunity to give feedback on the letter, and the final letter will be shared with all PRT Committee members prior to sharing it with the candidate for promotion.
 - E.1.f.4 In the case of a recommendation for promotion, the letter will become part of the candidate's promotion portfolio that is forwarded to the Dean according to the timeline set forward by UWL policy.
 - E.1.f.5 In the case of a negative decision by the PRT committee, the candidate may follow the appeal procedures outlined in the Guide to Faculty Promotions, Appendix B.
 - E.1.f.6 Promotion Decision Appeal/Reconsideration: Faculty may appeal a non-promotion decision. An appeal shall follow the appeal process as outlined in the Faculty Senate Bylaws (revised 2017; <https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/committees/faculty-senate/faculty-senate-manual-021417.pdf>)

E.2. Promotion Expectations

- E.2.a. Teaching, scholarship/creative work, and service contributions from the time of hire (for promotion to Associate Professor) or from the time of last promotion (for promotion to Full Professor) are evaluated as part of promotion reviews. In general, the PRT committee focuses on the evidence provided by the candidate describing their work at UWL, although

activities stemming from work prior to joining the faculty at UWL is considered in terms of the overall career trajectory of the faculty member.

- E.2.b Faculty members applying for promotion are expected to provide evidence in support of their teaching, scholarship, and service contributions that align with the definitions in Appendices A, B, and C, and the UWL promotion guidelines. To be considered for promotion to a higher rank, faculty must meet the minimum University criteria for that rank as specified in the Guide to Faculty Promotions.
- E.2.c For promotion to Associate Professor, there should be clear evidence that the candidate's work is consistent with promotion criteria outlined in the [Guide to Faculty Promotions](#). For the rank of Associate Professor a candidate must provide evidence of teaching excellence, establishment of a productive program of scholarship, and a record of active service, as outlined in Appendices A, B, and C of the DES bylaws.
- E.2.d For promotion to Full Professor, there should be documented evidence that the candidate has made substantial contributions to teaching, scholarship, and service, and meets the other criteria outlined in the [Guide to Faculty Promotions](#). To be promoted to Full Professor, a faculty member must show evidence of leadership and continued excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service, as outlined in Appendices A, B, and C of the DES bylaws.

E.3. Required Materials for Promotion Review

- E.3.a Faculty members applying for promotion shall provide their materials to the Department Chair according to the timeline described in V.E.1 in the form of an electronic promotion portfolio as specified in the [Guide to Faculty Promotions](#). The portfolio shall include reassignment letters associated with non-instructional workload assignments.
- E.3.b The Department Chair will provide the following materials to the PRT committee as specified in the [Guide to Faculty Promotions](#) according to the timeline described in V.E.3.
 - E.3.b.1 A Teaching Assignment Information (TAI) report for the faculty member since their time of hire.
 - E.3.b.2 Merit evaluation scores and rankings from the most recent 3 years.
- E.3.c In the case of a positive recommendation for promotion from the PRT Committee, the Department Chair will provide the following materials to the Dean as specified in the [Guide to Faculty Promotions](#) in the form of a Departmental promotion report according to the timeline described in V.E.3.
 - E.3.b.1 The candidate's promotion portfolio
 - E.3.b.2 A Teaching Assignment Information (TAI) report for the probationary faculty member since their time of hire.
 - E.3.b.3 Merit evaluation scores and rankings from the most recent 3 years.
 - E.3.b.4 The PRT committee letter
 - E.3.b.5 The promotion transmittal form

VI. Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Review (last revised 5/18/18)

A. Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) are instructional staff hired to teach on a part-time or full-time contractual basis to deliver content within the department/program curriculum and provide service where necessary. <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B5oINNrU5bquSFoyTVVoTThicE0>

B. Annual Review of IAS in Permanently Budgeted Lines

B.1. *In accordance with Faculty Personnel rules 3.05-3.11 and UWL 3.08, academic staff will be evaluated annually. The Department follows the policy regarding performance reviews found here: <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/employee-relations/performance-appraisals/>*

B.2. IAS positions in permanently budgeted lines will also be reviewed for Merit according to DES ByLaws section IV.

B.3. Annual Performance Review Procedures for IAS in Permanently Budgeted Lines (“WI Redbook Positions”):

B.3.a. The Department Chair serves as the supervisor for IAS.

B.3.b. DES PRT Committee will complete the annual performance evaluation in contract review years. The Department Chair will complete the annual performance evaluation, in consultation with the PRT committee on a case by case basis as determined by the Chair, in non-contract review years.

B.3.c. IAS personnel under contract review will provide an electronic portfolio related to their teaching, and scholarship/professional development/service activities extracted over a four year (consecutive) period (or since the time of hire if less than four years) inclusive of the current review year. Hyperlinked syllabi are required and the candidate may choose to provide additional hyperlinked evidence. A narrative is required in contract years, consisting of a compilation of the merit narratives from the same time period as the portfolio. Additional materials required for departmental review are indicated in these bylaws (see section V.A.7).

B.3.d. Annual IAS faculty review deadlines are determined by the University schedule.

B.3.e. The Department Chair will share the results of the review with the IAS member, and provide the results to the Dean and HR as dictated by UWL policy. <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/faculty-and-staff/performance-appraisals/>

B.4. Annual Performance Review Procedures for IAS in Non-Permanently budgeted Lines:

B.4.a. The Department Chair serves as the supervisor for IAS.

B.4.b. The Department Chair will complete the annual performance evaluation, in consultation with the PRT committee and/or Program Director as appropriate on a case by case basis as determined by the Chair.

B.4.c. Materials for review include SEIs, peer observation(s) of instruction, syllabi, and other information that is pertinent to the review as determined by the Chair.

B.4.d. Reviews will follow the University schedule for IAS Annual Review.

B.4.e. The Chair will share the results of the review with the IAS member, and provide the results to the Dean and HR as dictated by UWL policy. <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/faculty-and-staff/performance-appraisals/>

C. IAS Promotion

Policies and procedure guiding promotion for IAS are available at

<https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/offices-services/human-resources/ias-promotion-guide.pdf>

C.1. IAS may choose to advance through Promotion.

C.2. IAS promotion portfolios are reviewed by the DES PRT Committee.

C.3. IAS seeking promotion are evaluated on the basis of their Teaching and Professional Development/Creative Activity/Scholarship and/or Service.

C.3.a. An IAS-member seeking promotion must be an effective instructor as defined by the Statement of Teaching in the Department of Educational Studies (Appendix A) including the Faculty Senate SEI tool and faculty observations.

C.3.b. An IAS member seeking promotion must demonstrate an on ongoing record of Professional Development/Creative Activity/Scholarship and/or Service as defined in DES Appendices B and C.

C.4. **Appeal Decision Procedures re: Annual Review:** The same procedures used for ranked faculty appeals in retention and promotion issues will be used for IAS retention and career progression decisions.

VII. Non-Instructional Academic Staff and University Staff (last revised 5/18/18)

Annually, supervisors of instructional academic staff, non-instructional academic staff and university staff employees are expected to meet with their employees to discuss department/unit goals, employee career goals and supervisory position expectations according to UWL policy: <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/employee-relations/performance-appraisals/>

A. Non-instructional academic staff (NIAS) do not have teaching responsibilities. Department members who are NIAS are reviewed annually by the Department Chair. NIAS requesting career progression must follow procedures found at: <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/nias-career-progression/>.

B. Department members who are University Staff such as Academic Departmental Associates (ADAs) or University Services Program Associates (USPAs) are reviewed annually by the Department Chair. <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/faculty-and-staff/performance-appraisals/>.

VIII . Governance

A. Department Chair (last revised 5/18/18)

The Department Chair is elected and serves a three year term. A past Chair may serve consecutive terms if no other qualified tenured faculty member is elected. The Department will adhere to the selection and duties of the Chair that are delineated in the Faculty Senate Bylaws found at <https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/> and <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/remuneration-and-release-time-for-department-chairs/> under the heading "IV. Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members, and Department Chairpersons" and "VI. Remuneration of Department Chairperson." In addition, references to chair-related duties are contained in the Faculty Senate Bylaws (<https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/>).

A.1. Election Process

During February of the final year of the Department Chair's term, the Dean' Office will send a nominating ballot containing all names of Department members eligible to serve as Department Chair to all eligible voting members of the Department. Nominated list members may remove their name from the ballot. The remaining eligible names are put on the official voting ballot. The eligible voting members will vote for one person. If an individual receives 60% or more of the votes, and is willing to serve, then that person becomes Department Chair. If no person receives 60% of the votes, then the Dean places the names of the two highest vote getters on another ballot and an election occurs. Ballots are counted by the Dean's Office. The person receiving the highest vote total in the second election becomes the Department Chair. The new term starts

July 1.

A.2. Rights and Responsibilities of the Department Chair

A.2.a. Rights

A.2.a.1. The Department Chair will receive release time and salary adjustment to conduct the administrative duties as outlined in “VI. Remuneration of Department Chairpersons” of the Faculty Senate Bylaws <https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/>

A.2.a.2. The Department Chair will have an Administrative Department Associate (ADA) assigned to the Department Chair.

A.2.a.3. The Department Chair represents the Department faculty voice in all matters to the administration.

A.2.b. **Responsibilities:** The Department Chair responsibilities are outlined in the Faculty Senate Bylaws <https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/>

A.2.c. **Department Chair Evaluation:** The evaluation of the Department Chairperson is a survey administered annually by the EPC Dean and completed by DES membership.

B. Program Directors and Coordinators: (last revised 5/18/18)

B.1. Program Directors

B.1.a Program directors are nominated by the aligned PLC/Program and appointed by the EPC Dean (in consultation with the Department Chair, and Content Dean where appropriate). In the event of a tie, the EPC dean will cast the deciding vote.

B.1.b Program Directors receive 3 credits of reassigned time to fulfill the following roles/responsibilities:

B.1.b.1. Initiates, coordinates, and guides Professional Learning Community (PLC) monthly meetings with program faculty (set agenda, lead meeting, assure minutes are recorded and posted)

B.1.b.2. Conducts regular programmatic evaluations and prepares annual assessment reports for EPC/UWL/DPI (in consultation with program members)

B.1.b.3. Contributes to Academic Program Review (APR) reports and other larger program assessment documents/sections as needed

B.1.b.4. Continually monitors program to ensure that it is aligned with the EPC and program conceptual framework, and with state and national standards

B.1.b.5. Guides the PLC in monitoring student progress, and ensuring that students are adequately prepared for benchmark assessments and licensure standards

B.1.b.6. Initiates discussions about curricular issues and makes formal recommendations to the Department Chair/Dean regarding changes in programs

B.1.b.7. Represents program at biweekly EPC Leadership meetings (shares program updates and celebrations, voices program concerns, seeks clarification when needed - and takes this information back to PLC)

B.1.b.8. Represents programs with Department Chair and EPC Dean; serves as the first point of contact for student concerns or publicity requests. This may include occasional duties outside of

the contract period

B.1.b.9. Promotes Professional Education Programs on campus and in the community

B.1.b.10. Oversees Advisory Council by maintaining representative constituency, setting an agenda for regular meetings, and posting meeting minutes

B.1.b.11. Oversees edTPA support days to coordinate faculty coverage of support time for program student teachers

B.1.b.12. Works with faculty mentor(s) to provide guidance to teacher candidates during the edTPA retake process

B.1.c Program Directors serve a 3 year term.

B.1.d Program Directors are evaluated annually by program membership. The evaluation will be included in the Program Director's electronic portfolio for the purposes of personnel reviews.

B.1.d.1 A survey will be distributed by the EPC Dean's office and completed by the program membership. The questions on the survey (Appendix G) are determined/modified by EPC Leadership Team.

B.1.d.2 EPC Dean completes an evaluation letter in consultation with the DES Chair and shares this letter with the Program Director.

B.2 Program Coordinators are appointed by the Department Chair. Program coordinators will receive reassigned time for completion of administrative duties directly related to a program. Duties are determined by the program in consultation with the Department Chair.

C. Standing Departmental Committees (last revised 5/18/18)

C.1. All committees shall meet during the first month of the academic year to elect officers and set regular meeting times. All committees follow the most recent edition of Robert's Rules of Order.

C.2. The Department Chair appoints committee membership and sets conveners. Individual committee membership elects a chair and recorder.

C.3. A quorum is 50% of committee membership. A majority vote is required for all motion approval. Committee members are expected to attend regularly scheduled meetings. The Department Chair may replace a committee member with another Department member if committee duties cannot be carried out.

C.4. Standing committees include the following:

C.4.a. Admissions Committees: The DES has an Admissions Committee for candidates applying to the EC-MC, MC-EA, and EC-A (Art, Music, French Education, Spanish Education and German studies Education) programs. Candidates applying for admission to the Special Education minor are reviewed by the Special Education Admissions committee. . Committee membership may consist of tenured and tenure-track faculty and Instructional Academic Staff with at least an 0.5 FTE assignment in an undergraduate program.

The duties of each Admissions Committee include:

C.4.a.1. developing, reviewing, and revising admission criteria and procedures

C.4.a.2. providing faculty and candidates with information regarding the criteria and process for applicant reviews.

C.4.a.3. reviewing application materials and making admissions decisions

C.4.a.4. communicating with Department Chair and EPC Office as appropriate to share the results of the admissions decisions.

C.4.b. Appeals Committee: The Appeals Committee's membership may consist of tenured and tenure-track faculty and Instructional Academic Staff with at least a 0.5 FTE assignment, and must also include the Department Chair. This committee meets only as needed to review final course grade and undergraduate program admission denial appeals.

C.4.c. Assessment Committee: The Assessment Committee oversees the Department assessment. Assessment Committee membership may consist of tenured and tenure-track faculty and Instructional Academic Staff with at least an 0.5 FTE assignment. Assessment data will be forwarded to the Assessment Committee by the Department Chair after identifying information has been removed. The duties of the Assessment Committee may include:

C.4.c.1. Creating, implementing, and maintaining assessment tools for documenting: advising effectiveness for DES programs, Writing in the Major assessment, student success metrics, consistency in outcomes across course sections, Academic Program Reviews (APR), University Biennial Assessments, and EPC assessments.

C.4.c.2. communicating with Program Directors/Coordinators and EPC staff to coordinate assessment efforts as required by the Department of Public Instruction.

C.4.d. Curriculum Committee : The Committee is comprised of one representative from each program in the Department. Duties are assigned by the Department Chair.

C.4.e. Promotion, Retention and Tenure (PRT) Committee is comprised of all Department tenured faculty with at least an 0.5 FTE appointment in the department. The Department Chair is a member of the PRT Committee. The committee members shall elect a chair of the PRT committee. Duties of the PRT Committee include:

C.4.e.1. developing procedures consistent with those of UWS and UWL for purposes of conducting promotion, retention and tenure reviews of tenure-track faculty and IAS.

C.4.e.2. providing faculty with information regarding the criteria employed in decisions relative to promotion, retention, tenure, and merit.

C.4.e.3. reviewing portfolios and making recommendations to the EPC Dean on promotion, retention, tenure.

C.4.e.4. developing and implementing policies consistent with those of the university for purposes of post-tenure review.

C.4.e.5. providing a five-year post-tenure review cycle for submission to the EPC Dean.

D. Ad-hoc Committees

The Department Chair may create temporary committees to accomplish the work of the department not covered by standing committees. Tenured and tenure-track faculty and Instructional Academic Staff with at least an 0.5 FTE serve on Ad-hoc committees appointed by the Department Chair.

E. Instructional Course Assignment Policy (last revised 5/18/18)

E.1. Course instructor assignments are made by the Department Chair in consultation with appropriate Program Director &/or faculty member or Instructional Academic Staff member.

E.2. Graduate course assignments are made by the Department Chair based on expertise, graduate faculty status, and availability.

E.3. Summer and Winter session course assignments are made by the Department Chair based on past summer instruction opportunities, expertise, and availability.

G. Additional Departmental Policies (last revised 5/10/19)

G.1 Sick leave. Department members will account for sick leave in adherence to the current UW System Guidelines (<http://www.uwsa.edu/hr/benefits/leave/sick.htm>). Vacation. For unclassified staff, 12-month employees garner vacation time, 9-month employees do not.

G.2 Online Course Policy (last revised 5/17/17)

G.2.a. Course Length and Outcomes:

Online courses should be designed with the same student time-commitment as in-person courses. Online courses should be designed to insure that students meet the same Student Learning Outcomes as the face-to-face version for that course.

G.2.b. Faculty Workload:

G.2.b.1 The workload assigned to an instructor for teaching an online/blended/flipped course should parallel the equivalent of an in person course. Instructors teaching online courses are expected to provide a full level of service to the department, School of Education/College, and University as appropriate for their FTE appointment. Instructors of online courses must hold regular office hours, which may be online and/or on-campus.

G.2.b.2 Faculty/IAS who lead courses online will make necessary arrangements when they need to be absent, as consistent with face-to-face courses.

G.2.b. 3 Instructors offering online courses are expected to complete the online teaching training offered by the University or an equivalent prior to teaching a course in an online format. Decisions made relative to what constitutes *equivalent* preparation and/or experience and/or training will be reviewed by the Department Chair or a designated representative

G.3 Salary Equity Policy (added 5/10/19)

UWL utilizes CUPA peer data to benchmark faculty and staff salaries (or UW System matches if CUPA data does not exist). Faculty and IAS salaries are benchmarked by rank and discipline whenever possible. The Faculty Senate Promotion, Tenure and Salary (PTS) committee reviews trends in data regarding equity, inversion and compression and makes recommendations for the disbursement of salary equity funds and/or pay plan (if available). Departments do not have the ability to make equity adjustments and Deans only have a limited ability when guided by PTS/Faculty Senate procedures. Individuals with job offers from another institution should provide the written offer to their chair and Dean for potential consideration of a salary adjustment if approved by the Provost and Vice Chancellor of Administration and Finance.

IX. Search and Screen Procedures

The department will follow hiring procedures prescribed by the university's Office of Human Resources (HR) in conjunction with AAOD and UW System and WI state regulations.

A. Tenure Track Faculty

The approved UWL tenure track faculty recruitment and hiring policy and procedures are found at Classification: <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/classification/>

*Recruitment: <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/recruitment/>
Additionally, UWL's spousal/partner hiring policy can be found at: <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/spousal-and-partner-hiring/>*

A search and screen committee comprised of tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and Instructional Academic Staff with at least an 0.5 FTE appointment will be established for each tenure-track faculty search conducted. The Department Chair appoints the committee. The search and screen committee must be chaired or co-chaired by a tenured faculty member. (See the DES Bylaw Appendices for specific Departmental Search & Screen procedures.)

B. Instructional Academic Staff (IAS)

Hiring policy and procedures are found at the following links:

Classification: <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/classification/>

Recruitment: <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/recruitment/>

The search and screen procedures followed for an IAS position are identical to those that are utilized for faculty searches. An IAS search and screen committee must be chaired or co-chaired by a tenured faculty member. The Department Chair appoints the committee.

C. Contingency Work Force (Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Pool Search)

Hiring policy and procedures are found at

Classification: <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/classification/>

Recruitment: <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/recruitment/>

IAS Pool searches are established to develop a pool of candidates with skills needed to teach various courses that might be hired on a semester basis as IAS.

D. Non-Instructional Academic Staff (NIAS)

For NIAS positions search and screen committees are comprised of tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, NIAS with at least an 0.75 FTE appointment, and IAS with at least an 0.75 FTE appointment in a department program in which they teach. The search and screen committee must be chaired or co-chaired by a tenure or tenure-track faculty member. The committee will be established by the Department Chair. Hiring policy and procedures are found at:

Classification: <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/classification/>

Recruitment: <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/recruitment/>

X. Student Rights and Obligations (last revised 5/10/19)

A. Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures

A.1. Course grade appeals

Students who believe that the grade they received for a course does not reflect their performance in that course may appeal the disputed grade. This appeal must be initiated within 1 month of the posting of the grade that is being appealed and be completed by the end of the semester immediately following the semester in which the grade was posted.

A.1.a The student should first discuss this difference with the instructor.

A.1.b If a student-instructor meeting is not possible, or if such a meeting does not result in a resolution of the difference, the student should contact the department chair to share their concerns. After meeting with the student, the Chair will discuss the student concern with the instructor, if possible.

A.1.c If the student is not satisfied with the result, the student may file a written appeal for a grade change, with the department Chair with specific evidence that substantiates their claim.

- A.1.d Upon receipt of the written appeal, the Chair will form an ad hoc committee consisting of three department members plus the Chair and the instructor to review the concern.
- A.1.e The decision of whether to change the course grade rests with the instructor, but is made in consultation with the appeals committee. If the instructor is not available within the semester time frame, the Chair makes the final decision.

A.2. Incomplete Grades

A student may request an incomplete grade in such situations as outlined in the [UWL undergraduate catalog](#). The student and instructor must sign an agreement indicating how and by what date the incomplete will be made up.

A.3. Student Non-Grade Appeal Complaints to the Chair

Students who present themselves to the Chair with complaints regarding an instructor or their class will be presented with a variety of options starting with a strong urging by the Chair for the student to speak directly with the instructor. If the student is resistant to this suggestion the following options may be offered: speak with the instructor with a third person in the room (such as the Chair of the Department), meet with the Chair, write a letter to the instructor, and/or Chair and/or Dean, meet with the Affirmative Action and Diversity Officer or Office of Student Life (for special concerns). If the student endorses the action, the Chair will discuss concerns raised with the individual faculty member. Students may initiate and resolve complaints regarding faculty/staff behavior. Such complaints can be reported either orally or in writing to the Department chair within 90 days of the last occurrence. Complaints about the Department chair should be reported to the dean of the college within 90 days of the last occurrence. The hearing procedures for these non-academic concerns are detailed in the UW-La Crosse student handbook.

A.4. Graduation without certification

- A.4.a Students with extenuating circumstances may petition for permission to waive program requirements for student teaching and to graduate *without certification*.
- A.4.b Students must have completed 120 credits required for graduation. In addition, students must have completed all other program requirements with the exception of student teaching. Meeting this requirement does not guarantee approval of the request.
- A.4.c The procedure for consideration of this request is as follows:
 - A.4.c.i The student must meet with their academic advisor and with the EPC Certification Officer to discuss their request for a waiver and to ensure that the student fully understand the implications of this decision.
 - A.4.c.ii The academic advisor then consults with the program faculty and staff and forwards their recommendation to the Department Chair.
 - A.4.c.iii The Department Chair reviews the request and after consultation with the Program Director, forwards a recommendation to the EPC Dean.
 - A.4.c.iv. The student will be informed of the decision in writing.
- A.4.d If the student decides to return at a later date to complete their student teaching, they are readmitted under the most current catalog and are required to complete any additional coursework or testing requirements that may have been implemented since their graduation.

B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct

Faculty and staff are expected to report academic misconduct per Chapter 14 of the UW System code. The Office of Student Life Office provides guidance and assistance. Academic and non-academic misconduct policies are referenced in the student handbook:

<https://www.uwlax.edu/student-life/student-resources/student-handbook/>

C. Academic Advising

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) mandates that faculty provide individual academic and professional advising to students as outlined in PI 34.016. Each student majoring in teacher education in DES is assigned a DES faculty advisor. Students are required to meet with their academic advisor at least once each semester to discuss their academic progress, career interests, and course schedule. Students are not able to register for the following semester courses until they have met with their academic advisor. Students are responsible for knowing their requirements for graduation and monitoring their progress to degree completion. Questions or concerns about degree requirements should be directed to their academic advisor and/or EPC Teacher Certification Officer.

DES By-law Appendices
(renumbered 12/18/15, 5/17/17, 5/18/18)

- A. Statement of Teaching in the Department of Educational Studies**
(approved in full 12/18/15; last revised 5/5/17)
- B. Statement of Scholarship in the Department of Educational Studies**
(approved in full 12/18/15; last revised 5/5/17)
- C. Statement of Service in the Department of Educational Studies**
(approved in full 12/18/15; last revised 5/5/17)
- D. Overall Merit Score Matrix** (last revised 05/18/18)
- E. DES Search & Screen Procedures** (last revised 9/15/17)
- F. SEI Template** (formerly in handbook, last revised 3/31/17)
- G. SoE Program Director Evaluation** (last revised 5/17/17)

Appendix A: Statement of Teaching in the Department of Educational Studies

Teaching is the primary focus for individuals in tenure track and instructional academic staff positions in DES. DES faculty and staff pursue this aim within the context of guiding teacher candidates who intend to become teachers capable of supporting all students' learning. Thus, DES faculty implement good teaching practices with the goal of supporting teacher candidates as they acquire content knowledge, skill, and disposition awareness. This includes incorporating innovative teaching techniques that are relevant to the PK-12 setting, for example integration of relevant technology, making connections between theory and practice in the classroom, and implementing social justice pedagogy for all learners. This may also include modeling activities that PK-12 students would perform in their classrooms as a vehicle for discussing inclusive pedagogical applications.

Minimum expectations for teaching activities:

Faculty are expected to set well-defined expectations, distribute syllabi (in electronic or paper format), stay current in their field (including aligning objectives with content standards), return assignments and communicate with students in a timely manner, hold regular office hours, implement the approved course curriculum, and maintain an appropriate professional disposition.

Teaching in DES:

Effective Teaching:

For merit review and retention, tenure, and promotion decisions, faculty are expected to demonstrate effective teaching and should provide evaluative evidence in their portfolio that aligns in accordance with JPC guidelines and substantiates teaching effectiveness. The extent of the evidence provided will vary with the level of review. Types of evidence documenting effective teaching may include, but is not limited to:

- **Self-assessment of teaching.** This assessment may take the form of a narrative which addresses a teaching philosophy and statement of personal growth, course expectations, grading methodology, and other methods used for self-assessment. Any self-assessment should also articulate how include responses to direct and indirect assessment outcomes inform teaching practices and impact student learning.
- **Peer evaluation of teaching.** Faculty and IAS should seek input from DES, and/or other SoE colleagues, and/or other PK-12 colleagues related to their teaching effectiveness. Probationary faculty, faculty undergoing post-tenure review, and IAS will undergo Peer Evaluations based on classroom visitations by other faculty.
- **Student evaluation of instruction (see section III.D of the bylaws):** Student evaluations given in each of the courses taught will also be used as *one* measure to judge teaching effectiveness. SEI results from the Faculty Senate approved SEI questions are required for retention, tenure, and promotion. DES uses additional questions as part of the SEI instrument. The complete list of questions is given in Appendix H.

Additional Teaching Contributions:

Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) often make additional teaching contributions outside of the classroom. The Department of Educational Studies highly values these contributions, which can take many forms, including, but not limited to:

- Course/curriculum development/revision/innovation
- Course/curriculum grants and/or teaching materials/assessments
- Professional development related to teaching and/or licensure
- Non-credit instruction
- Field and/or student teaching supervision
- Professional Development School (PDS) leadership and/or development

Candidates for merit, retention, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review should provide evidence indicating the scope and impact of these types of contributions.

Statement on Grading:

Grading student performance in DES involves assessing mastery. Faculty are responsible for determining if teacher candidates ("TCs") are proficient in all areas of teaching. TCs must master planning, implementation of instructional

practices and assessment of student learning in order to progress. Through this process, faculty provide substantial feedback that is used by TCs to continually revise and expand their work to meet proficiency standards. Therefore, grades are typically high (typically As and Bs) because assessment is an iterative process that leads students to mastery. It is important for reviewers of faculty portfolios to appreciate mastery grading when reviewing DES course grade distributions.

Field and Student Teaching Supervision Assignments:

Faculty and IAS who supervise teacher candidates (TC's) in field placements or student teaching settings as part of their workload assignment are expected to perform the duties required, including observing TC's in the field, meeting with cooperating teachers and TC's, supporting TC's with portfolio assembly, submission, and evaluation as needed, and submitting required documentation to the School of Education, Professional and Continuing Education (hereafter referred to as SoE) in a timely manner.

The following aspects of field and student teaching supervision should be taken into account when evaluating faculty teaching workload and performance.

- **Observations** of teacher candidates (TCs) during their field or student teaching placements is required and should be performed in line with DES and SoE Office of Field Experience expectations.
- **Triad conferences** between each teacher candidate, university supervisor (DES faculty/IAS) and cooperating teacher are also required in both field and student teaching settings, and should be performed in line with DES and SoE Office of Field Experience expectations.
- **Documentation** responsibilities include completing observation reports using appropriate reporting tools, which are ultimately compiled by the faculty member into a common assessment documents (SIPs) as outlined by DES and SoE. These should be performed in line with DES and SoE Office of Field Experience expectations.
- **Support and evaluation of pre-student teaching and student teaching portfolios** is expected of faculty with Field II and Student Teaching Seminar assignments. For pre-student teaching portfolios, faculty are expected to provide feedback and evaluate a mini-version of the required teacher performance assessment (edTPA) portfolio. For student teaching portfolios (prepared during student teaching placements), faculty are expected to provide ongoing support, clarification, and technical assistance as the TCs prepare and upload their required teacher performance assessment (edTPA) portfolio.

Professional Development Schools (PDS)

Professional Development Schools (PDS) are schools that have joined with UWL to accomplish educational goals that are mutually beneficial to each. A PDS is a collaboratively planned and implemented partnership for the academic and clinical preparation of teacher candidates and the continuous professional development of teachers. The design of a PDS partnership is based on outcomes for the PreK-12 students in the school with collaborative staff development and pre-service teacher preparation centered on those outcomes. At a PDS, University courses are often held within the school context. These schools are clinical sites where cohorts of teacher candidates participate in structured learning experiences as part of their professional education programs.

At PDS sites, there is a formal agreement between the University of Wisconsin La Crosse and the School Districts of La Crosse and surrounding areas. These agreements include the following purposes:

- Exemplary instruction and other educational experiences for PK-12 students
- Preparation of teachers and other school based educators
- Professional development of teachers and other school based educators
- Applied inquiry designed to improve practice

The amount of effort and expertise involved in the formation and upkeep of PDS relationships is significant, and DES faculty who serve as PDS liaisons are allocated workload credits above the course credits to reflect these responsibilities.

Appendix B: Statement of Scholarship in the Department of Educational Studies

Faculty in DES are expected to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship. Scholarship activity in the DES reflects the faculty's role in teacher preparation, which is to provide instruction to undergraduate and graduate candidates in curriculum development, teaching methods and assessment that is relevant to pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, elementary, middle level and secondary school settings, and is based on current research and theory from a variety of disciplines and fields of study.

Minimal Expectations for Scholarship:

Faculty members are expected to be actively engaged in scholarship. This could involve collecting and/or analyzing data, writing articles and/or grants, presenting, reviewing, and/or publishing results. Active engagement will take different forms depending on the individual and their area of scholarship.

Scholarship in DES:

The department's definition of scholarship reflects its commitment to teacher education program that is field-based and is dedicated to developing reflective practitioners. Faculty may engage in content-focused research in their discipline, and/or they may engage in self-study or use other rigorous research methods to carefully examine their *own* instruction. Both types of scholarship ultimately result in the dissemination of findings. Grants that focus on the act of teaching and/or instructional methods should be considered scholarly products. Curricular redesign grants or those funding the development of courses would not be considered scholarship, unless there are research findings that are rigorously collected and then disseminated.

Specific examples of scholarly activities and products include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Publishing original works such as journal articles, manuals, textbooks, book reviews, etc.
- Presenting creative and/or original research or curriculum development by means of lectures, paper presentations, or seminar presentations given at various professional meetings, conventions, conferences, or at other colleges and universities
- Applying for and/or receiving grants and awards in support of the scholarly activity
- Refereeing and reviewing original research manuscripts, grants, and conference proposals
- Serving as an editor for a peer-reviewed journal or other similar forums
- Attending conferences or symposia in support of scholarly development
- Conducting research (including collecting & analyzing data, writing manuscripts, etc)
- Mentoring undergraduate or graduate research students

Faculty are expected to report their scholarly activities and accomplishments on an ongoing basis in their Digital Measures database. Contributions are generally viewed as having a higher impact when subject to peer review. Narratives describing scholarly activity should contextualize the strength and audience of the journal(s) in which they are publishing when they submit their materials for review.

The Department of Educational Studies values many levels of engagement in scholarship. Benchmarks for retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review are articulated in the body of these bylaws. A guide to the level of impact of different scholarly activities and products is given below:

Primary Areas of Impact are those that are highly competitive and subject to rigorous peer review by individuals or organizations external to the University. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- Publication in a peer-reviewed forum, with contextualization of the forum and its impact
- Publication of textbooks, manuals, curriculum guides, books, or book chapters
- Editor or Co-Editor of peer-reviewed journal or book
- Keynote or invited speaker at national or international conferences
- Peer-reviewed research presentation for a national or international audience
- Principal or Co-Principal Investigator for an **external grant** (Public or Private funding) that is related to education or has an education component

Secondary Areas of Impact are those that are subject to less rigorous peer review by individuals or organizations external to the University or to review by peers at the University. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- Publication in a non-peer-reviewed forum, with contextualization of the forum and its impact
- Keynote or invited speaker at a local, regional or state conference
- Session leader at a conference/webinar
- Peer-reviewed poster or paper presentation for a regional or local audience
- Principal or Co-Principal Investigator for an **internal grant at the System or University-Wide level** that is related to education or has an education component

Tertiary Areas of Impact are those that are not subject to external peer review. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- Reviews of books, articles or conference proposals
- Non-peer reviewed presentations at local conferences
- Peer-reviewed poster or paper presentations at an internal conference
- Principal or Co-Principal Investigator for an **internal grant at the School of Education, Professional and Continuing, College, or Department/Program level** that is related to education or has an education component
- Revising manuscripts based on peer-review feedback
- Serving as a Supporting Author on a grant
- Mentoring undergraduate or graduate research students
- Attending conferences or symposia in support of scholarly development
- Conducting research (including collecting & analyzing data, writing manuscripts, applying for grants, etc.)

Appendix C: Statement of Service in the Department of Educational Studies

DES uses the following definitions, which are aligned with JPC guidelines (http://www.uwlax.edu/uploadedFiles/Offices-Services/Human_Resources/Faculty-Promotion-Guide%20.pdf (2013)).

- **University service** includes activities such as doing department, college, and University committee work. Evidence that service activities have been particularly valuable to the discipline, University or the community serves to strengthen a service portfolio.
- **Professional/Community service** involves the use of professional expertise in a service activity that may be internal or external to the University. These types of activities may include contributions such as:
 - Making an active contribution to a professional society
 - Organization of lecture series, institutes, workshops etceteras
 - Provision of in-service training
 - Consulting and advising in a professional capacity
 - Providing lectures or workshops
 - Assisting colleagues with research design and statistical analysis
 - Evaluating a program for an external agency

Performance of community service unrelated to the candidate's expertise as a University faculty/staff member is certainly worthwhile and reflects well on the University, but such community service is generally not given as much weight as Professional or University service.

Minimal Expectations for Service:

Faculty members are expected to provide service to the Department, School, University, and/or the Profession. Faculty are expected to participate in service activities at lower levels of responsibility and/or leadership at earlier career stages, and increase their level of responsibility as they progress through their careers.

Service in DES:

DES values many different types of service. Faculty are expected to be actively engaged in their service activities at all career levels and to provide supportive evidence in their portfolio of the level of responsibility and impact of their service contributions. The evidence provided will vary with the level of review. Types of supporting evidence may include but are not limited to:

- **Self-assessment of service contributions** (in a narrative statement)
- **Peer letter(s) of support.** Faculty and IAS are encouraged to seek input from internal and/or external colleagues related to the extent and impact of their service involvements.

The following listing is not intended to be prescriptive, but rather a more general guide to the levels of different service activities. It is certainly possible for an activity listed in one category to have a different level of impact or responsibility. Likewise, faculty and IAS are not expected to have service activities in each category. It is incumbent upon the faculty or IAS member to articulate and contextualize the impact and extent of their service activities.

Category A - may include service activities associated with a high level of responsibility and impact.

- Program Directorship
- Chairing SoE, Faculty Senate, Search & Screen, or Program level committees
- Taking a leadership role in professional outreach, professional development, or professional organization
- Serving on state and/or national educational organizations
- Creating and organizing novel symposia, workshops, and short courses designed to bring current information and/or techniques to members of the education community
- Developing PK-12 partnerships such as Professional Development Schools (PDS)
- Serving as a Professional Development Plan (PDP) reviewer

Category B - may include activities associated with a moderate level of responsibility or impact .

- Serving on SoE or Departmental accreditation, curriculum, and program assessment committees (alignment with edTPA, DPI, state standards, annual reports, student support sessions)
- SoE Task Force committees membership
- Faculty Senate committee membership
- Serving on a Search & Screen committee
- Participating in ongoing collaboration with PK-12 partnerships (e.g., PDS liaison)
- Serving on local educational organization boards, committees, etceteras
- Presenting or participating in service grants with teachers or the broader educational community
- Service presentations at local and national conferences - Presentations related to “service” should relate to supporting learner growth and development (PK-12 or 12+ focus)
- Organizing or developing community events that contribute to student learning
- Serving on professional association committees
- Academic Advising (depending on the number of advisees)

Category C - may include activities associated with a lower level of responsibility or impact .

- Serving on Program committees (STEP, EC-MC, etc.) or SoE meetings that are above the department level (parallel to departmental meetings)
- Serving on SoE Ad Hoc committees (parallel to college committees)
- Academic Advising (depending on the level of number of advisees)
- Volunteering in a professional capacity at local schools or agencies
- Providing consultation for individuals at local schools or agencies
- Leading mini-PD workshops at UWL (i.e., Tech Session)
- Serving on local school boards, district committees, and/or board of directors for non-profit

Appendix D: Overall Merit Score Matrices

Faculty Merit Score Matrix:				
	Overall Merit Score			
	E	G	S	U
THREE "E" AREA SCORES				
EEE	E			
TWO "E" AREA SCORES				
EGE	E			
EEG	E			
EES	E			
ESE	E			
GEE	E			
SEE		G		
UEE				U
EUE		G		
EEU			S	
THREE "G" AREA SCORES				
GGG		G		
TWO "G" AREA SCORES				
EGG		G		
GEG		G		
GGE		G		
GGG		G		
GSG		G		
SGG		G		
UGG			S	
GUG			S	
GGU			S	
THREE "S" AREA SCORES				
SSS			S	
TWO "S" AREA SCORES				
SES			S	
SSE			S	
ESS		G		
SSU			S	
SUS			S	
USS				U
SSG			S	
GSS			S	
SGS			S	

Faculty Merit Score Matrix: Cont.				
	Overall Merit Score			
	E	G	S	U
THREE "U" AREA SCORES				
UUU				U
TWO "U" AREA SCORES				
UEU				U
UUE				U
EUU			S	
GUU				U
UGU				U
UUG				U
UUS				U
USU				U
SUU				U
E/G/S AREA SCORE COMBINATIONS				
EGS		G		
ESG		G		
GES		G		
GSE		G		
SEG		G		
SGE		G		
E/G/U AREA SCORE COMBINATIONS				
EGU		G		
EUG			S	
GUE			S	
GEU			S	
UEG				U
UGE				U
E/S/U AREA SCORE COMBINATIONS				
ESU			S	
EUS			S	
SEU			S	
SUE			S	
USE				U
UES				U
G/S/U AREA SCORE COMBINATIONS				
GSU			S	
GUS			S	
SUG			S	
SGU			S	
USG				U

IAS Merit Score Matrix:				
	Overall Merit Score			
	E	G	S	U
TWO "E" AREA SCORES				
EE	E			
ONE "E" AREA SCORE				
EG	E			
ES		G		
EU			S	
GE		G		
SE		G		
UE				U
TWO "G" AREA SCORES				
GG		G		
ONE "G" AREA SCORE				
GS		G		
GU			S	
SG			S	
UG				U
TWO "S" AREA SCORES				
SS			S	
ONE "S" AREA SCORE				
SU			S	
US				U
TWO "U" AREA SCORES				
UU				U

Appendix E: Search & Screen Procedures

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-LA CROSSE SEARCH AND SCREEN POLICY AND PROCEDURES

(Modification to SECTION 9 adopted by DES 9/15/17)

University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (UWL) is committed to an inclusive institution where all employees feel welcome and respected. To do so involves a search and screen process that adheres to best practices consistent with equitable standards and treatment.

The Search and Screen Policy and Procedures (Policy and Procedures) are a comprehensive resource for all recruitment efforts at UWL. It provides Hiring Authorities and decision makers with necessary information and guidance to meet the requirements of state and federal legislation. It is designed to establish clear responsibility and accountability with respect to recruitment and appointment. This document is a consolidation of the UWL Faculty Recruitment & Hiring Policy and Procedures last updated 3/28/2012 and will be reviewed annually by Human Resources for operational clarity and accuracy regarding Human Resources and/or Affirmative Action procedures. If a review or modification is needed regarding the policy associated with hiring of faculty or instructional academic staff, or administrative positions with back-up faculty positions, Human Resources, the Provost, or the Faculty Senate Executive Committee can request that the Faculty Senate Chair convene an ad-hoc committee in consultation with the Provost.

Vacancies shall be processed through UWL's web-based online job posting and employment website, PeopleAdmin. Vacancies for faculty, instructional academic staff (IAS), non-instructional academic staff (NIAS), university staff, administrative staff, pool positions and graduate assistant positions are advertised and processed through PeopleAdmin. PeopleAdmin offers applicants, Hiring Authorities, search and screen committee/panel members, Budget Office, Affirmative Action Office and Human Resources the ability to review and manage the search and screen process from any location, 24/7. The recruitment process is managed by Human Resources.

The UWL search process operates in a regulated, yet transparent environment in compliance with various laws, statutes, regulations, policies and procedures. Therefore, to assist those charged with the responsibility of filling a position, the Policy and Procedures are to be followed and utilized to the fullest extent when making an employment decision.

Creating a climate that embraces the values and benefits of cultural diversity is the responsibility of everyone on campus and is accomplished through words and actions. The responsibilities of the campus leadership team (Chancellor, Provost, Vice Chancellors, Deans, and Directors) include evaluating accomplishments toward the achievement of the unit's objectives including the goals of enhancing cultural diversity.

Search and Screen Committees must comply with Wisconsin Open Meeting Laws<http://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/conducting-a-search-and-screening-meeting/>.

SECTION 1: ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL FOR RECRUITMENT

Before a recruitment commences, the hiring unit must first obtain approval for the recruitment of the position from the Hiring Authority and the replacement salary from the Vice Chancellor of Administration and Finance. For recruitment approval, the following is taken into consideration: replacement position, new position, or Growth, Quality and Access (GQA) funded position, or change in position classification. Approval process flow charts are available on the HR web site.

Faculty/IAS Positions:

For IAS positions (not utilizing a pool search) and faculty positions, the department Chair requests the position following the Dean's criteria/procedure and develops or updates the basic components of the position description in consultation with the Dean. The Dean requests approval to commence the search from the Provost/Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (by providing short justification, funding source, department, specialty, and rank). Upon approval from the Provost, the starting salary (or salary range) is submitted for approval from the Vice Chancellor of Administration and Finance.

Administrative, NIAS, and University Staff Positions:

For Administrative, NIAS and University Staff positions, the supervisor requests the position following the unit's criteria/procedure and develops or updates the basic components of the position description in consultation with Human Resources. The supervisor requests approval to commence the search from their respective Vice Chancellor (by providing short justification, funding source, and department/unit). Upon approval from the Vice Chancellor, the starting salary (or salary range) is submitted for approval from the Vice Chancellor of Administration and Finance.

Positions that Cross Units or Divisions:

If a position includes appointments in two or more units or divisions, collaboration is expected throughout the recruitment process. Collaboration should occur on the position description (including required and preferred characteristics), on the selection of candidates for final interview, and any/all offers of employment.

School of Education Affiliations:

School of Education (SOE) affiliated position recruitment requests need to come jointly from the Dean of Education, Professional and Continuing Education and the Dean of the home department. Departments are expected to follow the *Hiring Procedures Policy for SOE Affiliated Faculty in Teacher Education Programs* available in the School of Education Faculty Handbook.

SECTION 2: SEARCH AND SCREEN STRUCTURES

Search and Screen Committee: This process is to be used for the recruitment of faculty and instructional academic staff, and is also an option for the recruitment of non-instructional academic staff. The search and screen committee is comprised of a diverse group of individuals selected by the Hiring Official and/or Supervisor/Department Chair in conjunction with applicable bylaws. Refer to Section 3: Roles & Functions.

Search and Screen Panel: This process is to be used for the recruitment of university staff, and is an option for the recruitment of instructional and non-instructional academic staff positions classified below the Director level. The interview panel is comprised of a diverse group of individuals selected by the Hiring Official and/or supervisor and should consist of the supervisor, subject matter expert and 2-3 additional interviewers. Refer to Section 3: Roles & Functions.

Administrative Search and Screen Committee: This process is used for the recruitment of senior administrators at UW-La Crosse and is conducted in a manner that is consistent, fair, transparent, efficient, inclusive, and that allows for the input of relevant constituencies and governance groups. Please see [Administrative Search Policy](#) for composition of committee.

Pool Recruitment: This process is used for short term instructional academic staff and can be for a semester or academic year, up to 100%.

SECTION 3: ROLES & FUNCTIONS

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT: During the search process, committee/panel members may have access to confidential information, including, but not limited to, personal information, education history, and employment history of applicants. This information and all discussions must remain confidential both during the search and after the completion of the search process. These conversations should take place in areas where others cannot overhear. Committee/panel members may discuss this information only with other members of the committee/panel, as well as with the Supervisor, the Dean/Director, the Human Resources director/designee, and the Affirmative Action Office. Members must not permit any unauthorized person to access documents in their possession that contain applicant or search and screen information.

Pursuant to the UWL [Nepotism Policy](#), any search and screen committee/panel member should remove themselves from the committee/panel should a related person become an applicant in the recruitment so as to avoid a conflict of interest.

Human Resources (HR)

HR provides expertise, advice, consultation, and assistance to committees/panels and hiring managers in the operating units who have direct responsibility for making employment recommendations and/or decisions. HR assists in all recruitment, advertisement, and employment activity for all recruitments within UWL. This is accomplished through coordination with the Hiring Authorities and search and screen committees/panels.

HR provides initial consultation and help throughout the hiring process (for committees or panels) regarding ways to protect the confidentiality of the process and the recording and communication of candidate strengths and weaknesses.

HR manages the PeopleAdmin software which includes, but is not limited to, the electronic workflow of the recruitment and appointment process by:

- consulting/training search and screen committee chair/panel chair on the recruitment process and navigation of PeopleAdmin;
- assisting with the creation and posting of a recruitment;
- assisting with the creation and review of recruitment documents;
- assisting with the development and placement of advertising (see [Advertising Guidelines](#));
- assisting with screening application materials for minimum qualifications using job specific questions, if applicable;
- assisting with the development of interview questions to ensure relevancy to selection criteria;
- reviewing interview and reference questions for legality and relevancy to position.
- providing applicants automated updates regarding the status of their application;
- providing consultation pertaining to salary and completion of the hiring details in PeopleAdmin;
- processing of the criminal background check;
- processing the appointment documents;
- serving as ex officio, non-voting member of search and screen committees.

Budget Office

Budget Office is responsible for approving funding source, salary and providing information on position control (ie. Redbook, GQA and new positions) as well as search and screen expenditures/budget.

Affirmative Action Office (AAO)

The AAO is committed to achieving equal opportunity in education, professional training, career advancement and employment at UWL.

AAO assumes responsibility for communicating, interpreting, and monitoring UWL's equal employment opportunity and non-discrimination policies.

Specifically, AAO is responsible for:

- reviewing the composition of the search and screen committee or panel;
- meeting with each committee or panel to discuss inclusive recruitment and evaluation practices; including diversity outreach efforts and opportunities;
- reviewing the advertising text for diversity and inclusion language;
- reviewing interview and reference questions in consultation with Human Resources;
- reviewing and approving all campus applicant pools for diversity;
- developing equal opportunity policy statements, procedures and processes for communication to the campus community;
- providing relevant availability data regarding minorities and women;
- measuring the effectiveness of UWL's outreach efforts and other equal opportunity programs and strategies;
- receiving applicant and/or search and screen committee/panel complaints and investigating claims of discrimination and/or harassment;
- serving as ex officio, non-voting member of search and screen committees and panels.

Hiring Authority (Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, Dean, Director)

The Chancellor is the hiring authority at UWL and as such, will decide on the final outcome of the search process and all offers of employment at UWL. The Chancellor has delegated this authority to the respective direct reports who may delegate it further to Deans/Directors as applicable. The development of the recruitment and selection process is delegated within each division and/or department. The Deans/Directors may designate an individual to serve as the chair of the search and screen committee for the search & screen process (this individual does not make the final hiring decision).

Some specific responsibilities of the designated Hiring Authority are:

- verifying FTE and salary;
- developing and/or reviewing position description;
- selecting a diverse group of individuals to serve on the search and screen committee/panel;
- recruiting and hiring persons without regard to their sex, race, religion, marital status, national origin, veteran's status, age, disability or ethnicity;
- ensuring that all applicants are given equal opportunity in employment consideration;
- ensuring that the criteria utilized for all hires are job related;
- submitting a request for approval to hire through PeopleAdmin;
- serving as ex officio, non-voting member of search and screen committees and panels.

It is the Hiring Authority's option to use either a search and screen committee or panel recruitment process for IAS and NIAS positions below the Director classification level, in consultation with HR.

All university staff positions will be recruited using the search and screen panel recruitment process.

Supervisor/Department Chair

Some specific responsibilities of the Supervisor/Department Chair include:

- initiating the search and screen process following department bylaws (faculty/IAS);
- developing the position description;
- securing a diverse group of individuals to serve on the search and screen committee/panel;
- identifying a subject matter expert in a search and screen panel recruitment; may identify search chair in a committee recruitment.

Search and Screen Committee Chair

The search and screen committee chair is appointed or elected by a simple majority vote to ensure the committee's administrative tasks are performed in accordance with the Policy and Procedures. The administrative tasks of the search and screen committee chair include, but are not limited to:

- coordinating with HR and AAO;
- posting open meeting notices;
- securing the necessary posting, interviewing and hiring approvals;
- forwarding interview and reference questions to AAO and HR for review;
- conducting reference checks;
- arranging interviews, associated travel (if applicable) and reasonable requested accommodations (contact HR);
- referring public records requests to HR;
- providing closing recruitment documentation to HR.

Search and Screen Committee

The search and screen committee is comprised of a diverse group of individuals selected by the Hiring Authority and/or Supervisor/Department Chair in conjunction with department bylaws. Diversity encompasses, but is not limited to race/ethnicity, gender, disability, age, and position (e.g. manager, staff, student, and community participant). A simple majority vote of committee members constitutes a quorum necessary to conduct committee business. Members may not vote by proxy but may vote by teleconference if they have provided advance notice to the search and screen chair and participated in the deliberations leading to the vote. The search and screen committee has the responsibility of:

- developing and/or approving recruitment documentation including selection criteria and advertising text based on the position description;
- creating interview questions for first screening (telephone, video conference, or on-site) and final screening interviews;
- creating reference questions;
- screening and selecting the applicants for interview based on the documented selection criteria, ensuring fairness of the process;
- conducting reference checks;
- presenting the pros and cons of the campus interviewees verbally to the Hiring Authority.

Recorder

The recorder is a member of the search and screen committee and is responsible for posting a notice of meetings and taking official minutes of meetings which must include the motion and vote by name to go into closed session. The role of recorder may rotate among multiple members of the committee.

Meeting minutes should not refer to applicants by name. You may refer to them by number, if needed. Strengths and weaknesses should not be included in the minutes, but should be kept in the Search and Screen chair's personal notes that will be shared verbally with the Hiring Authority. Please refer to the [guidelines](#).

Meeting agendas must comply with [open meeting laws](#).

Panel Recruitment Chair (panel chair)

The panel chair is the supervisor for the vacant position. The panel chair and subject matter expert are responsible for reviewing the applicant pool to select candidates for interview and ultimately select the hire. It is the responsibility of the panel chair to take into consideration feedback from the subject matter expert and panel members prior to making the hiring decision.

The role of the panel chair is to ensure that the administrative tasks are performed in accordance with the Policy and Procedures. These administrative tasks include, but are not limited to:

- coordinating with HR and AAO;
- securing the necessary posting, interviewing, and hiring approvals;
- forwarding interview and reference questions to AAO and HR for review;
- conducting reference checks;
- arranging interviews, associated travel (if applicable) and reasonable requested accommodations (contact HR);
- referring public records requests to HR;
- providing closing recruitment documentation to HR.

Subject Matter Expert (SME)

The SME should have a history of working in the same or similar position for which you are recruiting. It may be necessary to utilize an employee outside the department/unit as the SME who works in a similar position. HR can assist in providing names of potential SMEs and their supervisors' contact information to retain authorization for the SME to conduct recruitment responsibilities during work hours.

The SME may be asked to assist the panel chair with creating the position description and advertising text. The SME will conduct a review of applicants' materials with the panel chair to determine which applicants comprise Tier 3 (do not meet minimum qualifications), and select candidates for screening interviews. The SME will be involved in the screening interview, campus interview and reference checking processes as well as provide feedback to the panel chair about the interviewees.

Interview Panel (2 or 3 individuals recommended)

The interview panel is comprised of a small group of diverse individuals selected by the panel chair to assist in gathering facts to aid the panel chair in the selection process. The interview panel members do not have access to PeopleAdmin.

The interview panel members will be involved in the screening interviews and will provide input in the selection of candidates to be interviewed on campus. The interview panel members will participate in the campus interviews and may be asked to participate in reference checking. It is the responsibility of the interview panel members to review the position description and other materials provided by the panel chair in advance of any interviews. The interview panel members will also provide feedback on the interviewees to the panel chair.

SECTION 4: RECRUITMENT METHODS

In consultation with HR, Hiring Officials determine the appropriate method(s) to recruit a vacant position. Vacancies may be recruited by:

- external recruitment process,
- internal recruitment process,
- selecting a candidate from a previously closed recruitment (within three (3) months of being closed),
- direct appointment process,
- spousal/partner process,
- interim appointment, or
- pool process.

These options are described below.

External Recruitment Process

The external recruitment process seeks applicants within and outside UWL at a local, regional or national level and is generally recommended as the best option to fill a position vacancy. Either a search and screen committee or panel recruitment process should be used depending on the position type.

Internal Recruitment Process

The internal recruitment process is an option available to fill vacancies. The supervisor must request of the Dean/Director and HR, approval to fill a vacancy by an internal recruitment process. The internal recruitment option offers opportunities to retain and advance highly productive and qualified persons already employed by UWL. The determination to use the internal recruitment process will include consideration of the position type, departmental organizational structure, the position classification, diversity initiatives, and other related factors. An approved internal recruitment process shall be posted for a minimum of ten (10) business days. Either a search and screen committee or panel recruitment process should be used depending on the position type.

Below is the eligibility for the internal recruitment applicant pool:

1. Must be currently employed at UWL and successfully completed probationary period prior to the date of application.
2. Must not be under a performance improvement plan.
3. Project and temporary employees, either hired through an external agency or UWL, are NOT eligible.
4. NIAS interim appointments who have not been hired through a UWL recruitment process, are NOT eligible.

The supervisor is required to check references with the current supervisor(s) and previous employers, as appropriate. It is recommended the supervisor review the official personnel file in HR.

If the internal recruitment process does not result in a hire, the position will be re-announced and posted through the external recruitment process.

Selecting a Candidate from a Previously Closed Recruitment

In the circumstances where there is an unanticipated vacancy in the same classification, the Supervisor/Department Chair may request to consider previous applicants from a closed recruitment to fill the vacancy. It is recommended that a recruitment not be older than three (3) months to be considered. HR and Dean/Director must approve the use of a previously closed recruitment to fill a position vacancy.

Pool Recruitment

This is a short term hire – one (1) year or less. Reappointment is an option.

SECTION 5: SPECIAL HIRING METHODS

Direct Appointment

Direct appointments are rare and must be approved by the University Chancellor, HR, and division leadership. They are used only after a careful review on a case-by-case basis. Justification is required. Some examples in which this method may be used include:

- a history of unsuccessful searches;
- the required qualifications for the position are unique and necessary, making it extremely difficult to hire for the position;
- a current employee or a potential employee is uniquely qualified for the position.

See Direct Appointment Procedures

Spousal/Partner

See Spousal and Partner Hiring Policy.

Interim Appointment

An interim appointment is meant to be used during the recruitment of an ongoing position and is short term, typically one (1) year or less, depending upon position. There is no eligibility for reappointment. A position description, written justification, and recruitment plan are required. The interim appointment salary will be less than the salary of the ongoing position hire.

Only the Chancellor may appoint an interim appointment to a direct appointment.

SECTION 6: RECRUITMENT PLANNING AND APPROVALS

Verification from the Hiring Authority of the availability of the position and replacement salary must be obtained prior to the creation of a search and screen committee/panel or search and screen documents. After verification and approval;

1. the Department Chair/Director shall organize a search committee and identify a committee chair, or
2. the supervisor shall identify a SME and interview panel members.

The search and screen committee (committee) process is used for the recruitment of faculty, director and above (administrative/limited), and is an option for the recruitment of IAS and NIAS.

The search and screen panel (panel) process is used for the recruitment of university staff, and is an option for IAS and NIAS below the Director classification level.

The department/supervisor should make an effort to establish a diverse committee/panel to add new and beneficial perspectives to the applicant screening and assessment processes. If applicable, choosing a member outside of the department that is an internal customer of the position is encouraged.

Recruitment Meeting with HR

The committee/panel chair needs to meet with their respective HR recruiter prior to each search for purposes of obtaining access to and training on the use of the PeopleAdmin system and to discuss recruitment options and procedures.

AAO Officer Charging Meeting

Committee: The first meeting of the committee shall be the charging meeting with the AAO and the election of chair and recorder. Committees are not expected to have completed any documents (e.g., position description, advertising text, selection criteria, etc.) prior to the charging meeting. All committee members are expected to attend.

Panel: The panel chair, SME and interview panel members are expected to attend a meeting with the AAO. This meeting may take place after the posting of the advertisement, but it should always take place before the initial review of applicants.

The AAO will provide resources and tips designed to maximize the diversity of the applicant pool. This meeting is designed to last between 30 and 60 minutes depending on the nature of the search and the past experience of the committee/panel members. Requests for individuals to be excused from this meeting will be reviewed and approved by the AAO on a case-by-case basis.

Position Recruitment

PeopleAdmin will be utilized for the recruitment and hiring approval processes and for tracking purposes. HR will create the draft recruitment in PeopleAdmin; the search and screen committee chair/panel chair will complete all appropriate fields and screens within the draft recruitment, including uploading the required recruitment documentation (e.g., position description, advertising text, selection criteria, Policy and Procedures document, search and screen composition document), prior to sending the recruitment forward through the electronic approval process.

Provost/Vice Chancellor approval is dependent upon the salary amount, along with if the position is a replacement, new, or Growth, Quality and Access (GQA), or if there is a change in classification. Approval process [flow charts](#) are available on the HR recruitment web site.

HR conducts the final review of all recruitments and posts to the UWL career opportunities web site.

Applicants apply through the UWL career opportunities web site and any applications received outside the career opportunities site cannot be considered.

Closing Dates and Timelines

Application closing or first review dates shall be established so that potential applicants have sufficient time to respond to the advertisement. Faculty positions must be advertised nationally and will state a closing date or first review date no less than thirty (30) days from the posting date.

It is recommended that all other external recruitments be announced for a minimum of thirty (30) days. Certain university staff recruitments may be announced for a minimum of fourteen (14) days.

In the event a recruitment needs to be re-announced/re-advertised, it must be posted for a minimum of seven (7) calendar days. Situations where this may occur include: the search process does not result in a hire; the applicant pool requires additional outreach efforts; advertising and postings were not broadly disseminated or publicized; there is a modification in the approved recruitment after the advertising has been placed.

Positions may be advertised as a continuous recruitment with a first review date. If this option is selected, the full search and screen committee/panel chair and SME must consider ALL applications received prior to the advertised first review date.

The search and screen committee/panel chair and SME must determine how applications received after the first review date will be handled. There are three options:

- do not review or consider any applicants who apply after the advertised first review date;
- review and consider all applications as they come in until the position is filled, or;
- set a second review date and review and consider all applications as they come in until the second review date.

A recruitment that is advertised as a continuous recruitment with a first review date may be removed from the UWL employment opportunities web site (no longer accepting applications) any time after the first review date, and is typically dependent upon the quality of the applicant pool.

SECTION 7: ADVERTISING

Advertisements will be placed on a local, regional or national level, as appropriate. The search and screen committee chair/panel chair will place the approved position advertisements promptly and without modification in publications and on web sites as indicated in the posting details after all recruitment approvals have been obtained through PeopleAdmin and the recruitment is live on the UWL career opportunities web site.

Advertisements must include the following elements: title of position, college/unit, department, duties/responsibilities, required and preferred qualifications, anticipated start date, and application deadline or first review date.

For faculty recruitments considering ABD candidates, the following language must be included in the required qualifications: *“Candidates for the appointment should have or be near to completing a doctorate degree in XXXXXX or a related field by the start date. Degree must be earned by the first personnel review, no later than May 15, 20XX.”* If a candidate is hired for a January start, the date of first review should be December 15, 20XX.

Advertisements must also include a departmental statement regarding UWL’s value of diversity. Several examples are included below. Search and screen committees/panel chair may use the statements as written or modify the statements as needed. Alternatively, search and screen committees/panel chair may feel free to create an original departmental statement about our value of diversity.

1. The [Insert department name] supports and values diversity in its faculty, staff, and students. We seek a colleague who shares the department's commitment to diversity and inclusion and who will be a dedicated teacher, active scholar, and effective mentor for students with diverse backgrounds, preparation, and career goals.
2. The successful applicant in the [Insert department name] will demonstrate a commitment to multiculturalism, diversity and inclusive excellence and an ability to work with students and colleagues from diverse backgrounds.
3. We at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse believe students, faculty, and staff all are enriched by our exposure to differing ideas, opinions and cultures. We strive to be a leader in Wisconsin's movement toward increased diversity and inclusiveness. We believe that employees from diverse backgrounds are critical to achieving excellence as a nationally recognized institution of higher education. The [Insert department name] seeks to recruit, develop, and retain the most talented people from a diverse candidate pool. We strongly encourage applications from persons with diverse backgrounds and experiences.
4. The [Insert department name] has a strong commitment to multicultural and international education and is committed to supporting curriculum development and reform in these and other areas.
5. The [Insert department name] and the university are committed to being inclusive and supportive learning and teaching communities. We encourage applicants who enhance our commitment to these goals.
6. The [Insert department name] values diversity and faculty who bring diverse experiences to their teaching.

In addition, all electronic advertisements must include the following statements:

“UWL is proud to be an equal opportunity employer. We strive to recruit, develop, and retain the most talented people from a diverse candidate pool, and we encourage applications from persons with varied backgrounds and perspectives. In support of the Wisconsin Veteran Employment Initiative we encourage veterans and veterans with disabilities to explore employment opportunities at UWL.

Employment will require a criminal background check. A pending criminal background charge or conviction will not necessarily disqualify an applicant. In compliance with the Wisconsin Fair Employment Act, UWL does not discriminate on the basis of arrest or conviction record.”

Print advertisements may use the shortened version as follows:

“UWL is an AA/EEO employer and we encourage veterans to apply. Employment will require a criminal background check.”

If the placement of advertisements differs from the recruitment plan, contact HR. Please keep screen shots of all ads placed for submittal to HR at the close of the recruitment.

For additional information and advertising templates, refer to the [Advertising guidelines and templates](#).

SECTION 8: SCREENING AND TIERING APPLICANTS

All applicants shall be treated similarly in the recruitment, screening and interviewing process. Contact HR for questions related to this.

Tiering of Applicants

During the review of applications, the committee/panel chair and SME will be responsible for assigning “Tiers” to all applicants. The Tier definitions and corresponding reasons (for Tier 2) are listed below.

Please note that the ONLY applicants who can comprise Tier 3 are those who clearly do not meet the “required” qualifications for the position as outlined in the advertising text and selection criteria documents for the recruitment. Once an applicant is given Tier 3 status, they cannot be moved out of Tier 3.

Tier 1: Interview – electronic or on-campus

Tier 2: Applicant Meets Minimum Qualifications – Not Tier 1

REASONS: (choose the reason that best fits for each applicant)

- Does not meet the identified needs of the department
- Lacks technical competence, administrative or performance experience
- Not making satisfactory and timely progress on terminal degree, e.g., Ph.D.
- Lacks preferred experience
- Lacks publication/composition/exhibition record
- Research or portfolio does not meet identified needs
- Lacks service contributions
- Accreditation standards of degree-granting institution do not meet acceptable levels of quality and academic standards
- References do not support application materials
- Qualified but withdrew from consideration
- Incomplete applicant documents (reference letters not received by committee review)

Tier 3: Applicant Does Not Meet Minimum Qualifications

Initial Screening (review of applicant documents)

Each member of the search and screen committee/panel chair and SME will review application documents of the applicants and make an initial assessment (yes/no) of each applicant to determine whether they meet the minimum qualifications as indicated in the selection criteria.

The search and screen committee/panel chair and SME will then meet and discuss the applicants. Applicants who clearly and objectively do not meet the minimum qualifications are designated as Tier 3.

The remaining applicants are reviewed to determine, based upon selection criteria, who may move to a second screening.

If any search and screen committee member/panel chair or SME believes that an applicant deserves further consideration based on the selection criteria, that applicant will be moved to second screening.

SECTION 9: THE INTERVIEW PROCESS

The interview process shall assure that all qualified candidates interviewed receive similar consideration throughout the process. It is important that there is consistency during all phases of the interview process including participation by members of the committee/panel and other University forums. If a member of the committee/panel is not available during the scheduled interview of an applicant, that member will recuse themselves from providing input regarding the candidates during that phase of the process.

Hiring Officials, if not on the committee/panel, may participate in the interview process and/or conduct an individual interview with the candidate. In all cases however, the committee shall conduct its deliberations on the candidates on an independent basis, and shall provide a verbal summary of the basis for its final recommendations.

For tips for scheduling interviews (electronic and onsite), refer to [Tips on preparing for interviews](#).

Second Screening (telephone/electronic interviews)

If telephone or electronic interviews are conducted, a common list of core questions will be asked of all candidates interviewed. To ensure compliance, each member of the committee/panel should review UWL's *Brief Guidelines for Contemporary Employment Interviewing*. The use of standard questions does not prevent the committee/panel from asking follow-up questions as deemed appropriate. Each committee/panel member shall maintain their own documentation of information provided in the interview. Personal notes are not part of the official record. In the event any personal written notes are shared with other committee members, they do become part of the public record. Personal notes shall not be shared with any person who is not part of the search process.

The committee/panel may solicit additional material/information and/or additional references from applicants retained for further consideration. Any additional materials/information collected outside of PeopleAdmin is subject to records retention schedules. If unsolicited materials are received, the search and screen committee chair/panel chair retains the materials and does not share them with the committee/panel until such time (if ever) that similar materials are solicited of all candidates or finalists.

Determining the Finalist Group (Committee): The committee shall discuss and vote on each candidate to select those to be moved to Tier 1 and Tier 2 status. A simple majority vote of those members present is required to advance a candidate. It is expected that committees will adopt a dialogue approach that seeks to explore and incorporate all perspectives before a vote is taken.

Should a candidate fail to be advanced to Tier 1 status on the initial vote, they can be brought to a re-vote only once as initiated by the committee. Any committee member may request a re-vote. AAO may request a re-vote of a candidate to ensure a just and equitable applicant pool.

The committee shall vote to cluster the candidates in two "Tiers". Tier 1 shall include the three (3) to five (5) qualified candidates the committee believes should be invited to interview on campus. Tier 2 shall include the remaining qualified candidates. The committee will identify Tier 2 candidates that would be suitable for the position if the Tier 1 candidates are unavailable or are determined to be unacceptable after an interview.

Faculty: ~~Unless otherwise designated in departmental by-laws, the~~ The committee will present its Tiers of applicants with its recommendations for interviews to the department Chair and EPC Dean for approval. ~~The department shall vote on the recommendation of the committee. A majority of the department voting is required to approve the list of finalists. If paper ballots are used, each ballot must be signed, dated and retained for seven (7) years per records retention schedule.~~ **(Modification approved by DES 9/15/17).**

Final Screening (campus interviews)

After Dean/Director and AAO approve candidates for interview, the search and screen committee chair/panel chair shall contact each approved candidate to schedule a campus interview. To assist in planning on campus interviews, refer to Tips on Preparing for Interviews.

A list of core questions will be prepared and asked of all applicants brought to campus for interviews. The search and screen committee chair/panel chair will submit questions for review and approval by the AAO and HR via email.

Each member of the committee/panel should review *Brief Guidelines for Contemporary Employment Interviewing* and be apprised that interview guidelines regarding illegal questions apply to all conversations with interviewees in both formal and informal settings. There is no time that the committee/panel or UWL employees are off the record with candidates, or that candidates are off the record with the campus.

Following the on-campus interviews and any final reference checking, the committee/panel shall meet with dean/division officer/director to deliver their comprehensive screening results for all on-campus interviewees.

The committee/panel shall verbally identify the strengths and weaknesses (as they relate to the selection criteria) of these unranked candidates in alphabetical order.

SECTION 10: CONDUCTING REFERENCE CHECKS

HR recommends a minimum of three (3) documented reference checks and that they be completed prior to candidates being invited from outside the immediate area for an on campus interview. Reference checks for local recruitments may be done either before or after candidates have been interviewed campus.

The committee/panel may conduct telephone reference checks on each of the applicants still under consideration. Two or more committee/panel members shall be present for each reference call. For each call, a written record will be maintained until the close of the search at-which-time these reference notes must be shredded. Each committee/panel member shall maintain their own documentation of information provided during the reference checks. Personal notes are not part of the official record. In the event any personal written notes are shared with other committee/panel members, they do become part of the public record and must not be destroyed.

The committee/panel retains the right to make off-list phone calls. Off-list phone calls are reference calls to individuals not on the applicant's list of references. Given that confidentiality requests by the applicants are still respected during this phase of the process, all applicants must be informed prior to any off-list phone calls being made, and a provision must be provided for the applicant to specifically identify any individuals they do not wish to have called.

SECTION 11: THE HIRING PROCESS

Prior to a verbal offer, verify the Budget Office approved salary amount found on the Posting Details of the recruitment. Requests to negotiate a salary offer that exceeds the Budget Office approved rate shall require approval by the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance.

Academic Department

Committee: After the campus interviews and reference checking, the committee and/or departmental members authorized by the department bylaws shall discuss the finalists and provide a non-ranked list of the finalists to the Dean/Director. The strengths and weaknesses (as they relate to the selection criteria) of the non-ranked list of finalists will be provided verbally (not written) to the Dean/Director. The Dean/Director may choose to make additional reference checks. In accordance with departmental bylaws and policies, the department or authorized representative(s) will consult with the Dean/Director to collaboratively agree on recommendation(s) for hire.

After appropriate consultation, the Dean/Director and the department or authorized representative(s) agree on a hiring decision, then:

1. The search and screen committee chair will formally request via PeopleAdmin, approval to hire from the Dean/Director, and the Provost/Vice Chancellor (if applicable).
2. The terms of the offer are developed by the Dean/Director **in consultation with the Budget Office.**
3. Once approved at the appropriate levels, the Dean/Director will contact the applicant to extend the job offer.

If after appropriate consultation, the Dean/Director and the department or authorized representative(s) **do not agree** on a hiring decision, there are three (3) options to consider:

- an additional applicant(s) may be moved from Tier 2 to Tier 1.
- the search is authorized to be refreshed.
- the search is failed.

Hiring Details:

Upon acceptance of the offer by the applicant, the Dean/Director will complete the Hiring Details in PeopleAdmin, and forward electronically to HR.

Non-Academic Unit

Committee/Panel:

After the campus interviews and reference checking, the committee/panel shall discuss the finalists and provide a non-ranked list of the finalists to the Hiring Official. The strengths and weaknesses (as they relate to the selection criteria) of the non-ranked list of finalists will be provided verbally (not written) to the Hiring Official. The Hiring Official may choose to make additional reference checks. The Hiring Official makes the hiring decision in consultation with the Supervisor/Director.

Hiring Details:

Upon acceptance of the offer by the applicant, the Dean/Director will complete the Hiring Details in PeopleAdmin, and forward electronically to HR.

SECTION 12: THE CLOSING OF A SEARCH

HR will conduct the Criminal Background Check (CBC) process and issue the appointment document.

- after the CBC has been completed and the signed appointment document has been received, HR will notify the Dean/Director.
- HR will designate the position as “filled” in PeopleAdmin and all Tier 2 applicants will be notified by PeopleAdmin system generated email, with the exception of candidates brought to campus but not selected (Tier 1), who will be contacted by the search and screen committee chair/panel chair by telephone, speaking directly to the candidates in order to demonstrate respect for their time and interest in UWL.
- HR will create an official personnel file for the new hire.
- HR will complete the official recruitment electronic file for the search process.

The search and screen committee chair/panel chair and all committee/panel members shall shred any personal notes and/or worksheets from the search. Applicant files will be retained by PeopleAdmin. The following documents are to be turned in to HR at the close of a search:

- **approved minutes (committee)**
- **photocopies of actual advertisements placed**
- **photocopies of any solicited application documents, interview exams/exercises and the results, received outside of PeopleAdmin**

Faculty: If a foreign national is hired, the Department Chair and the Dean will assist HR with the necessary collection of documents to pursue an authorization to work. HR will submit petitions on behalf of UWL for foreign national hires in compliance with federal, state, UW System, and UWL rules, regulations, policies, and procedures.

SECTION 13: RECRUITMENT RECORDS RETENTION

Search and screen committee/panel documentation for all positions will be retained for 6 years from the date the position is filled, at-which-time they will be disposed of confidentially according to the UWL confidential records disposal procedures, shredding, or via the Iron Mountain bins located throughout campus.

Appendix:

Search and Screen Committee Composition Form

Search and Screen Panel Composition Form

Conducting a Search and Screen meeting

Brief Guidelines for Contemporary Employment Interviewing

Recruitment and Interviewing Tools and Resources

Faculty Senate Articles, Bylaws and Policies (See Faculty Qualifications – pg. 52)

The University of Wisconsin System UPS Recruitment Operational Policy

Wisconsin Administrative Code 3.02 - Faculty Recruitment Authority

Wisconsin Administrative Code 10.02 - Academic Staff Recruitment Authority

Appendix F: SEI Surveys

DES adopted the following protocol for the administration of electronic SEI surveys. Instructors should arrange for a proctor to be present during the administration of the survey if possible, but instructors may elect to step out of the classroom during the in-class administration period. A student should be appointed to retrieve the instructor when the evaluation period is complete.

Instructor sends an email to students one week in advance of evaluation day:

The faculty in DES are striving to have 100% student feedback on SEI's. For **CLASS XYZ**, you will be provided **XXX** minutes of dedicated in class time to complete the SEI survey. Please bring an electronic device (laptop, smartphone, iPad, etc.) to class to complete the SEI in class with a proctor on **Date Here**. You may elect to complete the survey outside of class time, or to not complete the survey at all, but we value your feedback and encourage you to participate.

On the day of the in-class evaluations: Script for Proctors or Instructor:

The Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) survey is an important means for you to express your view of your course and instructor experience, and for instructors and departments to learn about your impressions. While there are many factors that are considered in the assessment of quality instruction, we place great value on student input for course improvement and instructor professional development. Because of your unique perspective on what has occurred in the classroom, you are a part of the process in making the course more effective and the university a better place for learning. Thus, your responses are one component that is used in evaluating your instructor.

We ask that you treat this process professionally, and give honest and thoughtful feedback. Your responses will be kept anonymous, and are not provided to instructors until after final grades have been posted. While we strive for 100% student feedback, you may opt out of completing this evaluation, or you may choose complete it on your own time. The closing date for the SEI survey for this semester is **Enter Date Here**.

Thank you for your participation!

All SEI surveys include the following 6 questions, required by UWL Faculty Senate:

Motivation Question:

1. I was looking forward to taking this course.

Instructor Evaluation Questions (Composite of #2-6 reported for use in personnel decisions):

2. The instructor was helpful to students.
3. The instructor was well prepared.
4. The instructor communicated the subject matter clearly.
5. I learned a great deal from this instructor.
6. Overall, this instructor was excellent.

DES SEI surveys include additional questions that depend on the format/components of the course:

Form A: Courses with only a lecture component

Open-Ended

7. What could you have done to be a better learner?
8. What did the instructor do that most helped your learning?
9. What could have the instructor done to improve your learning?
10. Please use this space to provide any additional comments.

Likert Scale

11. The instructor treated me with respect.
12. The course objectives and assignments were clearly described in the syllabus.
13. The instructor utilized a variety of learning materials, activities, and approaches.
14. I received constructive feedback (verbal, written, peer and so forth) on activities, assessments, and/or assignments.
15. I received timely feedback (verbal, written, peer and so forth) on activities, assessments, and/or assignments.
16. The course required both critical reflective thinking (e.g., instructional strategies, teaching methods/styles).
17. I am better prepared to consider/support/teach diverse learners (including ability level, gender, race, SES, modality) as a result of taking this course.
18. The instructor provided guidelines to appropriately utilize the technology for the course.

Form B: Courses with both a lecture and field component (instructor leads both components)

Questions 7-18, plus the following questions that address edTPA preparation and field supervision:

19. The instructor provided adequate guidance for the edTPA components addressed within this field section.
20. My instructor discussed the expectations for my teaching experience.
21. My instructor facilitated productive communication and useful feedback in a timely fashion after classroom observations.
22. My instructor helped facilitate communication between myself and my cooperating teacher.
23. (open ended) Please use this space to provide any additional comments regarding the support you received from your instructor.

Form C: Courses with both a lecture and field component (instructor leads only the field component)*Likert-Scale*

7. My supervisor discussed the expectations for my teaching experience.
8. My supervisor facilitated productive communication and useful feedback in a timely fashion after classroom observations.
9. My supervisor helped facilitate communication between myself and my cooperating teacher.
10. I would recommend this supervisor for this role in the future.

Open-ended

11. Please use this space to provide any additional comments regarding the support you received from your supervisor.

Form D: Online Courses*Open-Ended*

7. What could you have done to be a better learner?
8. What did the instructor do to support your learning in this online environment?
9. What could have your instructor done to improve your learning in this course or the online learning environment?
10. Please use this space to provide any additional comments.

Likert Scale

11. The online environment facilitated a collaborative learning community.
12. The online environment allowed me to ask questions and voice my opinions.
13. The course objectives and assignments were clearly described in the syllabus.
14. I felt guided and supported in my learning within an online format.

15. I received constructive feedback (verbal, written, peer and so forth) on activities, assessments, and/or assignments.
16. I received timely feedback (verbal, written, peer and so forth) on activities, assessments, and/or assignments.
17. The course required critical reflective thinking (e.g., instructional strategies, teaching methods/styles).
18. I am better prepared to consider/support/teach diverse learners (including ability level, gender, race, SES, modality) as a result of taking this course.
19. The instructor provided guidelines to appropriately utilize the technology for the course.

Appendix G
SoE Program Director Evaluation

A. When thinking about your program director, to what extent would you agree with the following statements (5-point scale - strongly agree/strongly disagree)

Question	Alignment with PD roles/ responsibilities (see section IX.B.1)
1. Advances the program toward agreed upon goals.	4, 5, 6
2. Invites the opinion of program members before making decisions.	
3. Makes data-driven decisions that are in the best interest of the whole program.	
4. Facilitates open and professional communication amongst program members and a free exchange of ideas.	
5. Fosters positive morale and addresses conflicts when they arise.	
6. Attends to essential administrative tasks of the position.	1, 2, 3, 10
7. Has vision and awareness of future trends in the discipline, and guides the PLC in developing a sound long-range plan to carry out program goals	6
9. Guides the PLC in monitoring student progress, and ensuring that students are adequately prepared for benchmark assessments and licensure standards	11, 12
10. Oversees Advisory Council by maintaining representative constituency, setting an agenda for regular meetings, and posting meeting minutes	10
11. Shares information and updates with PLC members from biweekly SoEL meetings and other meetings with the Chair and/or Dean(s)	7, 8

B. My program director is an effective leader:

5 = Strongly agree – they appear to be doing an outstanding job as program director

4 = Agree – they appear to be doing a good job as program director

3 = Neutral – they appear to be doing an adequate job as program director

2 = Disagree – they appear to be doing a weak job as program director

1 = Strongly disagree – they appear to be doing a poor job as program director

C. Please provide any additional feedback in response to the questions below. (Open text answers)

1. What are the program director's particular areas of effectiveness?
2. What are the program director's particular areas for improvement?
3. The program director is effective in helping me reach my goals by ...
4. It would be helpful if the program director would