BY-LAWS

I. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES

Italic language is required by the University. Original approval dates are located within the footer of this document. The latest departmental approval date is located in the header of this document. These by-laws should be reviewed at least once every seven years, but once every other year is recommended.

II. Organization and Operation

A. Preamble

Department members are governed by six interdependent sets of regulations:
1. Federal and State laws and regulations
2. UW-System policies and rules
3. UW-L policies and rules
4. College of Liberal Studies policies and rules
5. Shared governance by-laws and policies for ranked faculty and staff
6. Department by-laws

A.1 Department by-laws provide procedures for conducting Department business. They shall not conflict with the by-laws of the College of Liberal Studies, the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (UW-L) or the UW-System (UW-S). In the event of such a conflict, the UW-S, UW-L or the College of Liberal Studies (CLS) by-laws shall take precedence and the Department by-laws shall be amended accordingly.

A.2 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.3 The Department is comprised of teacher education programs including initial certification at the undergraduate and graduate levels (Early Childhood-Middle Childhood, Middle Childhood-Early Adolescence, Early Childhood-Adolescence developmental ranges). The department also is responsible for graduate degrees including Master of Science in Education (MSE) and Master of Education-Professional Development (ME-PD).

B. Meeting Guidelines

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/AWP/OpenMeetings/2005-OML-GUIDE.pdf; summary at http://www.uwlax.edu/HR/employment/PeopleAdmin/tools/OpenMeetingsRules-/Summary.htm).

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

Department meeting minutes will be recorded by Department faculty and circulated to all members before the next Department meeting. Minutes are amended if necessary and approved by the members at the next meeting and posted electronically.
C. 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.

D. Definitions of Membership and Voting Procedures
D.1. Department Programs:
The department is comprised of the following programs:
D.1.a Early Childhood-Middle Childhood (EC-MC)
D.1.b Middle Childhood-Early Adolescence (MC-EA)
D.1.c Early Childhood- Adolescence (EC-A)
D.1.d ME-PD On-Campus Program—currently suspended
D.1.e Reading—currently suspended
D.1.f Special Education—graduate program currently suspended

D.2. 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.

D.3. Voting Membership
D.3.a The Department Chair, tenured faculty, and tenure-track faculty in the Department shall have equal voting privileges in conducting Department business.
D.3.b Instructional Academic Staff with a continuous contract in the Department and have at least .5 FTE appointment in the Department shall have equal voting privileges in conducting Department business.

D.4. Voting Procedures:
D.4.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. All electronic motions of the Department shall require a simple majority vote of the Department voting members for acceptance. The Department Chair shall provide a deadline for electronic voting.

D.4.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.

D.4.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.

E. Changes of By-laws
Department by-laws may be amended by a ¾ vote of the Department voting membership. By-law changes are subject to two separate readings.

III. Ranked Faculty/Staff Responsibilities
A. Ranked Faculty (Tenured and Tenure-Track faculty) Responsibilities and Expectations
Faculty responsibilities are referenced in Section IV of the Faculty Senate By-laws entitled “Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members, and Department
Chairpersons. "A complete set of the by-laws are available on the Senate webpage under "Senate Articles and By-laws" (http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/FacSenatePolicies.html).

A.1. All ranked faculty have work responsibilities determined in consultation with the Department Chair to be consistent with the UW-La Crosse Ranked Faculty Workload Policy, revised 2008 (http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/). 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.

A.1.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 Section V for criteria; http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate).

A.1.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 Section V for criteria; http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate).

A.1.c. **Service:** All ranked faculty are expected to provide service to the Department, College, University, and Profession. For retention and promotion, ranked faculty will need to demonstrate evidence of appropriate service. (See Section V for criteria; http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate).

B. **Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Responsibilities and Expectations**

Requests for IAS hiring will be presented to the College Dean. The request will indicate one of the standard titles from the lecturer or clinical professor series (http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/committees/ias/pages/titling.html) 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. (http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/41st/3-29-07/IAS%20Appendix%20B.htm). IAS responsibilities are predominantly related to the Department instructional mission and may be expected to fulfill service and advising responsibilities as described in their contract.

B.1. **Teaching:** IAS workload expectations are determined by the IAS member in consultation and agreement with the Department Chair consistent with the UW-La Crosse Instructional Academic Staff Workload policy (http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/41st/3-29-07/IAS%20Appendix%20B.htm).

B.2. **Scholarship:** IAS are required to perform scholarly activities for career progression only. (See IAS progression procedures; http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/committees/ias/pages/CareerProgression.html).

B.3. **Service:** Service may be part of IAS contracted appointment responsibilities. IAS are required to perform service activities for career progression or when outlined as part of their contract job description. (See IAS progression procedures; http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/committees/ias/pages/CareerProgression.html).

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

NIAS responsibilities are defined by their position description.
D. Student Evaluation of Instruction

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).

D.2. Ranked Faculty & SEI results from the Faculty Senate approved SEI questions are required for retention, tenure, and promotion 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 motivational item and the composite SEI are reported. Finally, the Department adds the departmental fractional median for both the single motivational 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.3. For IAS renewal and career progression, the same information as above is reported; however, no TAls are generated for IAS.

D.4. Online and hybrid courses will be evaluated using the same Faculty Senate approved SEI questions as used for face-to-face courses. SEI ratings will be included in the faculty or staff member’s SEI calculations 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 D.2. above. SEI evaluations may be conducted in an electronic format.

IV. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)

A. Merit Evaluation Process, Criteria, Distribution

A.1. The results of merit reviews for all ranked faculty and IAS, who have completed at least one academic year at UW-L, are due to the College Dean on December 15 annually. Merit reviews reflect activities during the prior academic year ending June 1.

A.2. The DES Promotion, Retention, and Tenure (PRT) Committee is responsible for determining merit decisions and monetary awards. Merit rankings include Exceptional Merit, Significant Merit, Merit, and No Merit. (See the DES By-law Appendices for the merit evaluation rubrics for Ranked faculty and Instructional Academic Staff.)

B. Evaluation Process and Criteria

The department uses a rubric to determine a merit ranking. To be considered for merit, Ranked Faculty and IAS with at least .5 FTE must upload all documentation into their electronic portfolio. The Department Chair is responsible for downloading an Annual Report for each eligible faculty and IAS for the designated time period for merit consideration by November 1. The DES PRT Committee forwards their rankings to the Department Chair by December 1. The DES PRT Committee informs the faculty members of their individual merit decisions by February 1. The faculty and IAS are then ranked by category from highest to lowest.

C. Distribution of Merit Funds

C.1. The total departmental merit pool is divided into two portions: 1) the portion generated by the ranked faculty in the department and 2) the portion generated by the instructional academic
C.2. The total merit money pool is divided between Ranked Faculty and IAS equal to the percentage of Department composition. Ranked faculty members divide their respective pool of merit dollars among ranked faculty members earning merit. IAS members divide their respective pool of merit dollars among IAS faculty members earning merit. Each pool of money is divided by percentage as outlined above. Ranked faculty and IAS members respectively earning the same merit ranking split the moneys designated for that category.

D. Appeal Procedures
Ranked Faculty members and IAS may appeal a merit decision to the Department Chair in writing stating reasons and evidence of why a different merit ranking is warranted. The Department Chair in consultation with the DES PRT Committee makes the final merit determination.

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; http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/rules/UPR3.htm). Tenure/retention decisions will be guided by the criteria established in the Department by-laws at the time of hire unless a candidate elects to be considered under newer guidelines. The criteria outlined in Section V in these by-laws should be applied to faculty with a contract date after April 2, 2010. The Department will follow policies guiding part-time appointments for ranked faculty and tenure clock stoppage available on the Human Resources website.

A. Retention (procedure, expectations, criteria, and appeal)

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 review. Hyperlinked syllabi are required and the candidate may choose to provide additional evidence. Additional materials may be required for departmental review and will be indicated in these by-laws.

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 (if available)

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. Starting with tenure-track faculty hired effective Fall 2008, 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. Formal reviews resulting in contract decisions will
minimally occur for tenure-track faculty in their 2, 4\textsuperscript{th}, and 6\textsuperscript{th} years.

A.5. Retention Procedures

A.5.a. Probationary Faculty under review provide an electronic portfolio detailing teaching, scholarship, and service activities extracted from their date of hire to date of review as identified by University policies (See HR http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/docs/2008_UW-L_Handbook.pdf). Probationary faculty informal reviews and formal retention reviews shall be conducted by the DES PRT Committee. Probationary faculty members shall make an oral presentation at the meeting to support his/her record. Retention requires a 2/3 majority vote by the entire DES PRT Committee. Annual review materials showing evidence of teaching, scholarship, and service are prepared by each probationary faculty member.

A.5.b. Retention Review Meeting Procedures

A.5.b.1. The DES PRT Committee Chair will provide a schedule of DES PRT Committee activities to all department members within fifteen (15) calendar days of receiving, from the Department Chair, the list of candidates for retention indicating the year and type of review.

A.5.b.2. At least twenty (20) calendar days prior to each review, the DES PRT Committee Chair will give each candidate written notice of the review. The Department Chair will provide SEI evaluation scores and written comments for each retention candidate up for review.

A.5.b.3. At least seven (7) calendar days prior to the review, the candidate is responsible for uploading all materials into the UW-L digital portfolio format. A completed electronic portfolio will be downloaded by the Department Chair and given to the PRT Committee Chair and Committee members. The Department Chair will upload electronic copies of all SEI comments for classes for semesters under review.

A.5.b.4. The candidate's portfolio will be kept on the UW-L website accessible only by DES PRT Committee members. Materials will be archived for each candidate on that site.

A.5.b.5. Advance notice of the retention review will be published according to University policy and Wisconsin Open Meeting Law.

A.5.b.6. The DES PRT Committee will organize the review meeting for the candidate, including date, place, and time. DES PRT Committee members will review in advance all written evidence submitted for retention by the candidate. The candidate shall attend each review meeting, make an oral presentation, and engage in a question and answer session with the DES PRT Committee about the candidate’s record of teaching, scholarship, and service. Guests attending the meeting may not participate. All decisions are made on the basis of the evidence provided by the candidate.

A.5.b.7. 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 [faculty member] in the [department] 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 candidate and guests will be excused from the closed meeting. The vote by show of hands should be part of the DES PRT Committee official minutes. A simple majority vote is required for retention.

A.5.b.8. The DES PRT Committee shall inform the candidate and the dean in writing of the outcome of the vote.

A.5.b.9. Copies of the DES PRT Committee and Department Chair letters will be placed in the candidate’s personnel file in the Department office.

A.5.b.10. 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 performance must be reviewed for the retention determination in formal reviews. Teaching, scholarship, and service performances are considered in informal reviews.

A.6.b. Retention decisions by the DES PRT Committee are peer reviews of past and expected performance. Consequently, in making retention and tenure decisions, the DES PRT Committee considers all matters bearing on the potential of candidates in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Retention decisions are based on documentation provided by candidates as evidence of effective teaching, ongoing record of scholarly activity, and professional, college and community service. Results of reviews for faculty members since the time of hire shall be part of the basis for making retention recommendations.

A.6.c. A listing of accomplishments does not suffice as sole evidence of teaching, scholarship, and service. “Evidence” is defined as actual and/or authentic work completed in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, including documentation that contains a description/narrative of participation, the frequency and duration of time spent completing the activity, and contributions made by participating in the activity. Evidence must include copies of documents showing active participation and/or products/work contributing to teaching, scholarship, and service.

A.6.d Teaching expectations: Candidates are expected to demonstrate effective teaching. Candidates are expected to distribute syllabi in all courses taught at the beginning of the course. “Effective teaching” is defined by SEI individual course and composite scores, candidate-generated evaluations, implementation of university-approved curriculum and evidence of student learning, tenured faculty observations, and overall favorable student comments.

A.6.d.1 Primary emphasis of the review will be on evidence of teaching effectiveness. Candidates are expected to demonstrate effective teaching. Effective teaching is demonstrated by positive SEI individual course and composite scores for all courses taught, results of candidate-generated evaluations, evidence of implementation of
university-approved curriculum, evidence of student learning, positive tenured faculty observations, and overall favorable student comments on SEI evaluations. SEI scores are only one source of evidence of effective teaching. Retention decisions are not based only on SEI scores. Candidates must submit the required documentary evidence in order for teaching activities and teaching effectiveness to be considered for retention. Submission of only a list of course information does not satisfy the expectation for evidence of teaching effectiveness. Candidates must provide additional evidence of effective teaching in order to be recommended for retention and tenure.

A.6.d.2 It is expected that all retention candidates will schedule at least one face-to-face classroom observation by a tenured faculty member each semester. The PRT Committee will choose the observer for one semester’s observation. The candidate chooses the observer for the other semester observation on a rotational basis so not to have the same observer each year of review. Each observation should include a pre-observation meeting classroom observation, and an observation report. (See the DES By-law Appendices for the Faculty/IAS Teaching Observation Template.)

A.6.d.2.a. Pre-observation meeting: Prior to the classroom observation, the candidate and the tenured faculty member should meet to discuss pedagogical practices, course delivery methods, and objectives for the class period to be observed.

A.6.d.2.b. Classroom observation: Classroom observation should be at least one full class period in length (a minimum of 55 minutes) and use the DES Observation Template.

A.6.d.2.c. Post-observation meeting: Following the classroom observation, the candidate and the tenured 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.

A.6.d.2.d. Observation Report: The report should contain a summary of the observation, including the following: name of the candidate observed, date, course title, and description of the class content and activities observed, strengths, and suggested areas of improvement.

A.6.d.3. Ranked faculty and Instructional Academic Staff who teach online and/or hybrid courses are subject to peer evaluation of those formatted courses. See the Online and Blended Course Policy in section IX of the DES By-Laws.

A.6.e. Scholarship/creative work expectations: Candidates are expected to demonstrate an ongoing record of research and scholarly activity. Each year candidates must show evidence of scholarly activity. (See the DES Scholarship Definition in the DES By-law Appendices.)

A.6.e.1. All candidates are required to generate scholarly, peer-reviewed publications, such as journal articles and books, and presentations; higher preference is given to scholarly, peer-reviewed publications and national and international presentations. It is expected that candidates will have a minimum of one scholarly, peer-reviewed publication accepted/published by the second year review, a total of two scholarly, peer-reviewed publications accepted/published by the fourth year review, and it is recommended that candidates have a minimum of three scholarly, peer-reviewed publications by the tenure decision.
A.6.e.2. By the tenure decision, it is also expected that candidates will have a minimum of either three scholarly, peer-reviewed international/national presentations or two scholarly, peer-reviewed international/national and two scholarly, peer-reviewed regional/state presentations.

A.6.f. Service expectations: Candidates are expected to demonstrate active participation in three levels of service including professional, university, and community service. Professional service is defined as the contribution of scholarly professional expertise within internal and/or external university activities. University service is defined as committee, task force, or special project work for the university, college, and/or department. Community service is defined as volunteer/civic work within the community (JPC Guidelines, May 2007; http://www.uwlax.edu/provost/pvchome/ep_promotion.pdf). Candidates are expected to establish a record of service in each of these three areas that may be related to, but not identical to their teaching responsibilities (JPC Guidelines, May 2007). Candidates must participate in service activities in each category to be recommended for retention.

A.6.g. Acceptable performance levels for retention decisions include:

A.6.g.1. Teaching: Teaching is evaluated through peer reviews by tenured faculty, SEI scores with adjoining comments, and documentation from the electronic portfolio. Probationary faculty are expected to maintain expertise to effectively perform their teaching assignments. The Department Chair is responsible for providing SEI scores and comments for each probationary faculty member’s courses each semester. Basic expectations for acceptable performance include but are not limited to:

A.6.g.1.a. being an effective instructor as defined by the Faculty Senate SEI tool and faculty observation. (Faculty may use informal course feedback material.) Faculty Senate SEI tool must be used. Probationary faculty are encouraged to also use informal course feedback materials.

A.6.g.1.b. listing of courses taught with syllabi and a listing of any capstone project (i.e., thesis, seminar paper, or other culminating project) supervision and participation.

A.6.g.1.c. positive report regarding rapport and interactivity with students and peers, following procedures as outlined in the Conflict & Communication Policy (See DES Handbook) as reported by the Department Chair.

A.6.g.1.d. positive review of teaching
   A.6.g.1.d.1. Teaching observations will be conducted by a DES tenured faculty member using the Observation Outline (See DES Handbook) once each fall and spring semester.

A.6.g.1.d.2. Peer review letters or observation notes will be included in the electronic portfolio for consideration by the DES PRT Committee.

A.6.g.2 Scholarship: Scholarship is evaluated through evidence of active scholarship activity, including research in progress and research disseminated in scholarly, peer reviewed outlets. Scholarship considered for retention may consist of:
A.6.g.2.a. Publications as
   A.6.g.2.a.1. scholarly, peer-reviewed articles in paper or online journals
   A.6.g.2.a.3. book chapters, and/or
   A.6.g.2.a.4. books, including theoretical, qualitative and/or quantitative research projects appropriate to the discipline

A.6.g.2.b. Scholarly, peer reviewed presentations to regional, national, and/or international conferences; national and international presentations are more desirable

A.6.g.2.c. Grants and other activities that directly support research endeavors

A.6.g.2.d. mentorship of undergraduate &/or graduate research or scholarly capstone project

A.6.g.3. Service: Service is evaluated through documented or explained department, college, and university service as well as professional service to organizations such as schools, community groups, and/or professional societies. Probationary faculty must show increasing involvement evidence in all areas of service throughout their probationary period.

A.7. Retention Criteria
   A.7.a General Required Evidence: Candidates will upload the following required documentation into their electronic portfolios. The Department Chair provide the DES PRT Committee Chair and Committee members with the necessary electronic portfolio report documents.

   A.7.a.1. A completed Retention Report, with appropriate evidence hyperlinked with no more than 10 links in each section (teaching, scholarship, and service), drawn from UW-L’s electronic portfolio system inclusive of all years of employment at UW-L. For second year and tenure reviews, relevant activities for all years at UW-L will be reported.

   A.7.a.2. A completed Annual Report, with appropriate evidence hyperlinked with no more than 10 links in each section (teaching, scholarship, and service), drawn from UW-L’s electronic portfolio system from the most recent year of employment at UW-L.

   A.7.a.3. A current detailed career-long vita.

   A.7.a.4. Narrative statements including short term and long term goals and plans for goal attainment for each area of teaching (including administrative responsibilities as part of load), scholarship, and service as described in the JPC Guidelines (May 2007, p. 6-11).

   A.7.a.5. SEI scores for all courses taught. The DES Chair will submit all SEI scores and written student comments from the SEI Forms for all semesters in a word-processed document.

Initial Document Approvals

Department of Educational Studies, Dr. Ruthann Benson, Dr. Kathleen Enz Finken,
Faculty Approval: 5-11-10 CLS Dean Approval: 6-14-10 Provost Approval: 11-16-10
A.7.a.6. Teaching Philosophy – A written, detailed, comprehensive statement of the candidate's teaching philosophy.

A.7.a.7. Copies of letters from the DES PRT Chair, DES Department Chair, Dean, and Provost from all past retention reviews.

A.7.a.8. Tenured faculty member observation reports (minimum of one per semester) for the review period as designated.

A.7.a.9. Copies of all merit evaluation rankings

A.7.a.10. Any other material the candidate wishes to have considered

A.7.b. Required Evidence of Scholarship: Candidates must upload the following required documentation into their electronic portfolios in order for scholarly activities to be considered for retention. A list of scholarly accomplishments does not constitute acceptable evidence and will not be sufficient for positive retention recommendations.

A.7.b.1 Scholarly, Peer-reviewed Publications – Accepted, In Press, and/or Published. For all of the following types of publications, required evidence includes: Copies of letters of invitation or acceptance; copies of submitted manuscripts if not yet published; copies of published articles with acceptance rates when available; and copies of books and book chapters. For all publications, include complete APA reference information. For editorial/refereeing activities, include copies of letters of invitation/agreement and name of journal or publisher.

A.7.b.2. Scholarly, Peer-reviewed Professional Presentations – Accepted and Completed – International, National, Regional, and State. For all presentations, required evidence includes: Title and description of presentation, name of organization, copies of letters of acceptance, copies of program documentation. For all presentations, include complete APA reference information.

A.7.b.3. Scholarly, Peer-reviewed Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research. For all contracts, grants, or research projects, required evidence includes: Copies of research/grant proposals, including funding source, funding amount, approved IRB proposals, a description of the project, and description of project length and progress to date.

A.7.b.4. Works in Progress. For any scholarly works in progress (publications, presentations, research, grants), required evidence includes documents listed above.

A.7.b.5. Other Scholarly Activities, Artistic and Professional Performances and Exhibits

A.7.c. Required evidence of Service:
A.7.c.1. Professional Service: Documentation of membership and leadership roles in professional and public organizations; evidence of consulting describing responsibilities; evidence of in-service/workshops; documentation of coordinating lecture series, institutes, or conferences; documentation of participation in faculty exchange programs.

A.7.c.2. College Service: Evidence of participation in faculty senate and/or senate
committees; evidence of participation in university, college, School of Education, department and/or program committees; evidence of advisor responsibilities for campus organizations.

A.7.c.3. Community Service: Evidence of participation in community service.

A.7.c.5. Additional Evidence. Candidates may submit additional evidence of service activities.

A.8. Retention Decision Appeal—Non-Renewal of Probationary Faculty: The probationary faculty member denied 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)
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 by the entire DES PRT Committee members.

   B.1.c. Tenure decisions by the PRT Committee are peer reviews of past and expected performance. Consequently, in making tenure decisions, the PRT Committee considers all matters bearing on the potential of candidates in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Tenure decisions are based on documentation provided by candidates as evidence of effective teaching, ongoing record of scholarly activity, and professional, college and community service. Results of reviews for faculty members since the time of hire shall be part of the basis for making tenure recommendations.

B.2. Tenure Review Meeting Procedures
   B.2.a. The DES PRT Committee chair will provide a schedule of DES PRT Committee activities to all department members within fifteen (15) calendar days of receiving, from the Department Chair, the list of eligible candidates for tenure.

   B.2.b. At least twenty (20) calendar days prior to the tenure review, the DES PRT Committee Chair will give each candidate written notice of the tenure review. The Department Chair will provide SEI evaluation scores and written comments for each tenure candidate up for review.

   B.2.c. At least seven (7) calendar days prior to the review, the candidate is responsible for uploading all materials into the UW-L digital portfolio format. A completed electronic portfolio will be downloaded by the Department Chair and given to the PRT Committee Chair and Committee members.

   B.2.d. The candidate's portfolio will be kept on the UW-L website accessible only by PRT Committee members. Materials will be archived for each candidate on that site.

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

   B.2.f. Tenure review meetings will be convened in open session and attendance taken. When
preceded by an open meeting notice, open sessions may go into closed sessions by invoking the exemption under law that allows the committee to convene in closed session. The motion shall be by a committee member, seconded, and a roll call vote taken, which if positive will result in the committee going into closed session. The motion would read, “I move to convene in closed session to consider the employment of [faculty member] in the [department] at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse as provided in sections 19.85(1)(c) [for retention] or 19.85(1)(b) [for tenure] of Wisconsin Statutes.” A majority vote is required to move into closed session. The vote should be part of the DES PRT Committee official minutes.

B.2.f.1. Probationary faculty have the right to declare the tenure meeting open (See s. 19. 85 (1) (b); http://www.uwsa.edu/gc-off/deskbook/woml.htm).

B.2.f.2 The tenure candidate may ask that the meeting be conducted in open session by submitting a written request to the DES PRT Committee chair at least seven (7) calendar days before the meeting.

B.2.g. The DES PRT Committee will organize the review meeting for the candidate, including the date, place and time. The candidate shall attend the tenure meeting, make an oral presentation, and engage in a question and answer session with the committee about the candidate’s record of teaching, scholarship, and service. All decisions are made on the basis of the evidence provided by the candidate. If the meeting is conducted in open session, all discussion and voting for tenure will take place with the candidate and guests present. Guests attending the meeting may not participate. If the candidate does not request an open meeting, the committee may move into closed session and the candidate and guests will be excused from the meeting. The committee will vote by show of hands on a motion to recommend tenure. A simple majority vote is required.

B.2.h. The committee shall inform the candidate and the Dean in writing of the outcome of the vote.

B.2.i. Copies of the DES PRT Committee and Department Chair letters will be placed in the candidate’s personnel file in the Department Office.

B.2.j. 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 Review Expectations

B.3.a. Tenure Expectations: A listing of accomplishments does not suffice as sole evidence of teaching, scholarship, and service. “Evidence” is defined as actual and/or authentic work completed in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, including documentation that contains a description/narrative of participation, the frequency and duration of time spent completing the activity, and contributions made by participating in the activity. Evidence must include copies of documents showing active participation and/or products/work contributing to teaching, scholarship, and service. Probationary faculty need to perform at acceptable levels in teaching, scholarship, and service to attain tenure. Acceptable performance levels for tenure decisions include:

B.3.a.1. Teaching Expectations: Teaching is evaluated through peer reviews by tenured faculty, SEI scores and comments, and documentation from the electronic portfolio. Faculty are expected to maintain expertise to effectively perform their teaching assignments. Candidates are expected to demonstrate
effective teaching. Candidates are expected to distribute syllabi in all courses taught at the beginning of the course. “Effective teaching” is defined by SEI individual course and composite scores, candidate-generated evaluations, implementation of university-approved curriculum and evidence of student learning, tenured faculty observations, and overall favorable student comments.

B.3.a.1.a. Basic expectations for acceptable performance include but are not limited to:

B.3.a.1.a.i. being an effective instructor as defined by the Faculty Senate SEI tool and faculty observation. Faculty Senate SEI tool must be used. (Faculty may use informal course evaluation materials.)

B.3.a.1.a.ii. positive peer reviews and/or demonstration of correction of identified concerns &/or recommendations noted in peer review letters and previous review meetings.

B.3.a.1.a.iii. positive report regarding rapport and interactivity with students and peers, following procedures as outlined in the Conflict & Communication Policy as reported by the Department Chair.

B.3.a.1.b. Effective teaching is demonstrated by positive SEI individual course and composite scores for all courses taught, results of candidate-generated evaluations, evidence of implementation of university-approved curriculum, evidence of student learning, positive tenured faculty observations, and overall favorable student comments on SEI evaluations. SEI scores are only one source of evidence of effective teaching. Tenure decisions are not based only on SEI scores. Candidates must submit the required documentary evidence in order for teaching activities and teaching effectiveness to be considered for tenure. Submission of only a list of course information does not satisfy the expectation for evidence of teaching effectiveness. Candidates must provide additional evidence of effective teaching in order to be recommended for tenure.

B.3.a.1.b.i. It is expected that all retention candidates will schedule at least one face-to-face classroom observation by a tenured faculty member each semester. The DES PRT Chair will choose the observer for one semester’s observation. The candidate chooses the observer for the other semester observation. Each observation should include a pre-observation meeting classroom observation, and an observation report. (See the DES By-law Appendices for the Faculty/IAS Teaching Observation Template.)

B.3.a.1.i.a. Pre-observation meeting: Prior to the classroom observation, the candidate and the tenured faculty member should meet to discuss pedagogical practices, course delivery methods, and objectives for the class period to be observed.

B.3.a.1.i.b. Classroom observation: Classroom observation should be at least one full class period in length (a minimum of 55 minutes) and use the DES Observation Template.

B.3.a.1.i.c. Observation Report: The report should contain a summary of the observation, including the following: name of the candidate observed, date, course title, and description of the class content and activities observed, strengths, and suggested areas of improvement.
B.3.b.1.b.ii. Ranked faculty and Instructional Academic Staff who teach online and/or hybrid courses are subject to peer evaluation of those formatted courses. See the Online and Blended Course Policy in section IX of the DES By-Laws.

B.3.a.2. **Scholarship/creative work expectations:** Candidates are expected to demonstrate an ongoing record of research and scholarly activity. Each year candidates must show evidence of scholarly activity. All candidates are required to generate scholarly, peer-reviewed publications, such as journal articles and books, and scholarly, peer-reviewed presentations; higher preference is given to peer-reviewed publications and national and international presentations. It is expected that candidates will have a minimum of one scholarly, peer-reviewed publication accepted/published by the second year review, a total of two scholarly, peer-reviewed publications accepted/published by the fourth year review, and it is recommended that candidates have a minimum of three scholarly, peer-reviewed publications by the tenure decision. By the tenure decision, it is also expected that candidates will have a minimum of either three scholarly, peer-reviewed international/national presentations or two scholarly, peer-reviewed international/national and two scholarly, peer-reviewed regional/state presentations.

B.3.a.2.a. Scholarship is evaluated through evidence of an active scholarly peer-reviewed dissemination record including publications, presentations, and grant writing. Scholarship considered for tenure may consist of a consistent record of: (See the DES Scholarship Definition in the DES By-law Appendices.)

B.3.a.2.a.i. scholarly, peer-reviewed articles in paper or online journals, book chapters, and/or books, including theoretical, qualitative and/or quantitative research projects appropriate to the discipline

B.3.a.2.a.ii. scholarly, peer-reviewed presentations to regional, national, and/or international conferences; national and international presentations are more desirable

B.3.a.2.a.iii. scholarly, research grants and other scholarly, activities that directly support research endeavors

B.3.a.2.a.iv. mentorship of undergraduate &/or graduate research or scholarly capstone project

B.3.a.3. **Service expectations:** Candidates are expected to demonstrate active participation in three levels of service including professional, university, and community service. Professional service is defined as the contribution of scholarly professional expertise within internal and/or external university activities. University service is defined as committee, task force, or special project work for the university, college, and/or department. Community service is defined as volunteer/civic work within the community (JPC Guidelines, May 2007). Candidates are expected to establish a record of service in each of these three areas that may be related to, but not identical to their teaching responsibilities (JPC Guidelines, May 2007). Candidates must participate in service activities in each category to be recommended for tenure. Service is evaluated through evidence of consistent, active participation at all levels of service, including department, college, and university. Professional service to organizations, such as schools, community groups, and/or professional societies is encouraged.
B.4. Tenure Criteria

B.4.a. General Tenure Criteria: Candidates will upload all documentation listed below into their electronic portfolios. The Department Chair will provide the DES PRT Chair and Committee members with the following required documentation:

B.4.a.1. A completed Retention Report, with appropriate evidence hyperlinked with no more than 10 links in each section (teaching, scholarship, and service), drawn from UW-L’s electronic portfolio system inclusive of all years of employment at UW-L. For tenure reviews, relevant activities for all years at UW-L will be reported.

B.4.a.1. A completed Annual Report, with appropriate evidence hyperlinked with no more than 10 links in each section (teaching, scholarship, and service), drawn from UW-L’s electronic portfolio system from the initial date of hire for employment at UW-L. (See 3.4)

B.4.a.1. A current detailed career-long vita.

B.4.a.1. Narrative statements including short term and long term goals and plans for goal attainment for each area of teaching (including administrative responsibilities as part of load), scholarship, and service as described in the JPC Guidelines (May 2007, p. 6-11).

B.4.a.1. SEI scores for all courses taught, candidate’s composite scores and departmental fractional median for the review period. Candidates will submit all written student comments from the SEI Forms for all semesters in a word-processed document.

B.4.a.1. Teaching Philosophy – A written, detailed, comprehensive statement of the candidate’s teaching philosophy.

B.4.a.1. Copies of letters from the DES PRT Chair, DES Department Chair, Dean, and Provost from all past retention reviews.

B.4.a.1. Copies of all merit evaluation rankings

B.4.a.1. Any other material the candidate wishes to have considered

B.4.d. Required evidence of Scholarship: Candidates must upload the following required documentary evidence into their electronic portfolio in order for scholarly activities to be considered for tenure. A list of scholarly accomplishments does not constitute acceptable evidence and will not be sufficient for positive tenure recommendations.

B.4.d.1. Scholarly, Peer-reviewed Publications – Accepted, In Press, and/or Published.
For all of the following types of publications, required evidence includes: Copies of letters of invitation or acceptance; copies of submitted manuscripts if not yet published; copies of published articles with acceptance rates when available; and copies of books and book chapters. For all publications, include complete APA reference information. For editorial/refereeing activities, include copies of letters of invitation/agreement and name of journal or publisher.

B.4.d.2. Scholarly, Peer-reviewed Professional Presentations – Accepted and Completed – International, National, Regional, and State. For all presentations, required evidence includes: Title and description of presentation, name of organization, copies of letters of acceptance, copies of program documentation. For all presentations, include complete APA reference information.
B.4.d.3 Scholarly, Peer-reviewed Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research. For all contracts, grants, or research projects, required evidence includes: Copies of research/grant proposals, including funding source, funding amount, approved IRB proposals, a description of the project, and description of project length and progress to date.

B.4.d.4. Works in Progress. For any scholarly works in progress (publications, presentations, research, grants), required evidence includes documents listed above.

B.4.d.5. Other Scholarly Activities, Artistic and Professional Performances and Exhibits

B.4.e. Required evidence of Service:
B.4.e.1. Professional Service: Documentation of membership and leadership roles in professional and public organizations; evidence of consulting describing responsibilities; evidence of in-service/workshops; documentation of coordinating lecture series, institutes, or conferences; documentation of participation in faculty exchange programs.

B.4.e.2. College Service: Evidence of participation in faculty senate and/or senate committees; evidence of participation in university, college, School of Education, department and/or program committees; evidence of advisor responsibilities for campus organizations.
B.4.e.3. Community Service: Evidence of participation in community service.
B.4.e.4. Additional Evidence. Candidates may submit additional evidence of service activities.

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

C.1. Tenured faculty must participate in a regular 5-year cycle review. Each tenured DES faculty member’s activities and performance will be reviewed once within each five-year period in accordance with the mission of the Department, College and University. The Department will establish a review cycle for its members and submit this to the College Dean. Each year the College Dean will send to the Department notification of those faculty members who are subject to review.

C.2. The purpose of reviewing DES tenured faculty is to encourage and support meaningful growth and development of faculty in ways that positively contribute to the University, College, and Department mission and goals. This review is to be a collegial process to promote the achievement of value and meaning in the roles that faculty play in their relations with students, colleagues and local communities. The Post-Tenured Faculty Review will be consistent with all UW-La Crosse directives and methods for evaluation of its teaching personnel.

C.3. Post-Tenure Review Expectations
C.3.a. Areas to be reviewed include: (a) teaching; (b) scholarship/creative work; and (c) service. The review process may include the use of both peer and student input. The review will be consistent with the departmental mission and those of the college and university.
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C.3.a.1. Observations and guidance regarding the teaching component will focus upon the areas of curriculum, instructional system, teacher-learner interaction, and management style.

C.3.a.2. Scholarship and service will be assessed within normal UW-La Crosse expectations of a quality teaching institution.

C.3.a.3. All criteria for faculty review are flexible to allow for shifts in professional emphasis and personal goals.

C.4. Academic freedom shall be respected at every level of the process.

C.5. Results may be used to facilitate and enhance faculty development. The Department has clearly stated written criteria describing what constitutes satisfactory performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service within the context of faculty review.


C.6.a. At the beginning of the Post-Tenure Faculty Review, the reviewee will select a senior faculty peer to be an integral member of the review process. Senior faculty is defined as a tenured faculty member who has earned the rank of associate professor or full professor. The name of the senior faculty member will be forwarded to the Department Chair, who will then call a meeting, including the senior faculty member, reviewee, and the Department Chair. At this meeting the reviewee will discuss the materials included for this review.

C.6.b. After the review, the Department Chair conveys the results of the review to the reviewee.

C.6.c. The Department Chair and Senior faculty member shall inform the reviewee and the Dean in writing of the outcome of the review.

C.6.c.1. If a faculty member is judged to have significant areas of concern in performance, a list of these areas of concern will be presented to the faculty member by the Department Chair and the senior faculty member in a three-way structured meeting. This meeting should result in the development of a Faculty Development Plan (FDP) to address the areas of concern within a reasonable period of time. A copy of the letter with concerns and FDP will be placed in the reviewee’s personnel file in the Department Office. The Department Chair will forward a copy of this letter to the dean and the designated faculty member involved in the review stating that the areas of concern have been addressed to the satisfaction defined by the review team.

C.6.c.2. When areas of concern have been addressed satisfactorily, the Department Chair will write the faculty member a letter stating this and place a copy of it in the faculty member’s personnel file in the Department Office. The Department Chair will forward a copy of this letter to the dean and the designated faculty member involved in the review stating that the areas of concern have been addressed to the satisfaction defined by the review team.

C.6.c.3. If the areas of concern have not been eliminated within the FDP timeline, the reviewee shall meet with the review team (department chair and senior faculty member) to evaluate the need for additional steps which may be necessary to remove the areas of concern.

C.6.d. Post Tenure Review results will be forwarded to the Dean, who will forward them to the Provost’s office as required by UW-La Crosse policy.

C.7. Post-Tenure Criteria: Each tenured DES faculty member will be reviewed on the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.
C.8. Post-Tenure Decision Appeal: Tenured faculty may appeal a Post-Tenure Review decision after reasonable completion of the Individual Developmental Plan process. If further appeal is necessary, the tenured faculty member would request a hearing by the hearing committee established under UWL 3.08. (Faculty Personnel Rules UWS 3.06-3.11 and UWL 3.06-3.08) Post-Tenure Review decisions may be appealed as outlined in the UW-L Faculty Personnel Guidelines 6.01 and 6.02 and may appeal department decisions to the CGAAF (p. 160, Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook).

E. Promotion

The department will follow the guidelines and schedules regarding faculty promotion available at [http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/promo-resources.htm](http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/promo-resources.htm). Ranked faculty may also be promoted from Assistant to Associate Professor and from Associate to Full Professor. Additional guidelines for this process can be found in the webpage information for the Joint Promotion and Tenure Committee ([http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/Unclassified/JPC_Guidelines_Spring2008.htm](http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/Unclassified/JPC_Guidelines_Spring2008.htm)). The department will follow the guidelines and schedules regarding faculty promotion available at [http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/promo-resources.htm](http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/promo-resources.htm).

E.1. Promotion Procedures

E.1.a. The Department will only consider activities accomplished since the time of hire at UWL for promotion to Associate Professor. There should be clear evidence that the candidate's work is consistent with promotion criteria established by the University at ([http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/promo-resources.htm](http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/promo-resources.htm)), and they have created an academic reputation of at least regional magnitude.

E.1.b. For promotion to Full Professor, there should be documented evidence that the candidate brings positive external recognition to the Department as a regional/national leader in education and/or cross-disciplinary fields. The basic process used for promotion consideration can be found in the UW-L Promotion Guidelines at [http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/promo-resources.htm](http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/promo-resources.htm).

E.1.c. Faculty who are eligible for promotion must upload all required documentary evidence for promotion into their electronic portfolio. The Department Chair will download a completed electronic Promotion Report as created using the University system and submit it to the DES PRT Committee at least ten days prior to the promotion consideration meeting. In addition to the promotion report, candidates should include the following materials:

- E.1.c.i. electronic Promotion Report
- E.1.c.ii. merit evaluation rankings,
- E.1.c.iii. narrative statements outlining teaching, scholarship, and service
- E.1.c.iv. letters from the DES PRT Committee and DES Chair, if applicable, and Dean
- E.1.c.v. other promotion materials as required by the UW-L Joint Promotion Committee (JPC).
E.2. Promotion Criteria

E.2.a. To be considered for promotion to a higher rank, faculty must meet the minimum University criteria for that rank as stated in the UW-L JPC Guidelines (http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/promo-resources.htm).

E.2.b. For the rank of Associate Professor a candidate must provide evidence of teaching excellence, establishment of a program of scholarship, and a record of service. Evidence of teaching excellence will include the results of self, peer and student evaluation of instruction (SEls). Scholarship will be consistent with the Department's definition of scholarly activity as stated above under criteria for tenure.

E.2.c. In addition to criteria in 2 above, to be promoted to Full Professor, a faculty member must show evidence of substantial leadership and continued excellence in teaching, significant scholarship, and service (i.e., leadership in curricular development for the Department) activity, in accordance with Department definitions and criteria.

E.3. Promotion Decision Appeal/Reconsideration: Faculty may appeal a non-promotion decision. An appeal shall follow the appeal process as outlined in the Faculty Senate By-laws (revised 2008; http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/bylaws.html).

VI. Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Review

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. (http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/bylaws.html#XII. FACULTY ORGANIZATION AND POLICIES).

B. Annual Review

In accordance with Faculty Personnel rules 3.05-3.11 and UWL 3.08, academic staff will be evaluated annually. The Individual Development Plan (IDP) form will accompany the Department’s evaluation. IDP Form: http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/IDP/IDP/General.Info.html.

B.1. Annual Review Procedures:

B.1.a. Instructional academic staff (IAS) are required to have an annual review based on their contract and/or position description.

B.1.b. The Department Chair serves as the supervisor for IAS. Supervisors of unclassified academic staff and classified employees are expected to meet with their employees to discuss department/unit goals, employee career goals and supervisory position expectations.

B.1.c. IAS personnel will be expected to upload appropriate documentary evidence in order to complete an electronic Individual Development Plan (IDP) for annual review. Information about the IDP process including timelines and sample forms can be found at: http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/idp/idp.htm. A copy of the completed IDP is placed in the employee’s personnel file.

B.1.d. IAS are evaluated by the DES PRT Committee.

B.1.e. Annual IAS faculty review deadlines are determined by the University
schedule.

B.1.f. The DES PRT Chair submits a letter reflecting the DES PRT Committee’s recommendations for improvement and decision to the IAS member and Department Chair.

B.2. Annual Review Expectations

B.2.a. Teaching: Full-time IAS members engaged in undergraduate instruction typically have an assigned load of 15 contact hours per week, consisting of at least 12 credits of instruction and 3 credits of service work. Part-time IAS assigned loads are defined within the DES Handbook.

B.2.b. Scholarship: There is no expectation of IAS members to engage in scholarly activities, unless the nature of their position requires it, and it is included as part of the position description. However, if an IAS member desires career progression, scholarship requirements must be met according to career progression guidelines found at:
http://www.uwlax.edu/FacultySenate/committees/ias/pages/CareerProgression.html.

B.2.c. Service: There is no expectation of IAS members to engage in service activities, unless the nature of their position requires it, and it is included as part of the position description. However, if an IAS member desires career progression, service requirements must be met according to career progression guidelines found at:
http://www.uwlax.edu/FacultySenate/committees/ias/pages/CareerProgression.html.

C. Career Progression

Policies and procedure guiding career progression for IAS are available at

C.1. IAS may choose to advance through Career Progression.

C.2. IAS career progression is considered by the DES PRT Committee.

C.3. IAS desiring career progression are evaluated on the basis of their teaching, service, and professional development.

C.3.a. An IAS faculty member requesting career progression must be an effective instructor as defined by the Faculty Senate SEI tool and faculty observations. They must also develop curricular material to enhance the assigned course(s).

C.3.b. In the area of service, an IAS member requesting career progression must provide service from Department, College, and/or University levels.

C.3.c. In the area of professional development, academic staff are expected to have current knowledge and skills to perform their assigned duties and improve with consistent effort. See http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/career_development.htm for additional information and procedures.
C.4. Career Progression Criteria

C.4.a. Teaching: An IAS faculty member requesting career progression must:
   C.4.a.1. be an effective instructor as defined by the Faculty Senate SEI tool and faculty observations.
   C.4.a.2. develop curricular material to enhance the assigned course(s)

C.4.b. Service: An IAS member requesting career progression must provide service to Department, College, and/or University levels.

C.4.c. Professional Development: Candidates for career progression would be expected to have current knowledge and skills to perform their assigned duties and improve with consistent effort.

C.5. 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 Staff

A. Non-instructional academic staff (NIAS) do not have teaching responsibilities. NIAS are reviewed annually by the Department Chair or appropriate supervisor. NIAS review and retention is based on their specific job description. Review procedures include submitting an electronic IDP and evidence of performance and career goals. NIAS requesting career progression must follow procedures found at: http://www.uwlax.edu/FacultySenate/committees/ias/pages/CareerProgression.html.

B. Academic Department Associate (ADA) must be reviewed annually. Supervisors of classified employees are expected to meet with their employees to discuss department/unit goals, employee career goals and supervisory position expectations. Information is documented on the IDP checklist and form and a copy of the completed IDP is placed in the employee’s personnel file. Information about the IDP process including timelines and sample forms can be found at: http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/idp/idp.htm. ADAs are reviewed annually by the Department Chair or appropriate supervisor.

C. University Services Program Associate (USA) must be reviewed annually. Supervisors of classified employees are expected to meet with their employees to discuss department/unit goals, employee career goals and supervisory position expectations. Information is documented on the IDP checklist and form and a copy of the completed IDP is placed in the employee’s personnel file. Information about the IDP process including timelines and sample forms can be found at: http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/idp/idp.htm. USAs are reviewed annually by the Department Chair or appropriate supervisor.

VIII. Classified Staff Annual Review

A. Classified staff are hired on a part-time or full-time contractual basis to deliver services within the department or programs within the department or to provide service where necessary. (http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/bylaws.html#XII. FACULTY ORGANIZATION AND POLICIES).

B. All classified staff must be evaluated on an annual basis and complete the IDP process. Classified staff are evaluated by the Department Chair or appropriate supervisor.
IX. Governance

A. Department Chair

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 By-laws found at [http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/FacSenatePolicies.html](http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/FacSenatePolicies.html) and [http://www.uw.ax.edu/hr/current/docs/2008 UW-L Handbook.pdf](http://www.uw.ax.edu/hr/current/docs/2008 UW-L Handbook.pdf) 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 By-laws ([http://uwlax.edu/facultysenate/bylaws.html](http://uwlax.edu/facultysenate/bylaws.html)).

A.1. Election Process

During February of the final year of the Department Chair's term, the Dean’s 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 By-laws ([http://uwlax.edu/facultysenate/bylaws.html](http://uwlax.edu/facultysenate/bylaws.html)).

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 By-laws ([http://uwlax.edu/facultysenate/bylaws.html](http://uwlax.edu/facultysenate/bylaws.html)).

A.2.c. Department Chair Evaluation: The evaluation of the Department Chairperson is a survey conducted by the PRT Committee. The survey results are submitted to the Chairperson. See the Department Chair Evaluation form in the Appendices.

B. Program Directors and Coordinators: Program Directors and coordinators are appointed by the Department Chair. Program Directors and coordinators may receive reassigned time for completion of administrative duties directly related to a program. See the DES Handbook for Program Director and coordinator duties. The DES houses teacher education programs as follows:

B.1. Early Childhood-Middle Childhood (EC-MC)
B.2. Middle Childhood-Early Adolescence (MC-EA)
B.5. Special Education Program
C. Standing Departmental Committees

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. 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 admissions committees for the EC-MC, MC-EA, and Special Education programs. Each admission committee’s work deals with the admission processes of all undergraduate department teacher education programs. Committee membership may consist of tenured and tenure-track faculty and Academic Staff with at least .5 FTE assignment in an undergraduate program. Graduate Program admissions are considered by the respective Graduate Program Director.

C.4.b. The duties of the Admissions Committee include:

C.4.b.1. developing, reviewing, and revising admission criteria and procedures
C.4.b.2. providing faculty and candidates with information regarding the criteria and process for applicant reviews.
C.4.b.3. reviewing application materials and making admission decisions
C.4.b.4. working with the Department Chair in providing appropriate responses to applicants who are denied admission.
C.4.b.5. developing and coordinating a process for making scholarship recommendations.

C.4.b. Appeals Committee: The Appeals Committee’s membership may consist of tenured and tenure-track faculty and Academic Staff with at least .5 FTE assignment. The Committee should also include the Department Chair and a representative from the College of Liberal Studies. Appeals handled by this committee include all final course grade, undergraduate program admission denial, and graduate program dismissal. (See DES Handbook).

C.4.c. Assessment Committee: The Assessment Committee oversees the Department assessment for academic advising, portfolio assessment, and School of Education, College and/or University level assessments as requested. Assessment Committee membership may consist of tenured and tenure-track faculty and Academic Staff with at least .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 include:


C.4.c.2. communicating with other School of Education bodies to coordinate assessment efforts as required by the Department of Public Instruction.
C.4.d. **Program Curriculum and Assessment Committee (Program Committee):** The Committee is comprised of all Department faculty and instructional academic staff with at least a .5 FTE appointment in the department. The Committee oversees the Department curricular process, including curriculum development and program assessment. The duties of the Committee include:

C.4.d.1. Receiving, reviewing, and approving individual course and program overview LX forms for all Department programs containing C-I, ECE, EDS, EDU, EFN, RDG or SPE prefixes, submitted by DES programs with evidence of program faculty consensus.

C.4.d.2. Receiving and reviewing umbrella LX forms and providing content recommendations.

C.4.d.3. Periodically reviewing existing courses and catalog language for revision or elimination.

C.4.d.4. Establishing, implementing, and analyzing program review data for all teacher education programs housed within the Department.

C.4.d.5. Guidelines for submission of LX forms are as follows:
   C.4.d.5.a. LX forms for umbrella courses, regular courses, and program proposals are initiated by DES faculty and program directors.

   C.4.d.5.b. Appropriate assurances must be provided that all relevant programs are aware of proposed program courses and program changes prior to the submission for approval beyond the Department level. “Relevant programs” refers to any and all courses housed with the Department containing the following prefixes: C-I, ECE, EDS, EDU, EFN, RDG or SPE, other university departments, or schools when appropriate.

   C.4.d.5.c. Course and program proposals are subject to two (2) readings by the Committee unless the Committee waives the right to a second reading.

   C.4.d.5.d. Approved LX forms will be forwarded to the Department Chair for his/her signature.

   C.4.d.5.e. The Department Chair is responsible for affecting curricular approvals through the university process.

C.4.e. **Promotion, Retention and Tenure (PRT) Committee** is comprised of all Department tenured faculty with at least a .5 FTE appointment in the department. The Department Chair is not eligible to serve as PRT Chair. Duties of the PRT Committee include:

   C.4.e.1. Developing procedures consistent with those of UWS and UW-L 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. Making recommendations to the Department Chair on promotion, retention, tenure, and merit.
C.4.e.4. developing 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 CLS dean.

C.4.e.6. developing and implementing merit procedures

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 Academic Staff with at least .5 FTE serve on ad-hoc committees appointed by the Department Chair.

E. Instructional course Assignment Policy
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 seniority, expertise, and graduate faculty status.
E.3. Summer course assignments are made by the Department Chair based on seniority, past summer instruction opportunities, and expertise.

F. Departmental Programmatic Assessment Plan
See the Assessment Committee above.

G. Additional Departmental Policies
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.1. Faculty Release Time Policy
G.1.a. New ranked faculty hires will receive a ¼ course release for one semester upon hire for development of instruction and initiation of scholarship plan.

G.1.b. Ranked faculty may receive ¼ reassigned time on a rotational basis to allow for grant writing, curricular development, publication proposal boost, or something deemed worthy by the Department Chair.

G.1.c. Faculty and IAS Equity Adjustment Policy
G.1.c.i Definition: An equity adjustment is a salary adjustment that results from the need to address unusual salary disparities that cannot be remedied by the annual department distribution of the salary adjustment packages. Unusual disparities will be based upon comparisons with other department members of similar rank and time at UW-L. Requests for equity adjustments will not be considered if the salary disparities result from better meritorious performance of comparison group.

G.1.c.ii. Procedures: Requests for adjustments must be made in writing to the Department Chair. Written requests should include the rationale for the adjustment and any necessary documentation. If the Chair supports the request, he/she will write a supporting letter and forward all materials to the Dean for consideration. If the Chair does not support the request, submitted material will be returned to the faculty member along with a written explanation of the non-support.
G.2. Tenure-track Faculty Mentoring Policy: The Department Chair will assign all tenure-track faculty members with a tenured faculty mentor from within the department. Mentors are to serve in an advisory capacity to assist with general department procedures and retention, tenure, and promotion procedures. The purpose of mentorship is to get the new faculty member acquainted to the larger university community.

G.3. Communication & Complaint Policy (Revised 2/06)

G.3.a. Communication Policy. The department recognizes the need to foster clear, open communication in order to resolve conflicts and build a healthy, professional, and academic community. Each faculty member and student should be treated with dignity and respect. It is understood that conflicts may occur between different combinations of individuals, including:

- Faculty/IAS and student
- Student and student
- School professional and student
- Faculty/IAS and School professional

G.3.b. Complaint Policy. When seeking resolution to conflicts that do occur, individuals should use the following procedures:

G.3.b.i. Complaints should first be brought directly to the individual with whom a perceived conflict exists, either orally or in writing within 90 days of the last occurrence of conflict. The communication should contain the nature of the complaint. If the complaint is with a student, the student should be given a copy of the complaint procedures.

G.3.b.ii. If the complaint is not resolved at the personal communication level, either party may present the complaint in writing to the Department Chair.

G.3.b.iii. If a student complaint is not resolved at the department level, the student may seek conflict resolution at the university level. (See http://www.uwlax.edu/studentLife/policies.html.)

G.3.c. If a faculty/IAS member conflict is not resolved at the department level, the faculty/IAS member may seek conflict resolution at the university level. (See www.uwlax.edu/HR/rules/Fac.htm for Chapter 6: Complaints and Grievances policies.)

G.3.d. Complaint Procedures. Any individual who has a complaint about a member (faculty, academic staff or student) in the Department of Educational Studies (DES) should use these procedures to seek a resolution to the problem.

G.3.d.i. Complaints should initially be addressed by contacting the DES member, either orally, in writing, or by e-mail to describe the nature of the problem within 90 days of the last occurrence. Every effort should be made to resolve the problem at this level.

G.3.d.ii. If a student has a complaint with a DES member, the faculty or academic staff member will provide the student with a copy of the DES Complaint Procedures.

G.3.d.iii. If the complaint between faculty, IAS, and students is not resolved at this level, either person may present the complaint in writing to the DES chair. The DES Chair will schedule a meeting to resolve the complaint.
G.3.d.iii. The procedure for students acting upon an academic non-grade appeal is located under the heading “Hearing Appeals” at http://www.uwlax.edu/StudentLife/policies.html.

G.4 Online/Blended/Flipped Course Policy

G.4.a. With the increasing demand for online/blended/flipped courses, the Department of Educational Studies supports the creation and delivery of online and/or blended course instruction where outcomes are appropriately met in that delivery format.

G.4.b. Course Length:
Online/blended/flipped courses should be designed with the same student time-commitment as in-person courses. Courses should be designed using the following minimum time lengths unless otherwise approved by the Online Course Development Sub-Committee (OCDsC) and Department Chair.

G.4.b.1. A one-credit course = 6-week course
G.4.b.2. A two-credit course = 8-week course
G.4.b.3. A three-credit course = 8-week course

G.4.c. Faculty Workload:
The workload assigned to an instructor for teaching an online/blended/flipped course should parallel the equivalent of an in-person course. No more than 50% of an instructor's teaching load should be comprised of online or blended courses, unless agreed upon by the Department Chair and Dean. Instructors teaching online courses are expected to provide a full level of service to the department, School of Education/College, and University. Instructors must continue to post and hold on-campus office hours for advisees and students enrolled in in-person courses. Instructors may hold online office hours in addition to on-campus office hours.

G.4.d. Winterim and Summer Course Offering:
The Department Chair approves the offering of Winterim and summer courses. Due to the preparation involved in the materials associated with online/blended/flipped courses, instructors who develop and teach an online/blended/flipped course have the "offer of first refusal" to teach that same course online for two Winterim or summer sessions within one year of the initial offering.

G.4.e. Review/Monitor of Online Course Content:

G.4.e.1. The Department Chair shall request from University IT services be added to online/blended/flipped courses with "instructor" permission to facilitate in the event of faculty/IAS absence.

G.4.f. Review/Approval of Online Courses:
All course prefixes within the Department of Educational Studies (CI, ECE, EDS, EFN, RDG, and SPE) must be approved to offer in an online/blended/flipped format. An online/blended/flipped course will be approved by the Department’s Online Course Development Sub-Committee (OCDsC) and then by the Department Chair.

G.4.f.1. The OCDsC will be comprised of at least three members, one of which must have completed the University online training or equivalent and previously taught within an online/blended/flipped format.

G.4.f.2. In order to offer a course in an online/blended/flipped format, the course plan must be approved the term prior to offering the course by the time courses are made available to students for registration.
G.4.f.2.a. A fall or Winterim online/blended/flipped course offering must be approved by March 1 the spring term prior to offering.

G.4.f.2.b. A Spring or summer online/blended/flipped course offering must be approved by October 1 the fall term prior to offering.

G.4.g. Online Course Approval Criteria: In order to have a course approved

G.4.f.1. The proposing online/blended/flipped course instructor must develop a draft online/blended/flipped course syllabus according to the Department Course and Suggestion Checklists. The course approval process must allow OCDsC members and the Department Chair access to the D2L site for review. Instructors must have at least one module for the review by the Committee. The remainder of the course content can be in the form of expectation, assignment, and assessment descriptions. All online and blended course offerings will be based on the University adopted e-course management software system.

G.4.g.1.a. Course Syllabus Checklist includes:

G.4.g.1.a.1. Course title, number, and section
G.4.g.1.a.2. Length of course (number of weeks and dates of course term)
G.4.g.1.b.3. Instructor information, including email, work phone, office hours (on-campus and virtual), office location
G.4.g.1.b.4. Primary instructional components on D2L, including syllabus, assignments, assessments, timeline of topics indicating reading assignments and due dates for assignments, discussion posts, and other student responsibilities
G.4.g.1.b.4. Course description, objectives, prerequisites (if applicable), Essential Learning Outcomes (ELOs), common assessments (for multi-section courses), and teacher education standard correlations to objectives, ELOs, assignments, and common assessments
G.4.g.1.b.5. Assignment descriptions/expectations with due dates, criteria &/or rubrics for each assignment (more detailed assignment descriptions may be included within an “assignment” course module)
G.4.g.1.b.6. Instructor expectations including the level of involvement in course forum activities, responses to emails and posts
G.4.g.1.b.7. Student expectations including estimated time commitment to complete course activities, time and frequency expected to be logged into the course
G.4.g.1.b.8. Assignment submission instructions for course activities and assignments, including acceptable formats

G.4.g.2. Course Content Checklist includes

G.4.g.2.a. All links to content modules, resources, videos, and other media forms are working prior to the start of the course
G.4.g.2.b. Separate discussion areas for “General Course Questions” or “Ask the Instructor”
G.4.g.2.c. Welcome message in the “News” by the first day of the course
G.4.g.2.d. Weekly updates for students posted in the “News” section or other forum
G.4.g.2.e. For online only courses, an assignment for students to get to know one another to begin the course
G.4.g.2.f. Quiz or assignment over the course requirements as stated in the syllabus
G.4.g.2.g. Statement that online and blended instruction is not “self-paced” instruction
G.4.g.2.h. Interact with students via discussion board or other online or blended forum

G.4.g.3. An online/blended/flipped course proposal must be reviewed and approved by the OCDsC and Department Chair each time an instructor proposes to offer a course in an online/blended/flipped format.
G.4.g.3.a. An instructor must successfully complete the review process prior to the registration time for the session in which the course will be offered.
G.4.g.3.b. An instructor need only to successfully complete the review process the first time that same instructor offers an individual course is offered in a online/blended/flipped format. Any instructor proposing to teach a course, previously taught in an online/blended/flipped format by a different instructor, must successfully complete the review process.
G.4.g.3.c. The instructor should provide materials to the OCDsC and Department Chair at least one month prior to registration opens to allow time for approval. A course without Department Chair and OCDsC approval cannot be offered in an online/blended/flipped format.

G.4.g.4. Online and blended course instructors are expected to complete the online teaching training offered by the University or equivalent as approved by the University prior to teaching a course in an online/blended/flipped format. Instructors are encouraged to apply for online teaching development grants.

G.4.g.5. In line with the UW-L Online Education Handbook’s “Instructor Sole Ownership Agreement,” course material is considered intellectual property. Instructors are not expected to provide materials to colleagues beyond a copy of the syllabus.

G.4.h. Online and Blended Course Instructor Evaluation:
G.4.h.1. In accordance with Faculty Senate and Department of Educational Studies course evaluation policy, all online and blended course instructors are required to complete student evaluations of courses with more than five students. The Faculty Senate Student Evaluation Index (SEI) tool required questions (Items 1-6) and Department approved items will be administered in an electronic format.

G.4.h.2. In accordance with Department By-laws, online and blended courses taught by Department faculty and Instructional Academic Staff are subject to instructional observations. Online and blended course observations are carried out by a tenured faculty member who has successfully completed the University online training course or equivalent and has taught a course within an online/blended/flipped format. In order to complete the online/blended/flipped course observation, the evaluator must be given full access to the e-instructional environment to complete the Online Peer Evaluation Form. (See the DES By-law Appendices for the Online Peer Evaluation Form.

G.4.h.2.a. The Department Chair shall request from University IT services that they and/or PRT Committee members be added to online/blended/flipped courses with “student” status to perform instructor evaluation as prescribed in the DES By-laws.

G.4.h.2.b. Pre-observation meeting: Prior to the classroom observation, the candidate and the tenured faculty member should meet to discuss pedagogical practices and objectives for the designated module(s) to be observed.
A.6.d.2.b. Classroom observation: Online/blended/flipped module(s) observation should be at least one module and use the DES Online/Blended/Flipped Peer Observation Form.

A.6.d.2.c. Post-observation meeting: Following the classroom observation, the candidate and the tenured faculty member should meet to discuss pedagogical practices, course delivery method, objectives, and questions about the module(s) observed as well as any recommendations for future instruction.

A.6.d.2.d. Observation Report: The report should contain a summary of the observation, including the following: name of the candidate observed, date, course title, and description of the class content and activities observed, strengths, and suggested areas of improvement.

G.4.i Online/Blended/Flipped Course Preparation and Curriculum Monitoring:

G.4.i.1. The Department Chair in collaboration with Department faculty designates the format of course delivery. Courses may be offered in a traditional face-to-face, hybrid, or online/blended/flipped delivery models. (Approved by Faculty Senate on April 15, 2010). Changes to all course delivery models must be approved by the Department Chair at the outset of the semester or as soon as an absence is known. Faculty and IAS cannot decide on an individual basis that a course or individual course sessions will be delivered in an online/blended/flipped fashion to compensate for an absence.

G.4.i.2. Facilitating an online/blended/flipped course requires the instructor to provide encouragement, guidance, and feedback to students. It is important for online instructors to model expected behavior for their students. For example, if you require your students to have substantive discussion posts, use correct grammar and spelling, practice netiquette, properly cite sources, and use appropriate language and tone, then you should do all of these in your posts. In addition, if you require your students to add substantial contributions to discussions on 4 of 7 days of the week, then you should be engaged in the course discussions at least that many days.

G.4.i.3. A major benefit of online/blended/flipped learning is the ability of students and instructors to participate from any location, as long as they have a computer and Internet access. Instructors who will not have regular access to an Internet connection during their contracted course period should not teach online during that time. Unexpected emergencies that interrupt the course and the instructor’s ability to facilitate the course should be communicated to the Department Chair as soon as possible to determine appropriate action.

G.4.i.4. Active learning is important in the online/blended/flipped classroom. Students should engage actively with the content in order to meet the course objectives. While some activities from your face-to-face course may translate appropriately into the online/blended/flipped classroom, it is important to consider the relevance, appropriateness, and purpose of the activity in the online/blended/flipped classroom. Just because the instructor cannot make a face-to-face meeting does not mean a class can be covered using an online/blended/flipped format. Activities in the online/blended/flipped classroom should meet course and module/unit objectives and accomplish the following:

G.4.i.4.b. Present students with essential information, materials, and resources

G.4.c.1.a. Examples: lectures, articles, links to library resources or articles, textbook readings, audio files, videos
G.4.i.4.b. Incorporate appropriate and accessible technology
   G.4.c.2.a. Examples: screen captures, tutorials, PDFs, PowerPoint presentations with voiceover and specific notes, videos with captioning or corresponding articles

G.4.i.4.c. Engage in collaborative techniques that encourage student-to-student and instructor-to-student interaction
   G.4.i.3.c.1. Examples: discussion, chat, group work, debates

G.4.i.4.d. Apply material to real situations
   G.4.i.3.d.1. Examples: case studies, virtual field trips, experiments

G.4.i.4.e. Offer an opportunity for students to practice what they have learned
   G.4.i.3.e.1. Examples: homework with practice assignments, self-reflection journal

G.4.i.4.f. Include an assessment tool to measure the extent to which objectives were met through assigned activities
   G.4.i.4.f.1. Examples: quiz, test, project, portfolio, case study

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 http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin/Forms/S&S-Planning&Procedures-Faculty.doc. Additionally, UWL's spousal/partner hiring policy can be found at: http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/Unclassified/Spouse-HirePOL.pdf.
   A search and screen committee comprised of tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and Academic Staff with at least .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 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 http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/fac.recruit.html.
   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 by a tenured or tenure-track faculty member. The Department Chair appoints the committee. Hiring policy and procedures are found at http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin/Forms/S&S-Planning&Procedures-IAS-NIAS-Admin.doc.

C. Contingency Work Force (Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Pool Search)
   Hiring policy and procedures are found at http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin/Forms/S&S-Planning&Procedures-Faculty.doc.
   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 .75 FTE, and IAS with at least .75 FTE in a department program in which they teach. The search and screen committee must be 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 http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin/Forms/S&S-Planning&Procedures-IAS-NIAS-Admin.doc.

X. Student Responsibilities and Rights

A. Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures
If a student has a complaint, grievance, or appeal, the student must go to the direct source of that complaint. If the complaint/grievance cannot be resolved, then the policies and procedures described in UWL Student Handbook and Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs should be followed. If the complaint cannot be mutually resolved, the student and/or the faculty member may seek further resolution through university procedures. Students should refer to Policies of Student Grievance, Grade, and Anti-Hazing in UWL Student Handbook (http://www.uwlax.edu/StudentLife/policies.htm) regarding complaint, grievance, and appeal procedures. Specific information on appeal procedures may be found in the Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs (http://www.uvlax.edu/docs/Catalogs.htm) and UWS/UWL grievance procedures (http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/bylaws.html; http://www.uwlax.edu/HR/rules/Fac.htm; http://www.uwlax.edu/HR/rules/AcSt.htm).

B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct
Academic and nonacademic misconduct policy referenced:
Students should follow academic regulations and student conduct described in Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs and UWL Student Handbook. As a part of a professional program, students within the Department should conduct themselves in a professional manner. (See the DES Student Handbook for expectations, responsibilities, and misconduct.)

C. Advisement
Each student is assigned to a Department faculty advisor based on their program of study. Advising procedures can be found in the DES Handbook.
DES By-law Appendices

1. Merit Rubric—Ranked Faculty
2. Merit Rubric—Instructional Academic Staff
3. Faculty/IAS Teaching Observation Template
4. DES Definition of Scholarship
5. Online/Blended/Flipped Peer Evaluation Form
6. DES Search & Screen Procedures
### DES MERIT RUBRIC

**Faculty Member Name:** ____________________________________________  **Academic Year:** _______________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>No Merit</th>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Significant Merit</th>
<th>Exceptional Merit</th>
<th>Total Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Faculty Development Opportunities</td>
<td>SEIs ≤ 3.75*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>SEIs ≥ 3.76*</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Faculty Development Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pedagogical Innovations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New Teaching Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No evidence of teaching areas listed</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1 or more of the teaching areas listed</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SEIs ≥ 3.76*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SEIs ≥ 4.0*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SEIs ≥ 4.2*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarship:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Professional Journal articles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Professional Conference presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Research grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 or more works in progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 or more local professional conference presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Active research agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 or more works submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 or more state/regional professional conference presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Active research agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 or more works accepted &amp;/or published &amp;/or funded grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 or more international/national professional conference presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Active research agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 or more works accepted &amp;/or published &amp;/or funded grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 or more international/national professional conference presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Active research agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Department/Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- University/SOE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Professional/Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Program Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 or less service areas listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 or more service areas listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 or more service areas listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 or more service areas listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leadership in 1 or more service areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Final Points:</strong></td>
<td>.49 – 0 = No Merit</td>
<td>1.49 - .5 = Merit</td>
<td>2.49 – 1.5 = Significant Merit</td>
<td>3.0 – 2.5 = Exceptional Merit</td>
<td>DES Approved: 5-3-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# DES MERIT RUBRIC

**Instructional Academic Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name:</th>
<th>Academic Year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categories</strong></td>
<td><strong>No Merit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Innovations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Teaching Material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEIs ≤ 3.75*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEIs ≥ 3.76*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEIs ≥ 4.0*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEIs ≥ 4.2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No evidence of teaching areas listed</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or more of the teaching areas listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more of the teaching areas listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more of the teaching areas listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarship:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Journal articles</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Conference presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or more works in progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or more local professional conference presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active research agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or more works submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or more state/regional professional conference presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active research agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or more works accepted &amp;/or published &amp;/or funded grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or more international/national professional conference presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active research agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Program</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/SOE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or less service areas listed</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more service areas listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more service areas listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more service areas listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership in 1 or more service areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Final Points:</strong></td>
<td>.49 – 0 = No Merit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = SEI ratings use the higher of the two semesters’ SEI scores.
Faculty/IAS Teaching Observation Template

Include the following when making an observation of faculty instruction:

- Syllabus for course
- Determine if all template components are present
- See where this day’s lesson will fit within the designated topics of the syllabus

Pre-Observation Conference

- Discuss lesson
- Determine focus for observation

Observation of Lesson

- Objectives for the lesson, concise but measureable
- Materials used (technology, etc.) Observation notes
  - Based on the pre-observation focus
  - Any other relevant information

Post-Observation Conference: Discuss observation

Develop recommendations &/or suggestions
DES Scholarship Definition

Background

Scholarship activity in the Department of Educational Studies 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.

The department’s definition of scholarship further reflects its commitment to teacher education program that is field-based and is dedicated to developing reflective practitioners.

Definition

The department views scholarship as being multi-dimensional ad including discovery, integration, application, and teaching (See Boyer, 1990). Ideally, all dimensions will be inter-related and mutually reinforcing.

Scholarship of discovery: New knowledge is produced as a result of basic, applied or action research employing either quantitative or qualitative methods. Examples of this kind of scholarship may include, but are not limited to, the following:

A. Research publications
B. Conference presentations

Scholarship of integration: Meaningful connections and new interpretations or fresh insights are made about existing knowledge. Dissemination of this research may include, but is not limited to, the following:

A. Research reviews
B. Synthesis papers
C. Book reviews

Scholarship of application: Knowledge of educational theory, research, and practice is used to address practical problems in the field. This type of scholarship may take many forms including, but not limited to, the following:

A. Publishing in journals or books for practitioners
B. Providing in-service or conference presentations for school personnel
C. Participating in collaborative research or grant activities
D. Serving on task forces
E. Serving as editors or reviewers for professional publications or conferences

Scholarship of teaching: The study of teaching involves deepening one’s own knowledge, creating ways to build bridges between one’s understanding and candidates’ learning, reflecting on practice, and inspiring candidates to become life-long learners. Demonstrations of the scholarship of teaching may include, but are not limited to, the following:

A. Statements of teaching philosophy
B. Course or teaching portfolio
C. Samples of student work
D. Candidate, peer, and self-assessment

References
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A) Pre-observation Conference Summary:
   a. Pedagogical Practices to be used:

   b. Objectives for designated module(s):

B) Module(s) Observation: Review each of the items below based on the amount of evidence found within the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extensive evidence (3)</th>
<th>Some evidence (2)</th>
<th>No evidence (1)</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Module requirements and expectations were clearly communicated with the students, including assignment criteria, due dates, and directions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The instructor demonstrated a command of the subject matter within the designated module(s) through thorough explanation of instructional concepts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The module(s) learning outcomes were clearly communicated with students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The instructor provided opportunity for students to respond to course content or ask questions regarding designated module(s) information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The instructor provided opportunities for student-to-student interaction within the designated module(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The instructor provided opportunities for student-to-instructor interaction within the designated module(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The instructor provided frequent communication with students. (response to questions, constructive, positive, non-threatening feedback) within the designated module(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The instructor utilized appropriate instructional and learning activities within the designated module(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>The instructor was able to involve students within class interaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The designated module(s) contained complete description of module information and module activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The module(s) was well organized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C) Post-observation Conference Summary:
   a. Observer questions resulting from online observation:

   b. Instructor strengths as demonstrated within the module(s):

   c. Recommendations regarding future delivery of this module(s):

Observer’s Signature: ____________________________ Date: ________________

Initial Document Approvals
Department of Educational Studies, Dr. Ruthann Benson, Dr. Kathleen Enz Finken,
Faculty Approval: 5-11-10 CLS Dean Approval: 6-14-10 Provost Approval: 11-16-10
DES Search & Screen Procedures

UW-L TENURE-TRACK FACULTY
RECRUITMENT & HIRING POLICY AND PROCEDURES
(Includes search and screen procedures)
(Updated 7/09)

HIRING POLICY DOCUMENTS & PROCEDURES – this document has been generated from the UW - La Crosse Faculty Recruitment & Hiring Guidelines recommended by the Faculty Senate to the Chancellor for approval and approved in 2001. This document will be reviewed every two years according to the Faculty Recruitment Hiring Guidelines.

OPEN MEETING LAWS: SS committees must comply with Wisconsin Open Meeting Laws – a summary of which is available at the following link: OPENMEETING.htm.

AAO CHARGING MEETING: All SS committees will need to meet with the AAO prior to obtaining access and/or creating a posting in PeopleAdmin. During this charging meeting, committees will be provided with resources and tips designed to maximize the success of the search, in other words, to attract a large and diverse pool of highly qualified candidates and to hire the very best person in the pool. This meeting is designed to last one hour and all SS committee members will be expected to attend. Committees will not need to create anything prior to that meeting.

As your department or unit plans for new searches, please contact Affirmative Action at 785-8043 or 785-8541 to schedule a meeting.

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT: During the search process, search and screen committee 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 and voting outcomes conducted in a closed meeting must remain confidential both during the search and after the completion of the search process. SS committee members may discuss this information only with other members of the search committee, as well as with the authorized ex officio individuals – the dean, the Human Resources director, and the Affirmative Action Officer. Members must not permit any unauthorized person to access documents in their possession that contain applicant or search and screen information.

DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT: The search and screen chair and department chair are responsible for reviewing current hiring procedures and updates.

The University of Wisconsin–La Crosse is committed to recruiting and hiring the best faculty to meet the campus mission of providing a high quality university education for a diverse population. The hiring process itself should be one that enables the university to reach these decisions with a minimum of delay. Attaining diversity in hiring is best promoted when job offers can be made expeditiously.

The following abbreviations are used in this document:
• PVC (provost & vice chancellor for academic affairs)
• AAO (affirmative action officer)
• HR (office of human resources)
• chair (department chair)
• SS chair (search and screen committee chair)
• SS committee (search and screen committee).

(Note: Changes to these procedures must be clearly indicated to HR and AAO – and be approved by the dean, the AAO, and HR)
General Procedures and Information

Part 1: Roles of the Faculty and the Administration
Faculty Authority in Recruiting and Hiring Members of the Faculty
The Faculty Personnel Rules, which are part of the Wisconsin Administrative Code, and the corresponding UW-L Faculty Personnel Rules, give departmental faculty the primary role in the recruitment and hiring process for faculty as outlined in Part 2, below. Specifically, UWS 3.02 states that "In all instances the procedures shall provide for departmental peer review and judgment as the operative step in the recruiting process." UW-L 3.02 further details areas of faculty responsibility. With respect to the decision to hire, UW-L 3.03(2) states that "Appointments and all terms of appointments shall be made only if based on an affirmative recommendation of the department and with the approval of the appropriate academic administrative officers."

Administrative Authority in Faculty Searches
Section 5.04 of UWS Unclassified Personnel Guideline #5 gives final approval in the hiring of faculty members to the chancellor. In practice, the chancellor has delegated this authority to the PVC who in turn delegates primary oversight of individual faculty searches to the appropriate dean (or equivalent) while retaining appointing authority. The chancellor has also delegated primary responsibility for compliance with affirmative action regulations and oversight of campus progress in achieving diversity goals to the AAO. The dean will only present recruitment materials for which the dean has ensured the department has the position and funding. HR will verify salary minimums, support the recruitment process, maintain official records of the searches, and open a personnel file when an applicant accepts a position at UW-L.

Part 2: SS Committee Roles and Responsibilities
- SS committees include members identified by the department according to department procedures. Additionally, the dean, HR director and AAO serve as ex officio, non-voting members.
- By a simple majority vote, the SS committee will elect the SS committee chair (hereafter “SS chair”) and recorder, if desired. The SS chair will be responsible for posting a notice of meetings in compliance with open meetings statutes, noting any meeting that will go into a closed session and whether a meeting that will go into a closed session will subsequently go into an open session. If a recorder is not elected, the SS chair will be responsible for taking official minutes of meetings for the record. Minutes must comply with open meeting rules.
- The SS chair and department chair are responsible for reviewing current UW-L hiring procedures. The SS chair is responsible for briefing the SS committee on the SS procedures including the confidentiality requirements.
- A simple majority of SS committee members constitute a quorum necessary to conduct SS committee business. Changes to these procedures require approval of a two-thirds majority of the SS committee members present and approval of the dean, HR and the AAO. Members may not vote by proxy but may participate and vote by teleconference with advance notice to the SS chair. The SS chair is a voting member of the SS committee. All voting shall be done by show of hands unless a roll-call vote is requested by any member of the SS committee. The SS chair shall maintain a record of all votes by indicating the number of yea, nay, and abstentions. Roll-call votes shall be used if a member is attending via teleconference.
- All deliberations of the SS committee and the names of nominees and applicants are confidential. Public statements are to be made only by the SS chair, and all questions relating to the business or progress of the SS committee are to be referred to the SS chair for reply.
- Evaluation meetings for the purpose of discussing individual applicants shall be closed by majority vote of those SS members in attendance (taken by roll call and recorded in the minutes as a roll call). The SS chair will announce s/he will entertain a motion "to convene in a closed session to consider personal history information about applicants for the position [list the position title, such as ‘assistant professor in English Department’] as provided in section 19.85(1)(f) of Wisconsin Statutes." Upon completing business in a closed session, the SS committee may not reconvene in an open session within 12 hours, unless notice of the subsequent open session was included in the original meeting notice.
- The SS chair shall be the custodian of all recruitment documentation outside of PeopleAdmin and shall be responsible for the maintenance and making them available to the SS committee. The SS chair shall maintain a file of SS committee documents and records as required by the
There are 6 steps involved in searching for a faculty position:

Step 1: Recruitment Planning & Approvals
Step 2: Placing the Advertisement
Step 3: Receiving and Processing Applications
Step 4: Screening Applicants and Interviewing Applicants
Step 5: The Hiring Process
Step 6: The Closing of a Search
STEP 1: RECRUITMENT PLANNING & APPROVALS

1. Confirmation of FTE (position) and Salary (available resources for the position).
   Prior to creation of a SS Committee or SS documents, the dean must have verification from the PVC of the availability of the position and the replacement salary for the position.

2. Creation of Search & Screen Committee.
   After verification of the availability of and salary for the position has been established by the PVC, the department shall organize a search committee and identify a convener.

3. Affirmative Action Officer Charging Meeting.
   The first meeting of the SS committee shall be the charging meeting with the Affirmative Action Officer and the election of SS 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. The AAO will provide resources and tips designed to maximize the success of the search, in other words, to attract a large and diverse pool of highly qualified candidates and to hire the very best person in the pool. This meeting is designed to last one hour and all SS committee members are expected to attend. Committees are required to meet with the AAO prior to obtaining access to PeopleAdmin.

4. Obtaining Access to PeopleAdmin.
   The SS chair (or department chair) (Level 1), dean (Level 2), Budget & Finance, AAO, PVC (Level 3), and HR will utilize PeopleAdmin for the approval processes and for tracking purposes.

   The SS chair, department chair, and support staff will need to complete a PeopleAdmin Training prior to obtaining access to the system. Individuals who have not previously completed the PeopleAdmin training should contact HR at 5-8013 to schedule the training. All three individuals, or any subset thereof, may complete the training together.

5. Posting Positions
   The SS Chair (Level 1) will complete the posting template (including uploading print ad text, electronic ad text, position description, and selection criteria) in PeopleAdmin, save as “pending” and forward to dean (Level 2). Templates for required documents can be accessed at: Forms/Templates/Samples.

   In PeopleAdmin, Level 2 (dean) will review the pending posting, and forward to HR for initial review. HR will then forward the pending posting to Budget & Finance for review of FTE availability and replacement salary. Upon verification of FTE and salary, Budget & Finance will forward the posting to AAO, who will review, make changes if necessary, and once approved, forward the posting to Level 3 (if necessary), or HR. HR will activate the posting in PeopleAdmin. Once the posting has been activated, the position will automatically appear on the UW-L employment website and Higheredjobs.com. HR will send an email to the SS chair granting permission to advertise.

STEP 2: PLACING THE ADVERTISMENT

Upon receipt of the approval notice, the SS chair or department chair will place the faculty position advertisements promptly and without modification in all other publications as indicated in the posting detail.

   All of the advertisements regardless of form must include the official University affirmative action statement:
   “UW La Crosse is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer. Women, persons of color, and individuals with a disability are encouraged to apply. If you have a special need/accommodation to aid your participation in our hiring process, please contact the SS chair above to make appropriate arrangements.”

This statement may be modified (expanded or shortened) with advance approval of AAO.

All advertisements must also include the following Criminal Background Check (CBC) statement:
“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, UW-La Crosse does not discriminate on the basis of arrest or conviction record.”

One advertisement must be in a print professional journal and include the title, duties, and qualifications in full.

Advertisements placed in addition to the full advertisement in a print journal may be shortened (if reviewed and approved by AAO) and placed in discipline-specific journals. These position descriptions must note that the full description is available on the UW-L website at https://employment.uwlax.edu/applicants/jsp/shared/frameset/Frameset.jsp?time=1241558127401

STEP 3: RECEIVING AND PROCESSING APPLICATIONS
The SS chair will manage the applicant files in PeopleAdmin throughout the process and will assign Guest User access to SS committee members to enable them to view applicant documents.

STEP 4: SCREENING APPLICANTS AND INTERVIEWING APPLICANTS

1. Initial Screening
   Each member of the SS committee will review files of the entire pool of applicants and make an initial assessment (yes/no) of each candidate to determine whether each applicant should be considered further – this should be based on whether the candidate meets the selection/qualifications criteria. The committees will then meet and discuss each candidate. If any committee member believes that a candidate deserves further consideration (based on the selection/qualifications criteria), that candidate will be placed in the “pool of applicants” to receive further consideration.

   Applicants deemed unacceptable for the position during the initial screening will receive no further review and will comprise Tier 3.

2. Additional Screening Leading to a Finalist Group
   The SS committee may solicit additional material from applicants retained for further consideration. Applicants may be asked to provide additional materials via written communication, telephone, or videoconference in support of their application, to respond to any specific questions developed by the SS committee (and approved by the AAO), and/or to provide additional references.
   - If telephone or electronic interviews are conducted, a common list of core questions (samples on the web) will be asked of all persons interviewed. Each member of the committee should review UW-L’s Brief Guidelines for Contemporary Employment Interviewing. The use of standard questions does not prevent the SS committee from asking follow-up questions as may be deemed appropriate.
   - If unsolicited materials are received, the SS chair retains the materials and does not share them with the SS committee until such time (if ever) that similar materials are required of all candidates.
   - The SS committee may conduct telephone reference checks on each of the applicants still under consideration. Calls will be made by one or more SS committee members as assigned by the SS chair (or SS committee) and will use a standard set of questions that have been reviewed and approved by AAO. For each call, a written record will be maintained. A sample form is provided (Telephone Reference Conversation Record).
   - The SS committee 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 s/he does not wish to have called. SS committee members making telephone reference checks shall verbally share the information obtained with the SS committee. The SS chair or designee may seek further information about each semifinalist as needed, while respecting the semifinalist’s need for confidentiality. A written record must be maintained for each call.

3. Determining the Finalist Group
   The SS committee shall discuss and vote on each applicant to select those to be moved to finalist
status. A simple majority vote of those present is required to advance an applicant. Applicants not advanced to finalist status on the initial vote can be brought to a re-vote only once. Any SS committee member may request a re-vote.

- The SS committee shall vote to cluster the group of finalists into two “tiers”. The top tier (Tier 1) shall include applicants the committee believes should be invited to interview on campus. [Note: The dean in consultation with AAO will decide upon the total number of applicants to be interviewed (normally 2-4).]
- The second tier (Tier 2) shall include the remaining applicants who the SS committee believes would be suitable for the position if the top tier applicants are determined to be unacceptable after an interview or are unavailable/decline an offer. At this stage any additional applicants not advanced to Tier 1 or Tier 2 shall be included with the original Tier 3 applicants and all shall be assigned a ‘reason’ in PeopleAdmin.
- Reason codes should also be assigned to Tier 2 applicants. In most cases Tier 2 applicants could be assigned the non-selection reason code of “Applicant is well qualified for the position, but the quality is higher in other applicants.

The SS committee will present its tiers of applicants with its recommendations for interviews to the department chair and college Dean.

4. Authorization to Interview

The SS committee chair and/or department chair will forward its recommendation to the dean requesting approval to interview. Applicants will be identified as Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3. Upon review, the dean will forward electronically to the AAO. AAO in consultation with the dean will make one of the following decisions:

1. approve the existing applicant pool,
2. require an extension of the application deadline,
3. cancel the search,
4. require other appropriate remedies.

The SS chair must receive approval from the dean and the AAO, before scheduling interviews. If questions arise, the dean and AAO will consult before approving applicants to interview. At this time, at the discretion of the SS chair and SS committee, correspondence can be sent to the Tier 3 applicants indicating they are no longer under consideration. Otherwise all applicants from the original pool will receive correspondence after the position has been filled (as described below in Step 5).

5. Interviewing

The SS chair and chair will complete a Faculty Pre-Approval for Reimbursement of Interview Expenses Form following the Budget & Finance procedure and deliver it to the dean for approval of anticipated expenses before extending any invitations to interview on campus. This form is retained by the dean for audit purposes. This would also be the appropriate time to ask the applicant if she/he needs accommodations for a disability. Please see Travel Reimbursement/Tools/Resources for reimbursement resources for SS chairs and candidates.

A list of core questions will be prepared and asked of all applicants brought to campus for interviews. The SS chair will attach the list of interview questions to the Documents tab in PeopleAdmin and notify the AAO via email that they are available for review and approval.

- Each member of the committee should review UW-L’s Brief Guidelines for Contemporary Employment Interviewing and be apprised that interview guidelines regarding illegal questions apply to all conversation with the interviewee in both formal and informal settings. The SS committee may also choose to make off-list phone calls regarding finalists during this part of the process.
- Please see Interviewing Tools for interviewing resources, including an interview question bank and tips for on-campus interviews.

STEP 5: THE HIRING PROCESS

1. Consulting with the Dean

After gathering information, interviewing, etc., the SS committee and/or departmental members authorized by the department by-laws shall discuss the applicants and provide a non-ranked list of applicants to the dean with supporting information on strengths and weaknesses (as they relate to the
selection criteria). This supporting information is provided outside the PeopleAdmin process. The dean may choose to make additional reference checks. Then, in accord with departmental by-laws and policies, the department or authorized representative(s) will consult with the dean to collaboratively agree on recommendation(s) for hire.

2. Making the Offer
Offers for hire must be agreed upon by the department or authorized representative(s) and the dean. Departmental by-laws and policies may be written to determine this process of consultation with the dean. If after appropriate consultation, the dean and the department or authorized representative(s) do not agree on a hiring decision, the following alternatives may be used: an additional applicant or applicants from the pool may be interviewed, an extension of the search may be authorized, or the search may be terminated by the department or authorized representative(s), or the dean.

The SS chair will formally request via PeopleAdmin approval to hire from the Dean, AAO and the PVC (when necessary). Once approved at the appropriate levels, the Dean will contact the applicant to extend the job offer. The terms of the offer are developed by the dean after consultation with the chair.

If the applicant(s) declines to accept the offered position (verbally or in writing), the department may request permission to offer the position to another interviewed applicant. Alternately, the department may request permission to interview additional applicants from the identified pool of qualified applicants, may request an extension of the search, or may close the search.

STEP 6: THE CLOSING OF A SEARCH

1. Acceptance of the Offer
Upon acceptance of the offer by the applicant, the dean will complete the Hiring Proposal in the posting, and forward electronically to Human Resources.

Official transcripts (with university seal or other indication of being an original document) will need to be forwarded by the department to Human Resources.

2. Issuing the Contract
HR will issue the contract letter and a CBC form.

3. Receiving the Signed Contract
After the signed contract has been received and the criminal background check has been completed, HR will notify the dean and department chair. HR will designate the position as “filled” in PeopleAdmin and all remaining applicants will need to be notified. HR will create an official personnel file for the new hire and will complete the official recruitment file for the search process. This process should be completed within two weeks after the notice of the hire.

- **Foreign Nationals**: If a foreign national is hired, the SS Chair and/or 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 UW-L for foreign national hires in compliance with federal, state, UW System, and UW-L rules, regulations, policies, and procedures.

4. Authorized to Work
New hires will be authorized to begin work only after HR has the necessary documents, including but not limited to I-9, signed contract letter, and a satisfactory CBC. HR will notify the dean and the department chair via email when the new hire is authorized to begin work.

5. Storage and Disposal of Search-Related Materials
The SS chair and all SS committee members shall shred any informal 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**
- **Photocopies of actual advertisements placed**
- **Samples of correspondence (if applicable)**
- **Bylaws**
Additional applicant documents received outside of PeopleAdmin must be kept in a secure location for six years. HR will notify the department when the files no longer need to be retained.

**The following documents are used in a faculty search:**

- Forms/Templates/Samples
- Interviewing Tools
- Travel Reimbursement/Tools/Resources