

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE
BYLAWS, POLICY STATEMENTS AND GUIDELINES

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-LA CROSSE

Reviewed April 6, 2018
Revised August, 2018
Revised August, 2020
Revised April, 2021
Revised March 2023

Table of Contents

I. Title with name of department and date of last bylaw adoption	4
II. Organization and Operation	5
A. Preamble which could include brief history of the department.....	5
B. Meeting Guidelines (e.g., Roberts' Rules, Open Meeting Laws)	6
C. Definitions of Departmental Membership & Voting	6
D. Definitions of Quorum and Majority	6
E. Changing by-laws	6
F. By-laws revision history	7
III. Faculty/Staff Responsibilities	8
A. Ranked Faculty	8
B. Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations	9
C. Non-Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations	10
D. Learning Environment Survey (LENS)	10
IV. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)	12
A. Evaluation Processes & Criteria	12
1. Faculty	12
2. Instructional Academic Staff (if included in merit processes, otherwise see VII).	14
3. Non-Instructional Academic Staff (if included in merit processes, otherwise see VIII).	15
4. Department Chair (if applicable)	15
B. Distribution of Merit Funds	15
C. Appeal Procedures (if applicable).....	16
D. Confidentiality	16
V. Ranked Faculty Personnel Review	16
A. Promotion, Retention and Tenure Committee (PRT).....	16
B. Retention and Tenure (procedure, criteria, and appeal)	17
C. Post-tenure Review	19
D. Ranked Faculty Promotion Procedures (procedure, criteria and appeal)	22
VI. Instructional Academic Staff Review	23
A. General	23
B. Annual Review	24
C. Career Progression Procedures	24
D. Appeal Procedures	25
VII. Non-instructional Academic Staff Review (if applicable) – indicate NA otherwise.....	26
VIII. Governance	26
A. Department Chair	26
1. Election of the Department Chair	26
2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair.....	27
B. Standing Departmental Committees (e.g., personnel (for any matters not covered above), materials, equipment, space, budget, curriculum, assessment, etc.).....	27
C. Departmental Programmatic Assessment Plan (if not included in VIII.B.)	28
D. Additional departmental policies	28
E. Professional development for faculty	28
IX. Search and Screen Procedures	29
A. Tenure-track faculty	29
B. Instructional Academic Staff	29
C. Contingency Workforce (Pool Search)	29
D. Non-Instructional Academic Staff (if applicable).....	29
X. Student Rights and Obligations	29
A. Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures	29
B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct.....	30
C. Advising Policy.....	30

XI. Other	30
A. Class Scheduling	30
B. Summer Session Appointments	31
C. Sabbatical Leaves, Faculty Development Leaves, and Released Time for Research	32
D. Periodic Review	33
E. Office Space	33
XII. Appendices	A1
Appendix A Department Statement on Teaching	A1
Appendix B Department Statement on Service	A3
Appendix C Department Statement on Scholarship	A5
Appendix D Merit Evaluation Form	A7

I. UW-L Department of Finance By-laws, Policy Statements and Guidelines

Approved: November, 2015

Updated and approved: November, 2017 and January, 2018

URLs in these by-laws are provided for convenience and should be reviewed regularly for accuracy.

II. Organization and Operation

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 policies and rules;
5. Shared governance by-laws and policies for faculty and academic staff; and
6. Departmental by-laws.

A. Preamble

The University of Wisconsin-La Crosse was founded in 1909 as the La Crosse Normal School. Through a merger in 1971, the university became part of the University of Wisconsin System and the name changed to the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse. Kenneth E. Lindner became the sixth president and then the first chancellor (The position was converted to chancellor due to the merger). Today, it is one of the 13 four-year campuses in the University of Wisconsin System. Originally known for its nationally recognized physical education program, UW-La Crosse now offers 85 undergraduate programs in 30 disciplines, and 21 graduate programs and emphases in eight disciplines.¹

The business program was initially an economics program started in the 1950's. It was offered as a minor program in the College of Letters and Sciences. The courses were initially taught by Maurice Graff and Carl Wimberly. In 1956 the first true business faculty member, Cloyce Campbell, was hired. By the early 1960's, a Department of Economics and Business Administration was created within the College of Letters and Sciences. It had 9 faculty members and offered three majors: business administration, finance, and economics. A fourth major, Marketing, was added by 1968. In 1971, with almost 40 percent of the graduates in Letters and Sciences being business majors, a distinct School of Business was created within the College of Letters and Sciences. Thomas White was the first Associate Dean and Director of the School. By 1972, there were 3 departments: Accountancy & Finance, Economics, and Management & Marketing. There were 13 faculty, 55 established course offerings, and approximately 630 students. During the 1973-74 school year, the School of Business Administration split from the College of Arts, Letters and Science and become a separate administrative unit with Maurice Graff as interim dean. P. Dean Russell became the new dean in 1974. William Tillman chaired the accountancy/finance department; Doug Sweetland chaired economics/finance; and John Kulp chaired the management and marketing department.

In 1975 finance merged with economics and accountancy was named a department. Enrollments had jumped to approximately 900 students. William O. Perkett was named Dean in 1976 and moved the business program towards AACSB accreditation. By 1977 enrollments had jumped to 1300 students, more than double the number of students only five years earlier. By 1981, with enrollments having jumped to 1990 students and the faculty size to 36, the School of Business became the College of Business Administration. In 1982, the college earned its initial AACSB accreditation.

The Finance Department became an independent department on January 1, 1984. Prior to that date, a Department of Economics and Finance existed. According to University procedures, the by-laws

¹ <https://www.uwlax.edu/info/uw-la-crosse-history/>

of the Department of Economics and Finance will be those of the Department of Finance as of the date of the reorganization into two departments until amended.

Objectives pertaining to the Department of Finance were adopted to provide direction to the Department. As such, these objectives have been integrated into the merit evaluation, promotion, and renewal (tenure) systems within the department.

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 WI state opening meeting laws <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin/Tools/OpenMeetingsRules-Summary.htm>.

Minutes will be recorded by a voting member or the departmental ADA and distributed within 7 days to department members. Copies of departmental and committee meeting minutes will be in a secure location in the department office. Minutes from closed meetings will be taken by the Department Chair or a designated faculty member and written within 7 days of the proceedings. They will be available by request to the department chair.

C. Definitions of Membership & Voting Procedures

Members of the department are defined as an instructional academic staff member teaching 50% or more, and IAS with faculty status [UWS 3.01 (d)], an academic staff member with 100% appointment, and all ranked (tenure-track or tenured) faculty (including those on leave or sabbatical who are in attendance), for the purpose of conducting business at any regular meeting.

Unless specifically indicated otherwise, a simple majority of those voting carries the vote. Voting occurs with a voice vote, or a hand vote and any member can call for a roll call vote. Proxy voting is not allowed. Members who join by teleconference and have heard all the deliberation are eligible to vote.

D. Definitions of Quorum and Majority

A quorum for the purpose of conducting business at any department meeting shall be a simple majority of the persons eligible to vote. For personnel meetings a quorum is achieved with 2/3 of those eligible to vote.

E. Changing By-laws

A two-thirds majority of the current department membership present and eligible to vote on by-laws is required to amend the by-laws. It is recommended that any proposed amendment(s) shall be presented and distributed in writing at a department meeting and voted on at the next subsequent meeting; however, second readings can be waived for by-laws that do not pertain to personnel decisions.

Policies pertaining to personnel issues, including retention, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review, which are the responsibility of the ranked faculty (tenured and tenure-track) may only be changed by those eligible to vote and require two readings.

F. By-Law Revision History

The Department of Finance has met several times to amend the existing by-laws and/or to formulate new by-laws. As of August 1, 1986, changes to the former joint department's by-laws occurred only in two sections: (1) Merit Evaluation and (2) Summer School Appointments.

During November 1986, changes were made in the following sections:

- Academic Staff
- Class Scheduling
- Renewal of Appointments and Granting Tenure

On September 1, 1988, the form for merit evaluation was changed.

During the spring of 1990, all changes were incorporated into relevant sections, and the by-laws were retyped.

In 1999, new merit by-laws were adopted.

In February 2004, the section of the by-laws related to summer session was revised.

In December 2005, selected revisions were made, and the post-tenure review document was added.

In May 2011, the by-laws were amended to the university template for by-laws.

In November 2015, selected revisions were made, and merit review document was added.

In April 2021, the merit process was revised.

In March 2023, the PRT process and criteria were refined, changes were made to reflect the new IAS titling and LENS survey, and the post-tenure review process was refined, in addition to other minor corrections.

III. Faculty/Staff Responsibilities

A. Ranked Faculty

Ranked faculty responsibilities are referenced in section IV of the Faculty Senate Policies entitled "Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons." A complete set of the policies are available off the Senate webpage under "Articles, bylaws, and policies" <https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/>.

Note: Throughout the Finance Department bylaws, ranked faculty refers to tenure and tenure-track faculty. Faculty refers to ranked faculty and Instructional Academic Staff (IAS), unless it is obvious by the context to have a different meaning.

1. Teaching

Ranked faculty are responsible for teaching assigned courses and participating in faculty/teaching development activities such as attending workshops, updating course materials, and advising internship and independent study activities. *Regular Teaching Loads:* The normal teaching load for ranked faculty in the College of Business Administration is three sections per semester provided that the person meets the Scholarly Academics guidelines <https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/academics/colleges-schools/cba/selected-documents/scholarlyproductivityqualifications09032020.pdf>. A nine-hour load usually will consist of two preparations. The department chair, in consultations with the dean, may assign newly appointed ranked faculty a nine-hour load to stimulate scholarly activities. Ranked faculty whose scholarly output is below the College productivity guidelines normally will be assigned a twelve-credit teaching load until they make satisfactory progress toward meeting the guidelines. However, actual teaching loads vary within the university and are influenced by such things as curricular constraints, physical facilities, and accreditation requirements.

The Department Chair, under the direction of the Dean, is responsible for establishing the teaching load for each faculty member and for managing the overall department workload in compliance with university and college guidelines.

Behavioral Guidelines: Ranked faculty members are expected to comply with the following behavioral expectations:

- Hold class as scheduled in the timetable
- Conduct rigorous classes
- Ensure currency of courses
- Maintain grade distributions in line with the departmental average
- Hold a reasonable number of office hours to accommodate student needs
- Select appropriate and current textbooks and other published teaching materials
- Develop and use appropriate syllabi, tests, written assignments, and supplementary handouts
- Adequately prepare for class and use appropriate classroom pedagogy
- Respect the dignity of students by providing fair and equitable treatment

See Appendix A for the department statement on teaching.

2. Scholarship

Ranked faculty should be actively working toward meeting or exceeding CBA productivity guidelines. Productivity guidelines are subject to change when revised by the College of Business Administration. (<https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/academics/colleges-schools/cba/selected-documents/scholarlyproductivityqualifications09032020.pdf>).

See Appendix B for the department statement on scholarship.

3. Service

It is expected that in most years faculty members will advise an appropriate share of finance advisees; represent the department on a standing CBA committee; serve on departmental committees if asked or eligible; and play an active role on at least one university committee.

Behavioral Guidelines: Ranked faculty members are expected to comply with the following behavioral expectations:

- Ranked faculty members are expected to actively engage in service as evidenced by regular attendance and participation on committees and/or positions of leadership.
- While the department recognizes the ability of ranked faculty members to work on course preparation, grading, and scholarship at home, in an attempt to foster collegiality within the department and college and to assist walk-in students with academic needs, ranked faculty are expected to work on campus a reasonable number of hours per week.

See Appendix C for the department statement on service.

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 teaching professor series 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. See Section X of the Faculty Senate Policies titled “Instructional Academic Staff Workload Policy: <https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/committees/faculty-senate/20211004-policies-fs.pdf>.

1. Teaching. The teaching expectations of IAS are similar to those of the ranked faculty, as described in section III.A.1. Examples of teaching expectations and evidence for instructional academic staff are also provided in section 5.1.1.1 of the *Guide to Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Career Progression and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse*, as approved by the UW-L Faculty Senate on 10/25/07 <https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/offices-services/academic-affairs/careerprogguide.pdf>.

These include, but are not limited to:

- Self-assessment of teaching (i.e., teaching philosophy and personal growth statements, course expectations, approaches to grading and evaluation, methodology)
- Peer evaluation of teaching
- Learning Environment Survey
- Advising students

2. Professional Development / Creative Activity / Scholarship. As stated above, the primary responsibility of an IAS member is to provide quality teaching; however, since professional development activities allow an IAS member to remain current in finance, some level of

professional development or scholarship is expected. Professional development activities for IAS may include, but are not limited to, those activities that can be shown to relate to the individual's teaching or service responsibilities (as described in section 5.1.1.2 of the *Guide to Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Career Progression and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse*):

- Participation in workshops, institutes, seminars, graduate courses, or participation in professional organizations or attendance at professional meetings
- Publication of literature reviews
- Publications in books, journals, and reviews
- Formal coursework
- Participation in continuing education
- Mentoring
- Scholarship (as defined in Appendix XII.A)
- In-service training
- Professional certification
- Basic and applied research
- New applications of existing knowledge
- Integration of knowledge
- Grant writing
- Presentations at professional conferences

3. **Service.** The expectations for involvement in service activities by IAS members of the Department of Finance will differ on the basis of the individual's title prefix. Examples of IAS service activities (as provided in section 5.1.1.3 of the *Guide to Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Career Progression and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse*) include:

- Serving on active departmental, standing Faculty Senate, and UW-System committees.
- Appointments with administrative responsibilities
- Volunteering to serve in professional organizations.
- Peer reviews of manuscripts and/or grant proposals
- Administration of grants
- Organization of lecture series, institutes, workshops, *etc.*
- Consulting and advising
- Providing lectures or workshops
- Providing service to an external agency
- Supervising student research projects

C. Non-Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations

The responsibilities and expectations of non-instructional academic shall conform closely to the categories and duties outlined in each individual's job description and shall serve to aid in the goal setting and professional development of the staff member.

D. Student Evaluation of Learning Environment

The department will follow the UW-L Learning Environment Survey (LENS) policy and procedure available off the Faculty Senate webpage ([Link to UWL Faculty Senate LENS Policy](#)).

Ranked Faculty & LENS. Results from the Faculty Senate approved LENS questions are required for retention, tenure, and promotion. The LENS summary will be used in evaluation, rather than the full LENS report. LENS summary reports (described in LENS Policy Section 1.C.3) must be included in promotion, retention, and tenure files.

LENS will be merely a piece of the teaching evaluation, along with direct and indirect assessments and peer observations. Comparisons should not be made across courses or across instructors. The summary report will emphasize trends across semesters. Evaluation should be based on a large enough sample size of a single course, such as 5 sections over a 2-year period or 3 semesters of multiple sections.

IAS renewal and career progression. The same information as above is reported.

Transition from Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) to LENS: UWL's approach to gathering student evaluations changed in Fall 2023. As such, during the transition years, any personnel review that requires submission of student evaluations will include data from two student evaluation systems: SEI (as guided by earlier policies) for review periods through Summer 2023 and LENS (as guided by current policy) for review periods beginning Fall 2023.

IV. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)

The merit evaluation process shall be based upon teaching, research, professional service, and contribution to the University. The results of merit reviews for all ranked faculty who have completed at least one academic year at UW-L are due to the Dean's Office on Dec. 15 annually. Merit reviews reflect activities during the prior academic year ending June 1.

All faculty and IAS have a June 1st deadline for entering teaching, scholarship, and service activities into the electronic portfolios system (Digital Measures) on activities from the prior year June 1st – May 31st.

A. Evaluation Processes & Criteria

1. Ranked Faculty

The results of merit reviews for all ranked faculty who have completed at least one academic year at UWL are due to the Dean's Office on Dec. 15 annually. Merit reviews reflect activities during the prior academic year ending June 1. All faculty and IAS have a June 1st deadline for entering teaching, scholarship, and service activities into the electronic portfolio system on activities from the prior year June 1st – May 31st.

The areas of review shall include Teaching, Scholarship/Professional Development, and Service activities. For all IAS, the annual merit review may coincide with and include any concurrent retention and/or promotion review. For all non-tenured, Ranked Faculty members, the annual merit review may coincide with and include any concurrent mid- contract, retention, promotion, and/or tenure review. For all tenured, Ranked Faculty members, the annual merit review may coincide with and include any concurrent promotion and/or post-tenure review. IAS merit review will be done in accordance with Section VI. The criteria and procedures for faculty merit shall be as follows:

A. Merit Committee. The Merit Committee will conduct the evaluation process. The Merit Committee will be composed of all ranked faculty in the department. Faculty members who are on a terminal contract are not eligible to serve on the committee. The Merit Committee will elect a chair to manage the evaluation process. The chair will remain in the position for at least one year or until a new vote is requested by any member of the Merit Committee. The Department Chair is not eligible to chair the committee.

B. Annual Activity Reports. Each year during the first week of May, the Department Chair will remind all faculty to update their electronic portfolio. The annual activity report shall serve as a vehicle for self-evaluation, which, along with other external evidence of Teaching, Scholarship/Professional Development, and Service activities, will form the basis for the annual review. The results of these annual reviews for all faculty who have completed at least one academic year at UWL are due to the Dean's Office on Dec. 15 annually.

C. Review Criteria. The criteria used by the Committee to evaluate a Ranked Faculty member's annual performance are designed to promote effective Teaching, quality Scholarship, and meaningful Service. Ranked Faculty are expected to devote 50% of their time and effort to Teaching, 30% to Scholarship, and 20% to Service, and review of Ranked Faculty in each of these areas will be weighed accordingly. For all faculty members, effective Teaching, Scholarship/Professional Development, and Service will be measured by comparing the evidence and artifacts reported in the annual activity report. In order to enhance the evaluation of effective teaching beyond the LENS survey summary and classroom peer observations, the annual activity report should also include the pedagogical devices that were used to measure course, Department, and/or CBA learning outcomes.

These devices can include assignments, quizzes, exams, or projects in whole or in part, and should be accompanied by assessment evidence, samples of student work, and/or reflective commentary to aid the Committee.

D. Evaluation Processes & Criteria

1. Faculty. Faculty members shall be evaluated annually for merit, and the distribution of any merit salary dollars shall be based upon this annual evaluation and on whether the position generates merit dollars. The evaluation shall consider all of the criteria listed below in Appendix E. In addition, the annual merit evaluation of faculty must differentiate between levels of merit. Merit reviews reflect activities during the prior academic year ending June 1.

a. Merit Review Procedures. Early in the fall semester, the Merit Committee Chair will initiate the merit process. This includes sending out a written notification to all eligible faculty who should be considered eligible for merit. The notification should include Merit Guidelines and a request for the Annual Activity Report. Once all Annual Activity Reports are received, the Merit Committee Chair will send out the Merit Evaluation Form (Appendix B) and all documents to the Committee members (Annual Activity Reports, LENS summary, and any other supporting documents that will be used in evaluation). The Merit Committee Chair will also send the Dean and the department chair materials for evaluation. Each ranked faculty member will be responsible for preparing and submitting the documents used for Merit Evaluation to the Merit Committee Chair. The committee members will submit the Merit Evaluation Form back to the Merit Committee Chair for scoring. The scores will be sent to faculty, at which point a faculty member can request a meeting to review the scores. If a meeting is requested, the committee would meet to discuss the scores assigned by the other committee members. Each member of the committee can then modify merit scores assigned for each faculty.

b. Scoring. Based on the merit definitions identified below, each Merit Committee member will assign an overall evaluation to each individual (other than themselves) using the Merit Evaluation Form. The overall merit evaluation score is based on the teaching, research, and service expectations of the department. The possible overall evaluations that can be assigned in the Merit Evaluation Form are: “Not Meritorious” and “Meritorious.” “Extra Meritorious” ratings in each of the three categories can also be assigned in addition to the Not Meritorious and Meritorious designation.

In the overall category, the faculty member will be assigned the highest overall score (Not Meritorious, Meritorious, or Extra Meritorious) given by one half or more (simple majority) of his or her colleagues. Extra Meritorious will be assigned to any individual who receives an “extra meritorious” rating by at least two-thirds of his or her colleagues in two of the three categories.

Within seven calendar days of completion of the reviews, the Merit Committee Chair shall notify each faculty member, in writing, of the results of overall annual merit ratings (not-meritorious, meritorious, or extraordinary merit).

Faculty members who are on professional leave are expected to submit a completed annual activity report by June 1 describing their leave and other professional activities.

c. Merit Ratings

i. Not Meritorious. A faculty member not meeting the criteria for meritorious or extra meritorious.

ii. Meritorious. A meritorious designation denotes satisfactory performance related to a faculty member's responsibilities and expectations. To receive a meritorious designation, faculty members must perform their Teaching responsibilities at a satisfactory level, as determined by students and peers, meet or maintain CBA Scholarship & Practitioner Productivity Guidelines (Appendix D). All faculty members shall be notified of their meritorious designation. Those persons not receiving a meritorious designation shall be notified, in writing, of the reasons for this action.

Faculty members qualifying for merit will receive the state-allotted meritorious performance funding. Faculty on approved leave shall be considered for merit and may be considered for extra merit.

iii. Extra Meritorious. Extra Meritorious recognizes the need to differentially reward faculty for levels of performance and individual accomplishments that exceed the expectations of the department. Extra Meritorious will be assigned to any individual who receives an "extra merit" rating by at least two-thirds of his or her colleagues in two of the three categories. Examples of Extra Merit activities for Teaching may include exemplary teaching accomplishments, new curriculum development, innovations in curriculum, grants to support teaching improvement, and teaching awards. Examples of Extra Merit activities for Research may include Tier 1 journal publication, and paper acceptance and presentation at one of the department discipline's top tier conference(s). Examples of Extra Merit activities for Service may include service leadership positions, notable service contributions to UWL, the CBA, the department, the profession, or the public. All faculty members shall be notified of their assigned extra merit ratings, along with the numbers of Department members in each merit category.

2. Department Chair. The department chair participates in the ranked faculty merit evaluation process in the same manner as all other ranked faculty.

3. IAS. IAS will participate in the IAS Merit process as described.

E. Distribution of Merit Funds. Annually, the Department may be allocated merit monies as determined by the action of the state legislature, the Board of Regents, and/or the UW-System Administration as a percentage of the Department total salary package. These monies shall be distributed to Department members based on the merit ratings assigned through the annual merit review process described above. The pool of merit funds for IAS is separate from the Ranked Faculty pool.

All faculty members judged to be "meritorious" shall receive the state-allotted meritorious performance raise. If the state fails to designate a specific percentage for meritorious, the department will assume the meritorious allocation will be 2/3 of the total percentage allocated and those funds will be equally distributed across all faculty. All faculty who receive an overall evaluation of "extra-meritorious" will receive an equal share of the remaining merit pool.

Note that when a whole-department merit designation is used for monetary reporting issues, the Ranked Faculty and IAS must be split into two separate merit category distributions because two separate sources fund these two different populations. At the appropriate time, the

Department Chair (or Human Resources Office) will communicate the merit adjustment dollars awarded to each faculty member.

Merit pay increases will not be made in years when merit funding is unavailable. The Committee will consider the annual merit ratings retroactive to the previous year and apply the highest evaluation to make the merit pay increase equitable when merit funds are made available.

F. Appeal Procedures. A faculty member may request a reconsideration of his/her annual merit ratings. The Committee will reconsider a member's merit evaluation upon receiving a written request. This written request must include reasons for reconsideration and must be submitted to the Department Chair within seven calendar days of notification of the annual review results.

The Committee will meet to reconsider its action. The resulting recommendation then will be presented to the faculty member, in writing, within seven calendar days of the reconsideration hearing. At the Department level, the reconsideration recommendation of the Committee is considered final.

Appeals beyond the Department level may be presented to the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals and Academic Freedom (CGAAF) Committee (see Section II.G. of the Faculty Senate Bylaws -- <https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/>). As in all processes involving the evaluation of personnel, mechanisms for merit evaluation appeals beyond the Department level are established on this campus. Your attention is directed to the UW-System Administrative Code, the local UWL Faculty Rules, and the UWL Faculty Handbook.

2. Instructional Academic Staff (IAS)

Annual (Merit) Review Criteria. The performance of all continuing, full-time Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) in the Department of Finance will be reviewed annually for purposes of merit. Since IAS do not have the same range of faculty responsibilities as ranked faculty, the merit evaluation of IAS will be based upon the quality of their classroom teaching (as described in section **III.B.1**), their professional development activities (section **III.B.2**), and their service activities (section **III.B.3**).

During the first week of May, the department chair will remind the continuing, full-time academic staff to complete the standard UW-L **Annual Faculty Activity Report** that contains a description of their activities occurring between the dates of June 1 from the previous summer and May 30 of the current academic year. One hard copy will be submitted, and one electronic copy will be emailed, to the chair by no later than May 30. This report, along with learning environment surveys and peer evaluations, will form the basis for the Annual (Merit) Review.

The process for evaluating continuing full-time instructional academic staff will follow that of the faculty, as described in section **IV.A.1**. These assessments will provide an opportunity for future goal setting and self-improvement, as necessary.

Teaching. In evaluating the teaching performance of instructional academic staff, the same criteria should be considered as those outlined for the ranked faculty as noted in section **IV.A.1.a** and in section **III.B.1**

- a. **Professional Development / Creative Activity / Scholarship.** As stated in section **III.B.2**, some level of professional development / creative activity / scholarship activities allows an IAS member to remain current in finance. IAS are expected to report their professional development activities and accomplishments in their Annual Faculty Activity Report.
- b. **Service.** The service component of an IAS member's responsibility is outlined in section **III.B.3**. IAS are expected to report their service activities in their Annual Faculty Activity Report.
- c. **Other Activities.** Any meritorious activities or accomplishments as a university citizen not explicitly included in review criteria **IV.A.2.a-c** above (or sections **III.B.1-3**), and not considered a part of Base Merit should be described in the appropriate section of the Annual Faculty Activity Report or highlighted in an explanatory cover letter to that report.

Annual (Merit) Review Procedures. The procedures for evaluating instructional academic staff and distributing any merit salary dollars follow those of the faculty members; however, IAS merit salary dollars are obtained from a separate pool of funds than those distributed to the ranked faculty.

- 3. **Non-Instructional Academic Staff** (if included in merit processes, otherwise see VII).

Not Applicable

V. Ranked Faculty Personnel Review

The department will follow the policies regarding retention and tenure described in the Faculty Personnel Rules (UWS 3.06 - 3.11 and UWL 3.06 -3.08) <https://kb.uwlax.edu/104775>.

Tenure/retention decisions will be guided by the criteria established in the by-laws at the time of hire unless a candidate elects to be considered under newer guidelines. The criteria outlined in Section V. A & V. B. "Faculty Personnel Review" in these by-laws should be applied to faculty with a contract date after

June 30, 2011

The department will follow policies guiding part-time appointments for faculty and tenure clock stoppage available on the Human Resources website.

A. Promotion, Retention and Tenure Committee (PRT)

The Promotion, Renewal and Tenure Committee for the Finance Department shall consist of at least three tenured members in the Department. Necessary members include those who hold at least a one-half-time teaching position in the Department. In case that the number of necessary tenured members in the Department does not meet the minimum size requirement for the PRT committee, Dean should provide a list of additional members, from which the department chair can decide to add to the PRT committee. Academic Staff, as well as other non-tenured members of the department, are not eligible to serve on the Promotion, Renewal and Tenure Committee.

No member of the Committee who is eligible for promotion shall take part in his or her promotion decision or the decision related to other members in the Department who are eligible for promotion to the same rank.

The Committee will establish and publish the by-laws it will use in its deliberations regarding promotion, retention, and tenure.

The initial review of probationary faculty shall be conducted by the Finance Department's Promotion, Renewal and Tenure Committee which shall consist of the tenured members of the department. The PRT Chairperson shall be elected by a simple majority of the committee members voting. The term of office shall be one year.

B. Retention and Tenure (procedure, criteria, and appeal)

The retention decision requires that, in the judgment of the PRT committee, the probationary faculty member will have met or demonstrates the potential to meet the criteria for tenure as outlined in this document. If the committee reappoints with reservations, reservations should be clearly documented and discussed with the faculty member being reviewed.

1. Procedure for Retention

The Department chairperson shall give written notice of the department review to each probationary faculty member subject to review at least 20 days prior to the review. At least 7 days prior to the review, the probationary faculty member shall provide the chairperson of the department with the following information:

Faculty under review provide an electronic portfolio related to their teaching, scholarships, and service activities extracted from their date of hire to date of review, along with a narrative. Additional materials (copies of exams and access to the Learning Management System courses) may be required for the departmental review and will be indicated in the written notice of department review.

- Scholarship materials the faculty member wishes the committee to consider should be included in the electronic portfolio.
- The department chairperson shall provide the PRT Committee with the following information: (1) Teaching assignment information (TAI) datasheet that summarizes the courses taught, workload data, grade distribution and LENS summary by individual course and semester (which are only available after completing a full academic year) ; and (2) Merit evaluation data (if available).

2. Procedure for Tenure

The department chairperson shall give written notice of the department review at least 20 days prior to the reviews. At least 7 days prior to the review, the probationary faculty member shall provide the chairperson of the PRT Committee with the following information:

- a. A completed copy of the CBA Faculty Report or Performance Summary which summarizes all relevant activities in previous years at UW-L.
- b. Copies of any research which the faculty member wishes to be considered by the Committee.

- c. Any other material which the faculty member wishes to be considered by the Committee.
- d. Any other materials requested by the Committee.

The department chairperson shall provide the chairperson of the PRT Committee with the following information for each tenure candidate:

- a. TAI form with LENS summary
- b. The information provided by the candidate to the department chair.
- c. Any other information requested by the committee which could have a bearing on the potential performance of the tenure candidate.

Faculty under review will provide an electronic portfolio related to their teaching, scholarship, and service activities extracted from their date of hire to date of review. Hyperlinked syllabi and a narrative are required, and the candidate may choose to provide additional evidence. Additional materials may be required for departmental review.

In accordance with UW-L 3.05, the areas in evaluation shall include:

- 1. Teaching
- 2. Research
- 3. Professional and Public Service
- 4. Contribution to the University

The above areas do not necessarily carry the same weights. A more detailed version of the areas and criteria in evaluation is presented in the current Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, UW-L 3.05.

Methods of Evaluation

- a. Evaluation of Area 1 includes both student learning environment surveys and peer evaluation. Evaluation of Areas 2, 3, and 4 shall be accomplished by peer evaluation. More detailed versions of the methods of evaluations can be found in UWL 3.05 (<https://kb.uwlax.edu/104774>).
- b. Members of the committee shall review renewal and required improvements letters from previous years and shall assess current and potential performance in part on the basis of recommendations made in these letters.
- c. Departments will provide the following materials to the dean:
 - 1. Department letter of recommendation with vote
 - 2. Teaching assignment information (TAI) datasheet that summarizes the courses taught, workload data, grade distribution and LENS survey by individual course and semester (which are only available after completing a full academic year); and
 - 3. Merit evaluation data (if available).

Probationary faculty

The initial review of probationary faculty shall be conducted by the tenured faculty of the appropriate department in the manner outlined below.

The renewal (tenure) decisions by the committee shall be regarded as peer judgment of future performance. Consequently, in making a renewal (tenure) decision, the committee shall consider all things that have a bearing on the potential of the renewal (tenure) candidate. Since it is virtually impossible to quantitatively define and forecast future performance, each member of the committee must make a subjective evaluation of the relevant factors and arrive at a decision. For tenure, a candidate must, at a minimum, have exceeded the Group 1 requirements for being Scholarly Academic according to the CBA Scholarly Guidelines during their probationary period. Further, a candidate must maintain the Scholarly Academic standing throughout their probationary period. The expectations laid forth in the department statements on teaching, scholarship, and service shall be used in renewal and tenure decisions.

After discussion of the relevant data, the committee shall vote on a motion to renew the candidate's appointment (grant tenure). Renewal (tenure) requires a simple majority. A tie vote, therefore, shall result in failure to renew (grant tenure).

The PRT Committee chairperson shall assign a member of the committee to draft a letter recommending renewal (tenure) or non-renewal (tenure) which shall include the outcome of the vote. The renewal (tenure) letter shall include reasons for renewal (tenure). If during the decision process members of the committee identify areas where the renewal candidate needs improvement, the candidate shall be informed of these areas. A list of required improvements shall be communicated to the renewal candidate through a separate required improvements letter, not through the letter recommending renewal. A copy of the required improvements letter shall be retained by the committee to be used for evaluation purposes in subsequent years. In the event of non-renewal, a separate list of reasons shall be drafted. The committee will review both the letter draft and list (if required), make necessary changes, and send the letter to the department chairperson along with a copy to the renewal (tenure) candidate. The PRT Committee chairperson shall be the official and sole spokesperson for the committee.

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 Human Resources Department. Formal reviews resulting in contract decisions will minimally occur for tenure-track faculty in their 2nd, 4th and 6th years.

3. Appealing a Retention or Tenure Decision

The probationary faculty member shall have all the rights of appeal as outlined in <https://kb.uwlax.edu/104775>, more specifically UWL 3.06 Renewal of appointments and granting of tenure; UWL 3.07 Non-renewal of probationary faculty member's appointment; UWS 3.08 Appeal of a non-renewal decision.

C. Post-tenure Review (PTR)

1. Each tenured faculty member's activities and performance will be reviewed by the Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Committee according to the review cycle established by UW-L Human Resources. Newly tenured faculty and tenured faculty who have recently undergone review for promotion will enter the rotation five years after the date of their tenure/promotion. All procedures must be in compliance with the UW-L Post-Tenure Review Policy (10-31-2016). <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/post-tenure-review-policy/>.

2. The PTR Committee comprised of all tenured faculty members, with a minimum of 3 tenured faculty members. The Department Chair serves as a committee member and chair of the committee unless the department chair is being reviewed. In that case, the committee shall elect a chair. In the event that there are not three tenured department members, the Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean and the faculty member, shall meet to select outside members. If there is not a mutual agreement, the Dean shall have the final say in the selection of the outside members.
3. Upon receiving notification from the HR, the Department Chair will give the faculty member at least 21 calendar day's notification of the time/date of the meeting and the deadline for which the materials asked by the PTR Committee will be due.
4. The Department Chair will circulate, at least seven calendar days prior to the committee meeting, the relevant merit files, electronic portfolio for the review window, and TAI for each semester being evaluated, among the other members of the committee for review.
5. Each faculty member's activities will be reviewed using the results of the merit committee's evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service. The candidate will receive a Post Tenure Review evaluation of "meets expectations" if the candidate meets the CBA scholarly guidelines and is found to be satisfactory in teaching and service. See Appendices X and Y for how teaching and service are evaluated. . The PTR chair provides a letter to the Dean, the faculty member, and the member's department file within 14 calendar days of the personnel meeting (no later than December 15) with the following information:
 - a) The date and the numerical result of the vote indicating the overall categorization of "meets expectations" for the faculty member. The letter should include the names of all the tenured faculty who voted and the committee chair's signature.
 - b) A brief description of the consensus points of the committee regarding the faculty member's strengths in teaching, scholarship, and/or service that formed the basis for the committee's "meets expectations" decision. The faculty member can request a meeting with the committee chair to discuss the evaluation further if the faculty member wishes.
6. If the faculty member under review "does not meet expectations", The PTR Committee Chair provides a letter to the Dean, and the faculty member within 14 calendar days of the personnel meeting (no later than December 15) with the following information:
 - a) The date and the numerical result of the vote indicating the overall categorization of "does not meet expectations" for the faculty member. The letter should include the names of all of the tenured faculty who voted, the committee chair's signature, as well as a statement indicating that the committee recommends the development of a remediation plan.
 - b) A description of the consensus points of the committee regarding the faculty member's work in teaching, scholarship, and/or service with a clear identification of any deficiencies that formed the basis for the committee's "does not meet expectations" decision.
 - c) The department will also forward the faculty's LENS summary.
7. The faculty member will receive the Dean's letter by February 1, and Provost's letter by March 1 of the same academic year of the departmental post-tenure review indicating whether Provost concurs with the department's categorization.
8. If the faculty member wishes to provide written commentary on the PTR Committee letter at any step of the process, s/he must provide the letter within 7 calendar days after the receipt of the PTR decision letter at the department, Dean, and/or Provost level. The letter should be addressed to the most recent review level and to the upcoming review level.
9. If the Provost does not concur with the department, no remedial plan is required. However, if the Provost sends a letter concurring with the department's decision, the Dean will initiate a face-to-face meeting with the faculty member and the PTR Committee chair within 21 calendar days of the date of the Provost's letter. If the faculty member rejects the opportunity for a face-

- to-face meeting or is unable to schedule such a meeting, the Dean will complete the process without consultation with the faculty member.
10. Prior to the meeting with the Dean, the PTR Committee chair and the faculty member will develop a written plan for mentoring and professional development to address the issue(s) leading to the “does not meet expectations” decision. The remediation plan should clearly indicate the links between the deficiency or deficiencies indicated and the specific goals and outcomes for the faculty member.
 11. The faculty member may choose one other tenured faculty member from the university to attend the meeting as a liaison (if desired). The Dean may also elect to have one other tenured faculty member or administrator from the university attend the meeting as a liaison (if desired) if the PTR Committee chair cannot be in attendance.
 12. The final remediation plan:
 - a) shall be the product of mutual discussion between the faculty member, the PTR Committee chair, and the Dean, shall respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and shall be flexible enough to allow for subsequent alteration.
 - b) is referred to as developmental as its purpose is to help the faculty member reach appropriate improvement goals in line with the area(s) of deficiency identified.
 - c) shall list resources for appropriate support from the department, Dean, and/or other campus resources as applicable. Specific financial resources, including supplies and equipment, reassignment time, etc. for supporting a scholarly agenda should also be identified and agreed upon, if needed.
 - d) shall clearly indicate a deadline (not to exceed three academic semesters starting the Fall subsequent to the development of remediation plan) by which time all elements of the plan must be satisfied. The faculty person can request an earlier deadline if s/he wishes.
 - e) shall indicate that 1) a progress meeting will be scheduled with the Dean, the PTR Committee chair, and the faculty member approximately one semester into the plan to help determine progress and identify additional improvement resources that may aid the faculty member, and 2) that a final remediation follow-up meeting will occur between the Dean, the PTR Committee chair, and the faculty member after the deadline, but before the start of the subsequent academic semester, and not to exceed 21 calendar days past the deadline (e.g., if three semesters are provided, within 21 calendar days of the close of the 3rd semester.).
 - f) shall indicate the specific consequence(s) of not meeting the goals of the remediation plan by the deadline. Consequences can range from informal sanctions such as workload assignments, to discipline short of dismissal for cause (such as suspension without pay), or in extreme instances, dismissal for cause, under UWS Chapter 4.
 13. Within 7 days of the meeting, the PTR Committee chair will provide the finalized remediation plan to the Dean, who will forward the plan to the Provost and HR. The final remediation plan will be on official UWL letterhead and will be signed by the faculty member, the departmental PTR committee chair, the Dean, and the Provost. All signatories will receive a final signed electronic copy of this plan from HR within 14 days of the meeting.
 14. At least 7 days prior to the final remediation follow-up meeting, the PTR Committee will write a letter to the Dean indicating whether the faculty member has either met or not met the goals of the remediation plan, including evidence for the decision. At the meeting, the Dean will consult with the PTR Committee chair and the faculty member about the evidence indicating that the faculty member has met or not met the obligations of the remediation plan.

15. The remediation follow-up meeting will result in a letter from the Dean to the faculty member and the Provost (copy to department Chair and HR) indicating that the faculty member has either
 - a) Met the conditions of the remediation plan, with a statement regarding when the next formal post-tenure review by the department will occur (either sooner or 5 years from the date of the review that triggered the remediation plan). OR
 - b) Not met the conditions of the remediation plan. If the remediation plan has not been met, the letter will include information regarding the sanctions, discipline, or dismissal procedures. Procedures in UWS4 or UWS 6 will be followed. The Provost will make the final determination in cases where the conditions of the remediation plan were deemed not to have been met by either the PTR Committee or the Dean.
16. Tenured faculty members who are completing a remediation plan or have been found to have not met the conditions of a remediation plan, are not eligible for equity adjustments based on merit. If/when the remediation plan is successfully completed, the faculty member is once again eligible, but retroactive pay cannot be awarded.
17. In those few remediation plans related to a performance shortfall in research where more than three academic semesters may be necessary to correct identified deficiencies, an extension of one academic semester shall be permitted only with the approval of the Provost, which shall trigger a notification of that extension to the UW System Administration Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs.
18. A faculty member cannot appeal a negative post-tenure review decision at the departmental level. Furthermore, the reviews conducted, and remediation plans developed in accordance with this policy are not subject to the grievance process set forth in Chapter UWS 6.02, Wis. Admin. Code.

D. Ranked Faculty Promotion Procedures (procedure, criteria and appeal)

The initial review of ranked faculty eligible for promotion shall be conducted by the Finance Department's Promotion, Renewal, and Tenure Committee which shall consist of the tenured members of the department.

The department will follow the guidelines and schedules regarding ranked faculty promotion available at <https://www.uwlax.edu/academic-affairs/provost-promotion-resources/>.

1. Departmental Procedure for Promotion

The timeframe for the following procedures must be in accordance with the university calendar available at <https://www.uwlax.edu/academic-affairs/provost-promotion-resources/>.

The review procedures for promotion will be essentially the same as the review procedure for granting of tenure outlined in UW-L Fin. 3.06.

2. Criteria for Promotion

The Fin. PRT Committee, when deciding to recommend (or not recommend) for promotion, will consider the University criteria for promotion as its primary criteria. (See Employee Handbook, Section I and <https://kb.uwlax.edu/104534>). The department statements on teaching, scholarship, and service will be considered as well. A candidate recommended for promotion should have exceeded the Group 1 requirements to be Scholarly Academic according to the CBA Scholarly Guidelines while continuously maintaining SA status during their time at their current rank.

3. Appealing a Promotion Decision

Department Level: Within 7 days of receiving the written reasons for a negative decision, the candidate may, by writing to the department chair the Finance PRT Committee chair, appeal the PRT committee recommendation. An appeal review shall take place within 14 days of the filing date. The faculty member shall be given at least 7 days' notice of such review.

Written notice of the reconsideration decision shall be transmitted to the candidate and appropriate dean within seven days.

University Level: Within 7 days of receiving the written reasons for a negative decision, the candidate may, by writing to the Joint Promotion Committee chair, appeal the Joint Promotion committee recommendation. An appeal review shall take place within 14 days of the filing date. The faculty member shall be given at least 7 days' notice of such review.

The burden of proof in such an appeal shall be on the faculty member, and the scope of the review shall be limited to the question of whether the decision was based in any significant degree upon one or more of the following factors, with material prejudice to the individual:

- (a) Conduct, expressions, or beliefs that are constitutionally protected, or protected by the principles of academic freedom, or
- (b) Factors proscribed by the applicable state or federal law regarding fair employment practices, or
- (c) Improper consideration of qualifications for promotion. For purpose of the section, "improper consideration" shall be deemed to have been given to the qualifications of a faculty member in question if material prejudice resulted because of any of the following:
 - 1. The procedures required by rules of the faculty or board were not followed, or
 - 2. Available data bearing materially on the quality of performance were not considered, or
 - 3. Unfounded, arbitrary, or irrelevant assumptions of fact were made about work or conduct.

Written notice of the results of the appeal shall be transmitted to the candidate and appropriate department chair within seven days.

VI. Instructional Academic Staff Review

A. General

All academic staff must be evaluated on an annual basis as specified in the UWL Employee Handbook <https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/offices-services/equity--affirmative-action/uw-handbook2015.pdf>. The evaluation shall be done by the department chair. The academic staff member shall be evaluated in accordance with the applicable parts of the department merit form and will use the same timeline as the rest of the department for submission of materials. A written notification of the evaluation shall be filed with the dean and a copy provided to the academic staff member within 14 days after the evaluation has been completed.

Academic Staff appointments may take many forms. Those most commonly used in academic departments are the Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, Teaching Professor, Research Associate, Visiting Scholar, and Faculty Associate. Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) in the Department of Finance are held to the same teaching expectations as tenure track faculty (see section **III.A**). Because IAS do not have the full range of tenure track faculty responsibilities (section **III.B**), their teaching load is usually larger than that of the tenure track faculty. Any special expectations of a member of the academic staff are stated in the contract

letter.

B. Annual Review.

In accordance with Faculty Personnel rules **UWS 3.05 -3.11 and UWL 3.08**, academic staff will be evaluated annually. The IAS Personnel Review Form will accompany the department's evaluation.

Timing of Reviews

Evaluations of instructional academic staff will occur in the spring semester. Each IAS member will provide an electronic portfolio related to their teaching, professional development / scholarship / creative activity, and service activities extracted either from their date of hire to date of review or from their previous two years of employment, whichever is less. Hyperlinked syllabi are required, and the IAS member may choose to provide additional evidence. The chair will remind each instructional academic staff member to submit an updated IAS Report-Individual (from Digital Measures), a **current vita**, and any **supplemental materials** deemed appropriate to the Chair of the Department of Finance at least **fourteen days** prior to the date of the review. Academic staff members may make oral or written presentations at the review meeting. The requirements of the *Wisconsin Open Meeting Law* shall apply to the review meeting.

1. Review Procedure.

a. The review of instructional academic staff shall be conducted by the chair of the finance department in the manner outlined below.

Using the criteria in section **VI.A.1.a** (below) the department chair shall evaluate each IAS member's performance based on the updated IAS Report -Individual, *vita*, department Annual (Merit) Review data (if available), classroom mentor and peer evaluator reports, learning environment survey (LENS), and any other information, written or oral, presented.

In order to obtain a recommendation for reappointment, the IAS member's performance must be judged to be satisfactory (see section **VI.A.1.a**).

In the case of a non-renewal recommendation, the department chair shall prepare written reasons for their decision. These reasons shall be reported to the instructional academic staff member by the department chair.

Within **seven** days of the review meeting, each IAS member shall be informed in writing by the department chair of the results of the retention review. In the case of a positive retention decision, the written notice shall include concerns or suggestions for improvement.

b. **Criteria.** The chair of the finance department shall use the submitted self, peer, and learning environment survey information to judge each IAS member's performance in the areas of teaching, professional development / scholarship / creative activity, and service using the criteria outlined in section **III.B**. It is expected that all academic staff members will direct some effort to all areas of IAS responsibility; however, it is expected that the primary focus of these efforts will be on teaching.

C. Career Progression Procedures

The Department of Finance follows the *Guide to Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Career Progression and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse*, approved by the UW-L Faculty Senate

on 10/25/07. Candidates for career progression must conform their application portfolio to the guidelines given therein.

The Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Career Progression Review shall be conducted by the department chair. The department chair shall work with the dean to make a recommendation for career progression. The department chair shall establish the date for the career progression consideration meeting in accordance with established university deadlines for the IAS career progression process in a given year. Recommendations for career progression will be reported to the department by the chair.

For positive recommendations, the department chair shall include a written recommendation as part of the "Department IAS Career Progression Review. With these materials, the department chair shall also transmit a written recommendation to the dean including a two-year appointment. A copy of this letter shall be provided to the candidate at least one day prior to the submission of the progression file to the dean.

When a candidate is not recommended for progression by the department, no further consideration shall occur, nor shall the candidate's file be forwarded to the dean. The career progression candidate shall be given written notification of the negative decision and written reasons for a negative decision within seven days.

1. Criteria. To be considered for progression to a higher title, IAS must meet the minimum university criteria as stated in the *Guide to Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Career Progression and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse* as approved by the UW-L Faculty Senate on 10/25/07. Departmental expectations for IAS are described in section **III.B**

For the rank of **Associate Teaching Professor**, a candidate must have completed 10 full-time semesters teaching in higher education or other appropriate experience with at least 6 full-time semesters teaching at UWL at the Assistant rank. The candidate must provide evidence of a strong record of *accomplishment* in teaching as evidenced by self-assessment, peer reviews, annual/merit evaluations, and learning environment surveys. Evidence of professional development, scholarship and/or service as described in section **III.B** is also expected.

For the rank of **Teaching Professor**, a candidate must have completed 20 full-time semesters teaching in higher education or other appropriate experience with at least 4 full-time semesters teaching at UWL at the Associate rank. The candidate must be able to demonstrate a sustained record of *accomplishment* in teaching and a sustained record of accomplishment in the areas of professional development, scholarship and/or service as described in section **III.B**.

2. Standards. In keeping with the IAS Career Progression guidelines put forth by the Faculty Senate, the criteria used to evaluate IAS for progression shall be the standard three areas of IAS responsibility outlined in section **III.B**: teaching, professional development, scholarship, and service to the department and institution, the profession, and/or the public. In ranking the importance of the areas of IAS responsibility, teaching is of primary importance, followed by professional development, scholarship and/or service.

D. Appeal Procedures.

Within seven days of receiving the written reasons for a negative progression decision, the candidate may, by writing to the department chairperson, request a reconsideration by a

departmental committee to review the decision. The reconsideration review shall take place within 10 days of the filing date. The IAS member shall be given at least 7 days' notice of such review. The IAS member shall be allowed an opportunity to respond to the written reasons, to present written or oral evidence or arguments relevant to the decision, and/or to use witnesses. Reconsideration shall be non-adversarial in nature. The committee shall give fair and full consideration to all relevant materials. Written notice of the reconsideration decision shall be transmitted to the candidate and to the appropriate dean within seven days.

Each career progression candidate has the right to appeal a negative reconsideration decision in a grievance filed with the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals, and Academic Freedom (CGAAF) Committee. Rules and procedures for filing a grievance are specified in *UWS 6.02* and *UWL 6.02* <https://kb.uwlax.edu/104775>. The Complaints, Grievances, Appeals, and Academic Freedom Committee shall forward its recommendation to the Provost after completion of its review (see *UWS 6.05*).

VII. Non-Instructional Academic Staff Review (if applicable)

In Accordance with Faculty Personnel rules UWS 3.05-3.11 and UWL 3.08, academic staff will be evaluated annually.

VIII. Governance

A. Department Chair

1. Election of the Department Chair

Eligibility Requirements for Voting – All members of a department holding at least half- time appointment are eligible to vote provided they have the status of:

- a) Ranked Faculty designated as holding appointments or tenure in a department.
- b) Instructional Academic Staff or Academic Librarians holding appointments in a department who have been granted eligibility by action of the Ranked Faculty of the department.
- c) Ranked Faculty, Instructional Academic Staff, or Academic Librarians described in a) or b) whose leave of absence from the university or assignment of duties outside the department will terminate within the three-year term of the chairperson to be elected.
- d) Ranked Faculty, Instructional Academic Staff, or Academic Librarians who are not in positions of administrative authority over the department chairpersons with the titles of dean, associate dean, assistant chancellor, assistant vice chancellor, provost/vice chancellor, or chancellor.
- e) Faculty or academic staff who claim membership in a department or who have been extended voting privileges by a majority of the other eligible voters of the department on grounds that their university appointment is functionally part of the department's activities.

Eligibility Requirements for Serving as Chairperson – All members of a department shall be eligible to serve as department chairperson provided they are:

- a) Tenured and of the rank of assistant professor or above.
- b) On staff of this university at least three full semesters.

- c) Not on terminal contract or temporary appointment.

Term of Office – A term of office shall be three years subject to removal for cause. The term shall start on July 1 of the year elected.

Method of Selection – Departments with fewer than five members eligible to vote shall have the chairperson appointed by the Chancellor. Departments with five or more members eligible to vote shall elect the chairperson under the following procedures:

- a) Elections shall be held during the month of February.
- b) The dean shall send nominating ballots, containing the names of all members of the department eligible to serve as chairperson to each member of the department eligible to vote.
- c) Each person receiving a ballot shall nominate one person and return it to the dean who shall tabulate the results.
- d) The dean shall determine whether or not the two persons receiving the highest number of votes are willing to serve if elected; however, if one person has received nominations from 60 percent or more of the eligible voters, that person shall be declared elected.
- e) If a chairperson has not been selected in the nomination balloting, the dean shall place the names of the two persons receiving the highest number of nominations on a ballot and sent it to eligible voters for an election.
- f) Each person receiving the ballot shall vote for one person and return it to the dean.
- g) The dean shall tabulate the results of the election and submit the name of the nominee receiving the most votes as the chairperson-elect to the provost/vice chancellor for approval, who in turn, shall submit it to the chancellor for approval. If approval is not given, the dean shall conduct another election under the provisions of this policy.

Additional information on policies can be found at:

<https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/committees/faculty-senate/20211004-policies-fs.pdf>

2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair

The department will adhere to the selection and duties of the Chair that are delineated in the Faculty Senate Policies (<https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/committees/faculty-senate/20211004-policies-fs.pdf>) under the heading "IV. Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons " and "V. The Selection of Department Chairpersons" and "VI. Remuneration of Department Chairpersons." in addition references to chair-related duties are stated throughout the Employee Handbook.

B. Standing Departmental Committees

Ranked faculty and full-time instructional academic staff are expected to serve on departmental committees as assigned by the department chair, College of Business Administration committees as assigned by the department chair, and university committees. Standing departmental committees include the Curriculum Committee; Merit Committee; Bylaw Committee; and Promotion, Retention, and Tenure committee. Faculty make up the Bylaw and Curriculum Committees. Ranked faculty make up the Merit Committee. Tenured faculty make up the Promotion, Retention, and Tenure committee. Other responsibilities, as assigned by the chair of

the department, include search and screen committees, library liaison, advisor for the Financial Management Association, and assessment.

Standing committees within the College of Business Administration requiring representation by Finance faculty or instructional academic staff include CBA Curriculum Committee; Assessment of Learning (AOL) Committee; Technology Advisory Committee; International Business Advisory Committee and CBA Scholarship Committee.

C. Departmental Programmatic Assessment Plan (if not included in VIII. B.)

A faculty member(s) will be responsible for coordinating and reporting programmatic assessment as requested by the department chair.

A department may wish to reference Academic Program Review (APR) procedures and schedules in this section.

D. Additional departmental policies

Departmental Salary Equity Policy: Faculty who believe they are entitled to an equity adjustment, for example in cases involving (a) recent acquisition of a Ph.D.; (b) gender or racial inequity; and (c) “inversion” and “compression,” may ask the Department chair to consider recommending a salary equity adjustment to the Deans. The department chair will scrutinize salaries for evidence of inequity and make a decision whether to support a salary equity adjustment. A faculty member denied a salary equity adjustment recommendation by the chair shall have the right to appeal the decision of the chair to the tenured members of the faculty. The chair shall supply the tenured faculty data on salaries and will forward their recommendation to the Dean.

Sick leave: Department members will account for sick leave in adherence to the most current UW System guidelines: <https://www.wisconsin.edu/uw-policies/uw-system-administrative-policies/sick-leave/>.

Bereavement: The department will offer funeral leave according to the most current UW System guidelines.

Vacation: For unclassified staff, 12-month employees garner vacation time, 9-month employees do not.

E. Professional Development for Faculty

The Department Chair reviews the department budget in Fall and allocates an equal dollar figure to each faculty member. Faculty can use the funds to support professional development (travel, software and journal submission fees, or other areas as approved). Faculty receiving startup funds or on 100% sabbatical leave are not eligible for department budget allocated professional development funds. Faculty must submit a spend plan by March 1 to the Department Chair. Any funds not tied to the spend plan are moved back to the department budget and allocated out at the Chair’s discretion. Faculty who do not plan to spend all of their allocated professional development budget are encouraged to notify the Department Chair **as soon as possible** before the March 1 spend plan deadline for reallocation across the department.

IX. Search and Screen Procedures

Departmental search and screen committee members will be appointed by the chair in consultation with a CBA dean. Members outside the department will be considered at the dean's recommendation. Members appointed will be asked if willing to serve. A convener will be appointed by the chair, in consultation with the dean. The chair of the committee will be elected by the committee.

The department will follow hiring procedures prescribed by the University's Office of Human Resources (HR) in conjunction with AAO, UW System and WI state regulations. The UWL Search and Screen Policy and Procedures are to be followed for all faculty and staff recruitments at UWL.

A. Tenure-track faculty

The approved UW-L tenure track faculty recruitment and hiring policy & procedures are found at <https://kb.uwlax.edu/104752>.

Additionally, UW-L's spousal/partner hiring policy can be found at <https://kb.uwlax.edu/103693>.

B. Instructional Academic Staff

Hiring policy and procedures are found at <https://kb.uwlax.edu/104752>.

C. Contingency Workforce (Pool Search)

Hiring policy and procedures are found at <https://kb.uwlax.edu/104752>.

D. Academic Staff (if applicable)

Hiring policy and procedures are found at <https://kb.uwlax.edu/104752>.

X. Student Rights and Obligations

A. Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures²

² THE UW-L STUDENT HONOR POLICY. STUDENT HONOR CODE (<HTTPS://WWW.UWLAX.EDU/STUDENT-LIFE/OUR-SERVICES/STUDENT-CONDUCT/ACADEMIC-MISCONDUCT/>) "WE, THE STUDENTS OF UW-LA CROSSE, BELIEVE THAT ACADEMIC HONESTY AND INTEGRITY ARE FUNDAMENTAL TO THE MISSION OF HIGHER EDUCATION. WE, AS STUDENTS, ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE HONEST COMPLETION AND REPRESENTATION OF OUR WORK AND RESPECT FOR OTHERS' ACADEMIC ENDEAVORS. IT IS OUR MORAL RESPONSIBILITY AS STUDENTS TO UPHOLD THESE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND TO RESPECT THE CHARACTER OF THE INDIVIDUALS AND THE UNIVERSITY."

Any student or group of students who has a complaint about faculty behavior is encouraged to resolve the complaint informally. Informal attempts may include but are not limited to:

- meeting directly with the faculty member and/or instructional academic staff
- meeting with the student's advisor
- meeting with the department chair
- meeting with an ad-hoc departmental complaint committee charged to address the issue
- meeting with any combination of such people

The intention of such meetings is to clarify misunderstandings or miscommunications that may be the source of the complaint. If informal procedures are unsuccessful (or within 90 days of the last incident) or if the student chooses not to resolve the complaint using the informal procedures, a student or group of students who wishes to pursue a complaint can do so by informing Multicultural Student Services (<https://www.uwlax.edu/multicultural-student-services/academic-resources/report-a-concern/>) or Student Affairs (<https://www.uwlax.edu/student-affairs/student-concerns-and-complaints/>).

B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct

Academic and nonacademic misconduct policy referenced:

<https://www.uwlax.edu/student-life/student-resources/student-handbook/#tm-student-code-of-conduct>

<https://www.uwlax.edu/student-life/our-services/student-conduct/academic-misconduct/>

<https://www.uwlax.edu/student-life/our-services/student-conduct/nonacademic-misconduct/>

C. Advising Policy

Students are assigned to a departmental advisor by the CBA Dean's office.

XI. Other

A. Class Scheduling

The following class scheduling guidelines were adopted by the Department of Finance in recognition of the priority which exists between student needs and faculty needs as they pertain to the scheduling of classes. As such, the guidelines are intended to provide direction for the department chairperson with the purpose of maintaining consistency (following the Master Plan of Course Offerings) and equity (for department members). Therefore, while the guidelines provide direction, they also provide avenues for students and department members to appeal class schedules.

1. The first priority is the needs of the students. Department member needs, as they relate to class scheduling, are secondary.
2. UW-La Crosse prides itself on individual contact between teachers and students. Since large class sizes reduce the possibility of individual contact, every reasonable effort will be made to keep class section sizes below 45 students.
3. Every reasonable effort will be made to follow the "master plan of course offerings".

4. Given student needs, every reasonable effort will be made to match class offerings with department member preferences.
5. A "previously taught" listing of courses and sections by department members will be maintained. This list will also reflect new preparations.
6. An inventory of department member teaching qualifications and preferences will be maintained. It will include courses department members: (a) were hired to teach, (b) are qualified to teach, and (c) would like to teach.
7. Every reasonable attempt will be made to avoid assigning three preparations to an unwilling department member.
8. Every reasonable effort will be made to equitably balance the individual department member teaching loads. This balance includes such things as number of preparations, number of new preparations, number of students, and class meeting times.

B. Summer Session Appointments

Off-term Teaching: The goal of the Finance Department regarding off-term teaching loads is to provide teaching opportunities to all ranked faculty whenever possible and to serve the needs of the students. The summer class schedule, developed by the department chair, in consultation with the Dean and senior department members, is based on the academic strengths, seniority, and teaching preferences of the involved faculty in conjunction with the historical "drawing power" of each class.

At the time of this writing, compensation for summer courses is based on a set amount per student, not to exceed \$6,000 for J-term or \$7,000 for summer; however, summer payment policies are subject to change and are set by the Dean's Office. Compensation received for teaching MBA classes and other outside sources of funding shall NOT be included in the consideration of undergraduate course assignments.

Position Swaps

Procedure to be followed if a person does not wish to accept a summer position:

- A. If the person affected can work out a "swap" with another faculty member for that person's succeeding summer slot(s), he may do so; e.g., if person X does not wish to accept his slot(s) for summer 2013, he may work out a "swap" with anyone else in the department to take his allocation for summer 2014. Thus, in summer 2014, person X would have his own slot and the one he had traded for. When summer appointments are swapped prior to the issuance of letters recommending appointments, the new salaries will be used in determining the number of slots. After the issuance of letters, the department chairperson will determine whether salary differentials are significant enough to warrant the distribution of any extra dollars.
- B. "Swaps" involve risks, particularly to the faculty member who is to receive a slot(s) in the future. All risks are to be assumed by the traders. Example: Suppose person X swaps a position in 2014 to person Y. If person Y leaves in 2015 and therefore is ineligible for a summer position in 2015), then person X loses out of the position that person Y was to return in 2015.

- C. If no such swap can be worked out, the slot(s) shall be allocated among the remaining eligible members.

Retiring faculty members

To provide maximum retirement benefits for all retiring members at the department, the retiring member will be allocated a full-time summer appointment (consisting of two-ninths of his/her academic salary) in each of the last three years prior to retirement. This provision is subject to the following qualifications:

- A. The retiring member must have a minimum of ten years with the department by the date letters recommending appointment are to be forwarded to the dean.
- B. A member who completes the three full summer appointments made available by the department for retirement is no longer eligible for summer appointments.
- C. This section of the summer session by-laws (Retiring Faculty Members) is automatically rescinded if the retirement plan is changed so that the department's allocation of summer positions does not impact on retirement benefits. For example, if the retirement plan is changed so that benefits are based on academic rather than annual salary, this section of the by-laws is rescinded requiring no further action on part of the department.

C. Sabbatical leaves, faculty development leaves, and released time for research

- 1. It is the policy of the Department of Finance to encourage participation by department members seeking sabbatical and faculty development leaves and research funding.
- 2. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to seek non-departmental funding for support of sabbaticals, faculty development leaves and research projects.
- 3. After exhausting external sources of support for his/her sabbatical, development leave or research project, the individual faculty member may approach the department for assistance.
- 4. Departmental assistance may consist of (but is not limited to) the following:
 - a. Released time for research approved by the department.
 - b. Supplies and graduate/undergraduate and secretarial assistance for research approved by the department.
 - c. Absorbing the workload of a faculty member on approved sabbatical/faculty development leave by one semester.
 - d. Absorbing the workload of a faculty member not on approved sabbatical or faculty development leave in order to provide a one-semester development leave program approved by the department.
- 5. A vote of the Finance Department will recommend faculty for development and sabbatical leaves.

D. Periodic Review

Evaluation of classroom performance of all faculty members in the department shall be conducted each semester during the academic year in the following manner:

- 1 Learning Environment Survey with a department approved instrument shall be administered each semester in a manner consistent with University policy. The evaluation item shall be the LENS summary.
2. The department chairperson shall confer privately with each faculty member as soon as possible following each semester to discuss teaching related incidents that have been called to the attention of the chairperson, the summary of LENS, and other evaluation or improvement of instruction instruments used by the faculty member.

E. Office Space

Order of preference for all vacated faculty offices (with the exception of the office reserved for the acting chair of the Department) is given to seniority within ranks where ranks are ordered as follows: 1. Tenured Professors, 2. Teaching Professors, 3. Untenured Professors, 4. Assistant and Associate Teaching Professors. Assignment/reassignment only upon vacancies.

Appendix A

Department Statement on Teaching

Behavioral Guidelines:

Faculty members are expected to comply with the following behavioral expectations:

- Hold class as scheduled in the timetable
- Conduct rigorous classes
- Ensure currency of courses
- Maintain grade distributions in line with the departmental average
- Hold a reasonable number of office hours to accommodate student needs
- Select appropriate and current textbooks and other published teaching materials
- Develop and use appropriate syllabi, tests, written assignments, and supplementary handouts
- Adequately prepare for class and use appropriate classroom pedagogy
- Respect the dignity of students by providing fair and equitable treatment

Evaluation Criteria:

When evaluating the teaching work of faculty, the Department considers examples of teaching activity such as those enumerated below as the fundamental aspect of the work of a faculty member at UWL. While it is recognized that different individuals have different talents and objectives within the classroom, faculty should strive to articulate and achieve student learning outcomes. Furthermore, this process is ongoing, and faculty are expected to continually examine their objectives and teaching strategies in this light.

Research has identified several components that make up effective teaching – five of which tend to be primary, overlapping and interrelated: enthusiasm, preparation & organization, ability to stimulate student thought and interest, clarity, and knowledge and love of the content (Gmelch & Miskin, 1995). The Department recognizes that student evaluations of teachers may tap many of the above characteristics. However, student evaluations may or may not tap other important aspects of teaching - namely, student learning. As Weimer (1993) stated “a good teacher entails more than a decision to be enthusiastic, organized, clear, stimulating, and knowledgeable, it involves translating those abstract ingredients into tangible behaviors and practices.” (Weimer, 1993). Consequently, the Department encourages our faculty to provide a wide portfolio of teaching materials in order to convey as many aspects of their courses as possible. Examples of teaching evidence are listed below:

1. Learning environment surveys: (with focus on trends across time in a given course)
2. Student commentary: (It is recommended that a colleague summarize students' written commentary from a sampling of classes. We expect faculty to monitor persistent themes from these commentaries).
3. Syllabi (most effective when clearly linked to course objectives and goals – syllabi should be detailed fully enough such that an outside reader could get good sense of the course content and process).
4. Class materials: examples of class activities, examinations, essays, projects, etc. (Material that might also be included in a teaching portfolio include: Statement of teaching responsibilities, including specific courses, and a brief description of the way each course was taught. A reflective statement by the professor describing personal teaching philosophy, strategies, and objectives. A personal statement by the professor describing teaching goals for the next five years. Self-evaluation by the professor. This would include not only a personal assessment of teaching-related activities but also an explanation of any contradictory or unclear documents or materials in the teaching materials.).

5. Additional descriptions of teaching involvement (e.g., Information about direction/supervision of honors projects, undergraduate research, graduate theses, and research group activities. Contributing to, or editing, a professional journal on teaching in the professor's discipline.)
6. Description of steps taken to evaluate and improve one's teaching (e.g., changes resulting from self-evaluation, time spent reading journals on improving teaching, participation in seminars, workshops and professional meetings on improving teaching, and obtaining instructional development grants).
7. Description of curricular revisions or new course development (e.g. new course projects, materials, assignments or other activities).
8. Evidence of student learning (e.g., Student scores on professor-made or standardized tests, possibly before and after a course, as evidence of student learning. Student essays, creative work, field-work reports, laboratory workbooks or logs and student publications on course-related work. Information about the effect of the professor's courses on student career choices or help given by the professor to secure student employment. A record of students who succeed in advanced courses of study in the field. Statements by alumni on the quality of instruction. Student publications or conference presentations on course-related work. Examples of graded student essays showing excellent, average, and poor work along with the professor's comments as to why they were so graded.) This evidence is particularly important when clearly linked to stated course goals and objectives.
9. Outside validation (solicited and unsolicited letters of support, classroom visitations, videotape analysis, awards or recognitions, classroom group interviews, senior exit interviews).
10. Finally, as aforementioned, faculty are expected to be active in advising which entails availability to students, knowledge of university policies and curricula and ongoing training in this arena.

*Material culled from Seldin (1991), Braskamp & Ory (1994), Centra (1993), and Boyer (1990).

Appendix B

Department Statement on Service

The Department upholds the belief that a well-rounded academician is a teacher who also pursues scholastic and service activities. Theorists (such as Boyer, 1994) have argued that service is particularly important in higher education because colleges and universities need to respond to the challenges that confront society. In terms of how service relates to scholarship and teaching, Lynton (1996) suggests that these three components that comprise the triad of academic activity should be seen “as a continuum along which basic and applied research overlap and merge into application and related forms of outreach, which in turn almost inevitably include a formative component that melds into organized instruction (p. 17-18).”

Behavioral Guidelines:

Faculty are expected to be actively engaged in service as evidenced by regular attendance and participation on committees and/or positions of leadership. While there are a variety of service opportunities available to faculty, it is expected that in most years faculty members will advise an appropriate share of advisees; represent the department on a standing CBA committee and/or serve on departmental committees if asked or eligible; and play an active role on at least one university committee when selected. Further, faculty are expected to attend one commencement ceremony per academic year.

Evaluation Criteria:

When evaluating the work of faculty, the department particularly values service that can enhance the department and/or university, benefit the community, be incorporated back into the classroom and/or enhance scholarly activities. UWL gives more weight to service that is related to the candidate’s professional discipline and the department is likely to weigh service work more heavily if the individual has played a key role on the committee or contributed heavily to an activity. Finally, evidence of the service work’s links back to the classroom is particular encouraged (e.g., a practitioner’s work serves to enhance class examples and case studies).

In defining service, the department considers the three traditional categories within service:

1. University service: involves work on committees, task forces, and special projects for the department, college, and/or University.
2. Professional service: involves the use of a faculty member’s professional expertise in a service activity that may be internal or external to the University. This may include sharing professional expertise with one’s professional organizations.
3. Community service: involves applying the faculty member’s professional expertise in a volunteer, civic or, community related capacity.

Examples of service (in alphabetical order):

- Certifications and licenses: obtaining and maintaining certifications and licenses in the field of finance. This should include efforts to incorporate content related to these certifications in the curriculum, promoting and advising students on the certifications, or providing other resources to students in this regard.
- Chairperson, director and/or leadership activities in the Department, College, University or professional associations
- Community education on Department related topics
- Editorial service to professional journals
- Engage in peer review for retention, tenure, and post tenure review processes.
- Evaluating manuscripts for professional publications

- Membership on boards, commissions, task forces, projects and/or special assignments in the college, university or university system
- Membership on departmental, college, university or professional association committees
- Office holding in professional associations
- Other contributions of clear value to the university, community and/or profession
- Professional consultant or advisor to boards, committees, commissions, task forces, community organizations and governmental agencies, or businesses
- Public speaking related to the faculty member's areas of professional expertise
- Social service to boards, committees, commissions, institutes, task forces, community agencies and organizations related to the faculty members' area(s) of expertise
- Writing guest editorials and granting media interviews in areas related to the faculty members' area(s) of expertise

Appendix C

Department Statement on Scholarship

The Department supports a broad view of scholarship that emphasizes keeping current in the discipline, acquiring and advancing knowledge, and incorporating new knowledge into teaching on a regular basis. The Department generally accepts the characterization of scholarly activity offered by the AACSB. While faculty may pursue research that leads to publication, there is an expectation that research and scholarship will be embedded in a commitment to translate and integrate new knowledge into effective teaching. Research has shown that such a broad definition is among the factors that characterize colleges where faculty are deeply committed to their work and enthusiastically support their institutions' distinctive missions (Rice & Austin, 1988).

The Department defines scholarship as any creative endeavor that results in significant contributions to the Department discipline within the areas of teaching, research, and professional service. Furthermore, in conjunction with the views of the University's Joint Promotion Committee, scholarly activities are further characterized as those having value to our discipline and, in most cases, having been subjected to external peer review.

Scholarly activity may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Basic and applied research
- New applications of existing knowledge
- Integration of knowledge
- Development and/or analysis of pedagogical methods

Expectations: The Department expects that successful candidates for retention as well as for meritorious performance evaluations, have a record of ongoing scholarly activity that meets or exceeds the CBA Guidelines for Maintaining Scholarly and Professional Qualifications (linked below). Further, the Department expects that successful candidates for tenure and promotion have a record of ongoing scholarly activity that EXCEEDS the Group 1 requirements in the CBA Guidelines for Maintaining Scholarly and Professional Qualifications. The department generally categorizes scholarship into three areas.

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

- Publication of research manuscripts in scholarly, peer-reviewed journals
- Publication of textbooks or edited collections by recognized academic publishers (and/or chapters in textbooks or edited collections)
- Publication of popular press books on topics germane to the Department discipline (if peer reviewed).
- Publication of manuals, book reviews, technical reports, and laboratory manuals (if peer reviewed).
- Grants from federal, state, or private agencies, UWL or UW System research grants for research, equipment or innovative teaching methodologies.
- Publications regarding the scholarship of teaching and learning in peer-reviewed venues.

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

- Invited presentations at professional meetings, conventions, conferences.

- UWL or UW System professional development grants or sabbaticals
- Publication of manuals, book reviews, technical reports, and laboratory manuals.
- Presentation of papers on creative or original work at professional meetings, conventions, or other colleges and universities.
- Original integrations of applied knowledge (non-peer reviewed presentations or publications) to practitioner audiences.
- Published or presented original research by an undergraduate or graduate students for which the faculty member was the primary advisor.

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

- Participation in institutes, short courses, seminars, workshops, and professional meetings.
- Refereeing and reviewing original manuscripts.
- Aids undergraduate and/or graduate students' independent research projects and/or supervises students' involvement in the faculty member's program of research.
- Obtains recognition regionally, nationally, or internationally for recent, as well as past, contributions to a particular field of study by a variety of means (requests for reprints, invitations to read papers, citations of research, etc.).
- Engaging in self-study or a professional growth plan to enhance professional competence – including licensure.
- Presentations before on-campus or general audiences that require original preparation.
- Conducting a program assessment for an external organization.

Journal Rankings

The Finance Department will use the [2022 Australian Business Deans Council \[ABDC\]](#) Journal list as its base list. The department also uses the [Academic Journal Guide 2021 from the Chartered Association of Business Schools \[ABS\]](#). The department considers A and A* journals in the ABDC list and 4- and 4*-rated journals in the ABS list to be high-impact journals. The department considers B journals in the ABDC list and 2- and 3-rated journals in the ABS list to be medium-impact journals. The department considers C journals in the ABDC list and 1-rated journals in the ABS list to be low-impact journals. The department list will be reviewed at least once every four years for changes to ABDC, ABS, and other considerations. The department will consider a quality and quantity tradeoff with a candidate's number of publications.

In the case of an article appearing in a peer reviewed journal not on the ABDC or ABS lists, the author must provide evidence on the quality and appropriateness of the journal.

The author is responsible for making the case for inclusion in the department list based on cross-referencing the journal with the ABDC and ABS lists. This could be achieved by using any of the following metrics to cross-reference the data:

Impact Factors

Social Sciences Citation Index

SCImago Journal Rank

Publications in predatory journals that are also not listed in ABDC do not count as a journal publication. If the faculty is unsure about its ranking, the faculty should consult the department and reference the journal blacklist.

CBA Guidelines for Maintaining Scholarly and Professional Qualifications

<https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/academics/colleges-schools/cba/selected-documents/scholarlyproductivityqualifications.pdf>

Appendix D

Merit Evaluation Form

Complete the following for every merit eligible faculty member except yourself. You may attach comments to this form if the room provided here is insufficient. Please check the appropriate rating and submit your evaluations to the Merit Committee chair that will tabulate the rankings and provide results.

	Overall Merit Evaluation		Extra-Merit Performance Recognition Categories		
	Not Meritorious	Meritorious	Teaching	Research	Service
Name of Ranked Faculty 1					
Comments:					
Name of Ranked Faculty 2					
Comments:					

Meritorious Evaluation Guidelines

A meritorious designation denotes satisfactory performance related to a faculty member's responsibilities and expectations. To receive a meritorious designation, faculty members must perform their Teaching responsibilities at a satisfactory level (Section III.A.1), as determined by students and peers, meet or maintain CBA Scholarship & Practitioner Productivity Guidelines, and meet Department Service responsibilities (Section III.A.3).

Extra-Merit Performance Recognition Guidelines

Extra merit recognizes the need to differentially reward faculty for levels of performance and individual accomplishments that exceed the expectations of the department in one or more of the three areas of responsibility (Section III.A and Appendix C). Examples of Extra Merit activities for Teaching may include exemplary teaching accomplishments, new curriculum development, innovations in curriculum, grants to support teaching improvement, and teaching awards. Examples of Extra Merit activities for Research may include Tier 1 journal publication, and paper acceptance and presentation at one of the department discipline's top tier conference(s). Examples of Extra Merit activities for Service may include service leadership positions, notable service contributions to UWL, the CBA, the department, the profession, or the public. All faculty members shall be notified of their assigned extra merit ratings, along with the numbers of Department members in each merit category.