1. General School Policies and Procedures

1.1. School Review Bodies

1.1.1. School Salary and Promotion Committee (SPC)

1.1.1.1. Composition of the SPC

The School Salary and Promotions Board (SPC) will consist of three members of the School of Education (School) excluding the Director. At least two members of the SPC must be tenured faculty. One seat will be a tenured or a non-tenured member (with voting privileges) who will serve a two-year term. The intent is to provide non-tenured faculty the opportunity to learn the process. The Chair will be elected from all members of the SPC.

1.1.1.2 Procedure for Election of the School Salary Promotion Committee

Members will be elected in May by the faculty (tenured and probationary). The Director may not be elected or serve as a member. Terms are two-year staggered. All tenure and tenure-track members of the School with more than 50% appointment are eligible to serve as members of the SPC and have voting rights. At least two members of the SPC must be tenured faculty.

1.1.1.3 Definition of Peer Group for Promotion & Salary Review

The School of Education SPC has the primary responsibility for peer evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of faculty. However, the time requirements for an effective peer evaluation, even with the use of technology with video-taped presentations, may be beyond the capabilities of the SPC members. Thus the SPC chair also may assign observations/evaluation roles to faculty members in the School of Education who are not currently on the SPC. The peer group for promotion and salary review for the School of Education faculty shall include tenured and non-tenured faculty from the School of Education. Non-tenured faculty will evaluate other non-tenured faculty. Tenured
faculty shall evaluate both tenured and non-tenured faculty. Evaluators should be tenured or be scheduled for a tenure vote prior to that of the individual being evaluated.

1.1.1.4 Procedure for Conducting Peer Group Evaluation and Voting

Peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness will be independent of the formal student evaluations. Peer evaluations (as described in section 1.3 below) will be conducted each semester for faculty during their first three years of service. Following these three years, non-tenured faculty will be peer evaluated once a year. Tenured faculty shall have a peer evaluation at least once every three years. The three year cycle of the peer evaluations appears in the body of this document and will be updated in an appendix (Appendix B) when needed. If the SPC notes a faculty member’s evaluations that have one or more areas (particularly in teaching) that are rated as negative, then peer evaluation may be conducted more frequently. If a faculty member does not comply with the required peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness as described in section 1.3 then the faculty member’s rating will be taken from the previous year. If the faculty member does not comply with the required peer evaluations in any subsequent year, then the faculty member will receive a “no merit” ranking for that academic year evaluation.

Because tenured faculty may go for two years without peer evaluations, the rating the faculty receive during a peer evaluation year will be used for the next two years, unless extra peer evaluations are requested or what is reported on Form 4 provides convincing evidence the rating should be changed for a particular year.

The completed evaluation forms will remain in the School of Education office for use by the SPC and will not be forwarded. A copy of the completed evaluation form will be given to the instructor by the evaluator within one week of the evaluation with the preference being a post-observation, face-to-face meeting with the evaluator and the instructor being evaluated. The faculty member being evaluated can also record a written response to the evaluation on the appropriate forms. See Appendix A.

1.1.2 Renewal and Tenure Review Body (RTRB)

1.1.2.1 Composition of the RTRB/RTRBs and Voting Procedure

The Disciplines within the School of Education are in teacher education. Tenured faculty assigned include: Rea Kirk, Dan Leitch, Leigh Monhardt, John Nkemnji, Won Im Son and Karen Stinson as well as any faculty tenured by January of 2016.

The Director of the School of Education shall call the meeting of all tenured faculty and act as chair of the meeting. A volunteer from the tenured faculty will chair the meeting if the tenure consideration is for the director. The vote will be conducted using ballots signed by the voting tenured members. The chair of the meeting and at least one other member of the committee will count the ballots and forward the ballots to the Provost.
Tenure for the Director Process:
If the tenure consideration is for the director, then a volunteer from the tenured faculty will serve as chair of the tenure vote and follow the procedures for voting and counting that is described in 3.1.1.

1.1.2.2 Composition of an Interdisciplinary RTRB and Voting Procedure (if applicable) NOT APPLICABLE at this time

1.1 Procedure for Approving the School of Education RST

The RST Plan will be reviewed and discussed by the faculty during the August retreat of each year. The plan will then come up for approval by a vote of the faculty during a School of Education faculty meeting in September of each year.

1.2 Procedures for Evaluation of SoE Faculty

1.3.1 Peer Evaluations

Peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness will be based on the most recent information obtained from the following sources:

1. Observation of two different classroom teaching sessions (if at all possible). The Director (since the Director is required to conduct a review) and at least one other member of the SPC (selected by random number chart) shall conduct peer evaluations using the forms and rubrics provided. Each of the reviewers will observe the classroom materials and teaching and make an independent assessment of the points that should be awarded. The Director will schedule at least a half-hour visit of the classroom, videotaping the session for the faculty peer reviewer in case attendance is not possible. In this scheduled visit, whenever possible, a pre-visit will occur that includes discussion of the goals, student learning outcomes, connections to the edTPA and Wisconsin teaching standards, and professional content standards for the course, and objectives for the class session. A second, at least half-hour scheduled visit will be conducted by the Director and video taped for the faculty reviewer. A pre, during observation, and post observation form and Rubric will be used with the faculty member being observed. Forms will be reviewed and attached when reviewed and approved by the faculty. The director and the faculty peer reviewer will meet to discuss and arrive at the final points for the faculty member.

2. File Form 4 Section 1 on Teaching Effectiveness: The SPC members will review the self-reported information on Form 4 for Teacher Effectiveness for the year to provide context for the classroom observations/evaluations.
1.3.2 Student Evaluations

Administration of the evaluations will be accompanied by a verbal explanation. The instructor will not be in the room during the evaluation. The calculated average of the student responses on all five questions on the teacher evaluation form will be used as the student evaluation score. The instructor will not receive the results of the evaluation until after the end of the semester and after grades have been posted.

At least three weeks prior to evaluations, faculty must decide whether or not he/she wants student evaluations in all his/her classes and notify the program assistant of the School of Education. If the faculty member chooses to not conduct student evaluations, then the faculty members Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness rating can be no higher than “Meets Expectations”. If the faculty member does not conduct required student evaluations, then the Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness will be “Does not Meet Expectations”. A second year of not conducting required student evaluations will result in a “no merit” rating for that academic year evaluation.

Non-tenured Faculty:
For non-tenured faculty student evaluations must be conducted for each and every class taught during each fall and spring semester until tenure.

Tenured Faculty:
For tenured faculty not seeking promotion, the SPC may make annual recommendations without requiring current student evaluations. A full review that includes at least three full semesters of student evaluations of each class taught by the faculty, is required once every three years.

For tenured faculty seeking promotion, three-consecutive semesters of student evaluations from every class taught by the instructor, must be submitted.

1.3.3 Additional Types of Evaluation (if applicable)

Split Appointments:
If an individual holds a split appointment between two or more Schools or departments, programs, or units, that individual is to be evaluated and recommended by the group in which he or she holds the major fraction of appointment. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to obtain input from the other partial appointment area. Split appointments will be evaluated based on the information provided by faculty member and the recommendation for merit incentive pay will be based on the percentage of appointment. If appointments are split 50-50, then a joint visit and evaluation will be conducted.
1.4 Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty - Non-Teaching

School of Education Director Evaluation Process

A. SoE Director’s files shall also contain:
   i. Annual evaluation of his/her performance by the SoE faculty.
   ii. The College of Liberal Arts and Education Dean’s evaluation of his/her performance as SoE Director.

B. It is the responsibility of the SoE Director to have these additional items in his/her file.

Assistant Director Evaluation Process (to be developed later)

Clinical Experiences Evaluation Process (to be developed later)
2. Renewal of Probationary Faculty

2.1 Criteria for Evaluating Teaching, Professional/Scholarly, Service

2.1.1 Teaching Effectiveness

The SPC will conduct peer evaluations on all faculty
a. No member of the SPC will participate in his or her own peer evaluation.
b. All faculty will have the opportunity to orally review their faculty file in an individual meeting with the SPC if they desire.
c. Appendix A Faculty Observation Evaluation delineates assessment indicators and categories. In the Evaluation, 50% of the evaluation is based on Teaching Effectiveness with 35% from the SPC process and 15% from student evaluations. The SPC teaching evaluations include 7 elements.

2.2 Ancillary Materials required in the RST file

Vita and Narrative

A. Personal File
   Each faculty member is encouraged to build and edit a personal file for SPC purposes. If a faculty member chooses not to build such a file, according to URST guidelines, the Director of the School of Education shall assemble a file for the faculty member using whatever data is available.

B. Format for RST file (refer to Faculty Handbook, Chapter 6 on Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures, page 44)

All faculty are strongly encouraged to maintain separate files of all historic and current artifacts and documentation for tenure, promotion, merit or equity considerations that includes artifacts and documentation.
3. Granting of Tenure

3.1 Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarly/Professional, Service

3.1.1 Teaching Effectiveness

Tenure Committee:
The tenure vote of School of Education faculty shall include tenured faculty from Teacher Education.

Tenure Vote Process:
The Director of the School of Education shall call the meeting of all tenured faculty and act as chair of the meeting. The vote will be conducted using ballots signed by the voting tenured member. The Director and at least one other member of the committee will count the ballots and forward to the Provost.

3.1.2 Scholarly, and Professional Activity

The same forms and criteria described in an earlier section 2.1.1 will be used here.

3.1.3 Service to the University and to the Community

The same forms and criteria described in an earlier section 2.1.1 will be used here.

3.2 Ancillary Materials required in the RST File

Not applicable at this time.
4. Promotion to Full Professor

4.1 Evaluation of Teaching, Professional/Scholarly, Service

4.1.1 Teaching Effectiveness
4.1.2 Scholarly and Professional Activity
4.1.3 Service to the University and to the Community
   *The same forms and criteria described in an earlier section 2.1.1 will be used here.*

4.2 Ancillary Materials required in the RST File

Not applicable at this time

5. Salary and Inequity

5.1 Evaluation of Teaching, Professional/ Scholarly, Service

Faculty requesting salary increases or inequity adjustments must complete a full review. It is the responsibility of the faculty to research and provide documented evidence of salary compression, inversion or inequity. The same rubrics developed to determine tenure and promotion will be used for salary and inequity requests.

5.1.1 Teaching Effectiveness
5.1.2 Professional, Scholarly, and Creative Activity
5.1.3 Service to the University and to the Community
   *The same forms and criteria described in an earlier section 2.1.1 will be used here.*

5.1.4 School of Education Guidelines for Determining Merit or High Merit
Assessing Meritorious Performance: The following are essential concepts and elements necessary to judge meritorious performance:

- Meritorious performance must be achievable within one’s position description.
- Meritorious performance must be attainable for each individual member, regardless of how other members have been judged in their roles.
- In addition to financial compensation, meritorious performance may be recognized and rewarded through oral and written recognition, special assignments, provision for personal growth, etc.
- The basis for performance evaluation will be (1) the degree of accomplishment of the faculty member’s individual professional objectives and (2) overall performance in relationship to professional expectations as established through the peer review process.

5.2 Ancillary Materials required in the RST File

Not applicable at this time.

6. Post-tenure Review

6.1 School of Education Criteria for Evaluation

Post-Tenure Review:

The post-tenure review is consistent with the overall SPC Plan and the School of Education conceptual design statement. The overall collection of data for post-tenure review follows all aspects of the plan previously discussed.

i. Purpose: The purpose of the post-tenure review is to encourage and support faculty growth and development that positively contributes to the mission and goals of the School of Education, the college and the university.

ii. Timing/Rotation

a. Once every 5 years the professional performance of the tenured faculty will be reviewed following the outline below. This review will be conducted simultaneously with the annual SPC merit review and is considered a supplement to that review.

b. The anticipated rotation is no later than October of the following years:

   Rea Kirk: 2017, 2022, 2027
   Dan Leitch: 2019, 2024, 2029
   Leigh Monhardt: 2017, 2022, 2027
   John Nkemnji: 2015, 2020, 2025
   Won Im Son: 2016, 2021, 2026
   Karen Stinson: 2015, 2020, 2025
iii. Review Materials

In addition to building and editing a personal file for SPC purposes, on years of Post-tenure Review the faculty member shall develop and place in Section VII: Ancillary Supporting Materials of the SPC file the following:

i. A statement which articulates plans for future teaching, scholarly activity, service to the university and community, and collaboration (hereinafter called the Professional Development Plan).

ii. A summary of any student and peer teaching evaluations collected during the last five years.

iii. Evidence of professional accomplishments during the last five years.

iv. Professional Development Plan (PDP)

a. The PDP shall articulate plans for future teaching, scholarly activity and service to the university and community service and collaboration.

b. The tenured faculty member will meet with the School of Education Director to review his or her PDP and to ascertain the appropriateness of the plan as it relates to the mission and goals of the School of Education, the college and the university. This meeting shall take place by the end of the November prior to the appropriate annual SPC review.

c. Once the PDP is acknowledged by the SoE Director, this plan shall stay in the faculty member’s SPC file for 6 years. Acknowledgement shall be documented by having the SoE Director’s signature and date at the end of the PDP.

d. Modifications may be made to the PDP after the original acknowledgement, only when done in consultation with the SoE Director and a written explanation for the change is included with the modified plan.

e. All versions of the plan, and explanations, must stay in the SPC file for the duration of that six-year cycle.

v. Review Process

a. Simultaneously with the annual merit review, the SPC shall prepare an evaluation of the faculty member’s post-tenure performance meeting the following criteria:

i. Based primarily on the faculty member’s professional performance during the last five years as evidenced by both materials provided and observations throughout the previous five years by fellow faculty members.

ii. Address the faculty member’s progress towards achieving goals from his or her previous Professional Plan.
iii. Address the needs of the faculty member to make progress toward achieving the current Professional Plan's goals.

iv. Recommend ways of helping the faculty member to meet those goals.

b. Tenured faculty may use the same appeals process and timing as probationary faculty.

c. The Chair of the SPC shall report to the SoE Director the results of all post-tenure Reviews.

d. If a faculty member's review reveals a need for significant improvement in performance, the SoE Director shall report such to the academic dean. The dean and the chair, in consultation with the faculty member, will recommend a retraining or redevelopment program and shall assist the faculty to find resources to fund such a program.

e. SPC post-tenure performance evaluations shall become part of the personnel file of the faculty member concerned and be retained in the college dean's office.

6.1 Policy on Professional Development Tied to Post Tenure Review
Appendix A

Faculty Pre-Observation Form

Appendix B

Faculty Observation Form (to be approved at a later date)

Appendix C

Student Evaluation Form of Faculty Teach
Appendix D

Review of Faculty Performance

### 2.1 TEACHING 50%  (35% SPC and 15% student evaluations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrates a breadth of field of specialization and education examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Includes the major components and research of the field of specialization in the syllabi and course content and appears to consistently include in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly models, assesses and reinforces student understanding of content in the field of specialization and provides opportunities for students to learn and incorporate in their learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models and helps students analyze, critique, and look at different ways of understanding the content knowledge and research in the field of specialization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL** for SPC Teacher Effectiveness observation range 35% of evaluation

**SUBTOTAL** of Student Evaluations 15% of evaluation

**SUBTOTAL FOR TEACHING COMBINED SPC AND STUDENT EVALUATIONS** is 50%
## 2.12 Scholarly and Professional Activities - examples

### Presentation examples
- local, School of Ed, other School or department
- College (student learning outcomes for Council meeting)
- university-wide presentation (Faculty Scholar, APC, UUCC, MCIC)
- area presentations
- State, national or international presentation at a conference

### Research
- locally conducted and shared research – results of a CIF, or other received grant or own research shared with SoE or other entity
- collaborative or university wide research (Physics and education, math and education) that is shared with multiple persons or the entire university
- research of county-wide project or shared county wide
- research of state or nationwide issues or research impact shared state or nationwide

**SUBTOTAL 25% of evaluation**

## 2.13 Service examples

### Leadership provided to the university – as an active member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership provided to the university – as an active member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>in a non-elected position</strong> (College budget committee, registration committee, commencement, School of Ed committee, or adhoc committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>in an elected position</strong> (APC, Faculty Senate - with verification of active membership from committee chair and/or multiple colleagues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a chair of a unelected committee on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a chair of elected committee on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a chair of a UW system committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Collaboration

| Conduct collaborative projects at the SoE level with local schools or at least one faculty or staff from within or outside SoE |
| Conduct collaborative project with at least one faculty from outside the college, and a K-12 school |
| Conduct collaborative project related to field that includes at least two P-12 school districts |
| Conduct collaborative project that is statewide or involves multiple agencies and organizations |
| Conducts collaborative projects that are national or international |

**SUBTOTAL 25% of evaluation**
Appendix E

EVALUATION OF FACULTY SUMMARY SHEET

Point Total 100 points total

50 % from Teaching Effectiveness,
35 % from SPC observation
15% student evaluations
25 % from Scholarly and Professional Activities)
25 % from Service
Observed faculty point total______/ 100 % possible

Determinations for merit/no merit/consideration for tenure and or promotion will be
based on multiple measurements, including:
• formal observation by director,
• formal observation by peers,
• narrative
• SRB binder

Written post-observation comments from Director and peer observer/evaluator.

Comments regarding strengths:

Observer’s recommendations for continued growth

Comments from observed faculty:

Signature of observed faculty_________ Printed_________ Date______
Signature of Peer______________________ Printed_________ Date______
Signature of Director__________________ Printed_________ Date______
**Additional Areas** related to Teaching that can be used for additional advancement, nominations for awards, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides proactive planning and guidance for students, addresses student concerns, clearly mentors students in the advising process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervises independent work when asked by student with a schedule conflict that cannot be addressed in another way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guides undergraduate research for one student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guides a group of students with undergraduate research and presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leads and guides undergraduate research including organizing topics, new areas of study, and formal presentation with students at state or national event</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty serves as a resource for other faculty in the appropriate methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actively monitors and contributes data to the overall assessment of student learning in the School of Education database</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EdTPA scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serve as a local scorer of edTPA each semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained as a national scorer of edTPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively involved in scoring edTPA at (proof of number of portfolios assessed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B: Rotation for Faculty Peer Review

The anticipated rotation is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rea Kirk</td>
<td>2017, 2022, 2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Leitch</td>
<td>2019, 2024, 2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh Monhardt</td>
<td>2017, 2022, 2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nkemnji</td>
<td>2015, 2020, 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Won Im Son</td>
<td>2016, 2021, 2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Stinson</td>
<td>2015, 2020, 2025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observer: Karen Stinson

Academic Area/Class: ______________

Faculty ________________

Observation Date __________

Date of Pre-Observation/ Syllabi Review ___

Post-observation Conference: ______

ANNUAL SMART GOALS (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Timebased. These goals listed as positive, personal, precise statements that are within your control.
1.
2.
3.

Expected Outcomes and date of completion (What will I see when I get there?)

What are some possible obstacles?
What contingency plans might you need?
What Skills and behaviors are needed?
What resources are needed?

Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Action Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What methods will you use to monitor and measure progress?

Commitment: I am making a commitment to myself to accomplish this goal by the completion date by implementing each action outlined

Signature________________