

**UW-LA CROSSE DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTANCY
BYLAWS, POLICIES, and PROCEDURES**

Approved and adopted by the Department on:
January 18, 2024

**UW-LA CROSSE DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTANCY
Bylaws, Policies, and Procedures**

Table of Contents

<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. Department of Accountancy Bylaws, Policies and Procedures	4
II. Organization and Operation	4
A. Preamble	4
B. Meeting Guidelines	4
C. Definitions of Department Membership and Voting Procedures	4
D. Definitions of Quorum and Majority	5
E. Changing the Bylaws	5
F. General Provisions	5
1. Definition of Faculty	5
2. Conflict of Interest	5
3. Dean's Office	6
4. AACSB Documents	6
III. Faculty Responsibilities and Expectations	6
A. Teaching	6
B. Scholarship/Professional Development	7
C. Service	8
D. Learning Environment Survey (LENS), Student Evaluations	9
IV. Review Criteria and Procedures	9
A. Review Committees	10
B. Annual Activity Reports	10
C. Review Criteria	10
D. Merit Review	11
1. Merit Review Procedures	11
2. Merit Ratings	11
a. Solid Performance	11
b. Extra Merit	12
3. Distribution of Merit Funds	12
4. Reconsideration and Appeals	13
E. Retention Review	13
1. Retention Review Procedures	13
2. Timeline	14
3. Reconsideration and Appeals	14
F. Tenure Review	15
G. Post-Tenure Review	15

H. Promotion Review	16
1. Promotion Review Procedures	16
2. Promotion Ranks	17
3. Reconsideration and Appeals	18
V. Governance	18
A. Department Chair	18
1. Election of the Department Chair	18
2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair	19
B. Standing Department Committees	19
1. IAS Review Committee	19
2. Promotion, Retention, and Tenure (PRT) Committee	19
3. Curriculum Committee	19
4. Bylaws Committee	19
C. Department Programmatic Assessment Plan	20
D. Salary Equity	20
E. Sick Leave and Vacation	20
F. Search and Screen Procedures	20
G. Summer and Winter Intersession Teaching Assignments	20
H. Faculty Leaves	21
I. Emeritus Status	21
J. Travel	21
1. Procedures	21
2. Priority in Allocation of Travel Funds	21
VI. Student Rights and Obligations	22
A. Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures	22
B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct	22
C. Advising Policy	22
VII. Appendices	
Appendix A. Accountancy Scholarly Journals	
Appendix B. Legal Scholarly Journals	
Appendix C. Department of Accountancy Statement on Scholarship	

I. UW-L Department of Accountancy Bylaws, Policies, and Procedures¹

Approved: January 18, 2024

Last amended: January 18, 2024

II. Organization and Operation

Department members are governed by six interdependent sets of regulations:

1. Federal and State laws and regulations
2. University of Wisconsin – System (UW System) policies and rules
3. University of Wisconsin – La Crosse (UW-L) policies and rules
4. CBA bylaws, policies and rules
5. Shared governance bylaws and policies for faculty and academic staff, and
6. Department bylaws

A. Preamble. These Bylaws were adopted by the members of the Department of Accountancy (Department) in accordance with the UW-System and UW-L *Faculty and Academic Staff Personnel Rules*.

B. Meeting Guidelines. Meetings of the Department and its Committees will be conducted in accordance with the most recent edition of *Robert's Rules of Order* and WI state open meeting laws.

Minutes will be recorded by a voting member (see Section II.C. below) of the Department and distributed within two weeks to Department members. Copies of the minutes of Department and Committee meetings shall be kept in a secure location by the Department. Minutes from closed meetings will be taken by the Department Chair (or a designated faculty member) and written within one week of the proceedings. They will be available upon request under applicable rules related thereto.

The Department shall meet at least once per semester to conduct Department business. The Department Chair, any Committee chair, or other Department member may request a Department meeting to discuss or act upon Department matters. The Department Chair will attempt to schedule meetings when all members of the Department are able to attend. An agenda will be provided in advance of the meeting.

C. Definitions of Department Membership and Voting Procedures. Members of the Department are defined as all tenure-track or tenured faculty (Ranked Faculty), including those on leave or sabbatical who are in attendance, and all non-tenure track and non-tenured faculty (Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) or members with at least a 50% appointment during the preceding and current semesters.

¹ Blue text indicates text required by current UW-L policy.

Those classified as members of the Department are eligible to vote on matters requiring a Department vote. IAS below the rank of Teaching Professor who are eligible to vote on Department matters, are not eligible to vote on merit, retention, promotion, and tenure issues. IAS at the rank of Teaching Professor are eligible to vote on IAS merit, retention, and promotion issues.

Proxy votes are not permitted in meetings of the Department and its Committees.

- D. Definitions of Quorum and Majority.** For meetings of the Department and its Committees, a **quorum** is defined as the majority of the entire membership eligible to participate. For personnel matters, a quorum is achieved with a majority of those eligible to vote, but no less than three (3). Within a meeting, a **majority** is the simple majority (>50%) of those present. Members who join by teleconference and have heard all the deliberation are eligible to vote.
- E. Changing the Bylaws.** Amendments or additions to these bylaws require a **simple majority** of the current Department membership eligible to vote. Any proposed amendment(s) shall be presented and distributed in writing at a Department meeting to provide an opportunity for a second reading and discussion. A vote will be taken at the next subsequent meeting. A second reading may be waived (by majority approval) for bylaw changes that do not pertain to personnel decisions.
- F. General Provisions.** In order to provide clarification and guidance to the Department, across all sections of the bylaws, the following paragraphs shall be applied in any and all situations and circumstances where their application will serve to better define the boundaries and parameters for deliberation. It is the intent of the Department that the application of one or more of the general provisions will lead to a more effective, efficient, and equitable outcome in the decision-making process for both the Department and its members.
- G. Definition of Faculty.** “Faculty” or “faculty member” includes Ranked Faculty and IAS. Ranked Faculty are individuals who generally hold a terminal degree in their field, and tenure or tenure-track teaching positions with the rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor. IAS positions in the UW-L College of Business Administration (CBA) generally require a master’s degree. IAS with 100% appointment are normally titled as Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, or Teaching Professor.
- 1. Conflict of Interest.** Department faculty members understand and accept the potential that exists for a real and/or perceived conflict of interest between related faculty members. A Department member or the Department Chair must not vote when there is an actual or apparent conflict of interest, including but not limited to such as voting on any matter that directly affects a spouse, ex-spouse, relative, or domestic partner. Any faculty member may also make a written request to

the CBA Dean (Dean) with all pertinent information at least five calendar days prior to a Department or Committee vote, requesting a determination of whether a Department member is barred from voting based on an actual or apparent conflict of interest. The Dean may act in the capacity of Department Chair, if necessary, when the Department Chair is barred from voting. If a faculty member or Department Chair has not recused himself or herself and has not obtained a determination by the Dean prior to the meeting, then a decision with an actual or apparent conflict of interest may be tabled to a subsequent meeting by two faculty members stating their objection, and the Dean shall make a determination prior to the subsequent meeting and action being taken. The faculty member or Department Chair will leave the room during the vote and discussion prior to a vote being taken to avoid influencing the vote.

2. **Dean's Office.** Management advisory documents created and maintained in the Dean's office are understood by the Department's faculty to have been prepared for the sole purpose of providing guidance to the decision-making across the various departments of the CBA. In any case or situation where a Dean's office management advisory document is in direct or indirect conflict with a provision of the Department's bylaws, the Department shall meet to consider amending the Department's bylaws to conform to the Dean's office management advisory document.
3. **AACSB Documents.** The Department's faculty is fully aware of, understand, and accept the important role that AACSB accreditation has had and will continue to have for the CBA. Further, the Department is committed to maintaining this standard and will seek guidance from AACSB documents that are prepared and intended to assist colleges in their efforts directed at fulfilling the AACSB mission. In any case or situation where an AACSB accreditation advisory document is in direct or indirect conflict with a provision of the Department's bylaws, the Department shall meet to consider amending the Department's bylaws to conform to the AACSB accreditation advisory document.

III. Faculty Responsibilities and Expectations

Ranked Faculty responsibilities are referenced in Section IV of the Faculty Senate bylaws entitled "Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons." Requests for IAS hiring will be presented to the 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.

- A. **Teaching.** Teaching is the primary mission of all faculty in the Department, and all faculty members are expected to be active teachers throughout their careers. This teaching mission extends beyond traditional classroom instruction. It is expected that all faculty will take active roles in ensuring that all programs of study in the Department (majors and minors) are meeting the contemporary needs of students in terms of preparing them to enter the workforce, graduate schools, and/or professional training programs. In addition, all faculty members are expected to challenge students to learn by using various pedagogical devices

or techniques and by setting well-defined student learning objectives and outcomes. Faculty members are expected to contribute to this Department mission in a variety of ways.

At a **minimum**, all faculty members **must**:

- Utilize course resources (text and online course support) in a consistent manner across all sections of CBA pre-core courses that are housed within the Department.
- Structure course content in a manner that directly addresses course-specific, Department, and/or CBA learning goals as agreed to by the Department and/or CBA.
- Advise students assigned as their advisees by the Department and/or the CBA. The Department requires mandatory advising for its majors, and faculty members must be available in person to fulfill these Department advising responsibilities. Faculty members must be knowledgeable regarding current UW-L, CBA, and Department policies, procedures, rules and regulations to provide effective advising.
- Grade and return student assignments, including examinations, in a timely manner.
- Respond to emails from students and advisees in a timely manner.
- Hold regularly scheduled office hours in person in their offices between 8 AM and 8 PM during weekdays in the amount of a minimum of 30 minutes of weekly office hours per credit taught during that semester based on a typical full load during the semester (thus overloads are not included in the office hour calculation). Office hours must be included on course syllabi, posted on office doors, and given to the Department Chair and ADA at the beginning of each semester. If faculty members have to cancel or shorten office hours in case of an emergency, faculty members must make every effort to notify affected students by email and/or having a note placed on their office doors explaining their absence. Must also notify Department Chair and ADA.
- Teach their regularly scheduled classes in the manner prescribed, e.g., face-to-face, online or hybrid. Under UW-L regulations, all classes must adhere to a standard of 770 minutes per credit per term, and no exceptions are permitted without prior approval of the Department Chair. Faculty must notify the Department Chair, ADA, and affected students if any classes are canceled, and must follow UW-L HR procedures and take appropriate leave for all absences.

All faculty members **should** engage in a variety of teaching activities that are above the minimum. Examples of such activities include:

- Participating in Department curriculum development by improving and updating the courses they teach. The Course Information Management System (CIM). Course forms should be reviewed annually and any changes/updates drafted and put forward using the CIM proposal interface as needed.
- Designing and implementing new courses aimed at increasing the knowledge of students in the Department's areas of responsibility.
- Advising students in undergraduate research, independent study projects and internships.
- Continuing professional teaching development by attending workshops and seminars aimed at improving teaching effectiveness.

- Improving course pedagogy as a means to challenge and motivate students and increase student learning.
- Using classroom assessment to reflect on and improve teaching and learning outcomes.
- Keeping current in their subject matter area.
- Incorporating appropriate software such as Excel and/or other skills that benefit students and their employers.

B. Scholarship/Professional Development. The CBA is unique in that its work is guided by AACSB accreditation standards. Standards have been promulgated by the CBA that address faculty [Scholarship & Practitioner Productivity Guidelines & Faculty Qualifications](#).

At a **minimum**, all faculty members **must**:

- Maintain Scholarly Academic (SA) or Practice Academic (PA) status if Ranked Faculty, and Scholarly Practitioner (SP) or Instructional Practitioner (IP) status if IAS.

For retention, promotion and tenure, all non-tenured, Ranked Faculty **should**:

- Average at least one Publication per full academic year of employment with the Department (except the first year with respect to new Ph.D. graduates), Publication being defined as:
 - If research in a Department discipline, a peer-reviewed publication in an Accountancy Scholarly Journal (as currently set forth in Appendix VII.A., and as amended by the Department from time to time);
 - If interdisciplinary research, in addition to any Publication defined in the preceding bullet point above, a peer-reviewed publication in any journal that meets another CBA department's publication standards for Ranked Faculty in such department;
 - If legal research, in addition to any Publication defined in the preceding two bullet points above, a publication in a Legal Scholarly Journal (as currently set forth in Appendix VII.B., and as amended by the Department from time to time).
- Present scholarly work at international, national, or regional conferences.

All faculty **should** also engage in professional development activities, examples of which include:

- Attaining and maintaining professional certification such as CFE or CMA; or license such as CPA or attorney.
- Participating in workshops, seminars, and graduate courses.
- Participating in professional organizations and/or attending professional meetings.
- Participating in continuing education.

The Department of Accountancy Statement on Scholarship is provided set forth in Appendix VII. C addresses scholarly impact, discipline-specific scholarship factors, and additional details regarding expectations for Scholarship during the Probationary Period, including suggestions for establishing a vibrant, sustainable research program. See Appendix VII. C

C. Service. All faculty members in the Department are expected to remain actively engaged in service to UW-L at all levels. It is also expected that the faculty maintain some level of

commitment to professional service and/or service to the public.

All faculty members **should** engage in a variety of service activities, including:

- Working to enhance the spirit of collegiality and cooperation within the Department.
- Attending Department meetings.
- Serving on Department and CBA committees, including search and screen and *ad hoc* Committees, and periodically chairing committees.
- Serving on UW-L Faculty Senate and UW-System committees. Faculty members are encouraged to display leadership in university governance, i.e., serving as chairs on UW-L committees.
- Volunteering in professional organizations.
- Editing or reviewing manuscripts for professional journals or conferences.
- Participating in conferences as session chair or paper discussant.
- Taking an active role in Beta Alpha Psi (BAP) student organization.
- Taking an active role in the Department's internship program.

D. Learning Environment Survey (“LENS”).

The Department will follow the UWL LENS policy and procedure available on the Faculty Senate webpage (<https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/#tm-learning-environment-survey---lens-policy>). Results from the Faculty Senate approved LENS questions are required for retention, tenure, post-tenure review, and promotion for ranked faculty and for renewal and promotion of Instructional Academic Staff in the form of the LENS summary report. The LENS summary report contains student response frequencies for target responses to LENS items for courses taught within the last six semesters. Probationary ranked faculty will be expected to provide LENS summary reports since date of hire for retention and tenure decisions. LENS summary reports will be electronically accessible to personnel review committees who have been granted the authority to access them.

IV. Review Criteria and Procedures

The department will follow the policies regarding retention and tenure described in the Faculty Personnel Rules (UW-System 3.06-3.11 and UW-L 3.06-3.08). Tenure/retention decisions will be guided by the criteria established in the bylaws at the time of hire unless a candidate elects to be considered under newer guidelines. The criteria outlined in this Section IV “Review Criteria and Procedures” in these bylaws should be applied to faculty with a contract date after January 18, 2024. The department will follow policies guiding part-time appointments for faculty and tenure clock stoppage available on the UW-L Human Resources website. In accordance with Faculty Personnel rules UW-System 3.05-3.11 and UW-L 3.08, the performance of all faculty in the Department will be reviewed annually.

The areas of review shall include Teaching, Scholarship/Professional Development, and Service activities (see Sections III.A.-C.). 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. The criteria and procedures for all such annual merit, mid-contract, retention, promotion, tenure and/or post-tenure reviews for all Department faculty shall be as follows:

- A. Review Committees.** For Ranked Faculty members, the annual merit and any concurrent mid-contract, retention, promotion, tenure and/or post-tenure reviews shall be conducted by the Promotion, Retention and Tenure (PRT) Committee, which shall consist of all tenured Ranked Faculty members of the Department. For IAS, the annual merit and any concurrent retention and/or promotion reviews shall be conducted by the IAS Review Committee which shall consist of all tenured Ranked Faculty members and any IAS Teaching Professors in the Department (henceforth, the relevant PRT and/or IAS Review Committee shall be referred to as the Committee). In the case where there are fewer than three eligible members of the Committee, the Committee shall work with the reviewee and the Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean, to add an external member to 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 in Digital Measures (DM) to reflect activities from the prior June 1st to the current May 31st. A Department annual activity report shall be generated using DM and submitted electronically to the Department Chair by June 1st. The annual activity report should include narratives relating to the three areas of responsibility. 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 UW-L are due to the Dean's Office on Dec. 15 annually. For review purposes, tenured faculty are subject to "Post-Tenure Review" a minimum of every five years.](#)

- 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. IAS are expected to devote 80% of their time and effort to Teaching, and 20% to Service and Scholarship/Professional Development unless otherwise reallocated in advance by the Department Chair. Review of IAS in each of these areas by the Committee will be weighed accordingly. Though Scholarship is not expected or required of IAS for merit, retention or promotion, it will be looked upon favorably by the Committee during such review as "extra work." If teaching quality and service is maintained.

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 to the criteria set out in Sections III.A.-C. In order to enhance the evaluation of effective teaching beyond the measure of LENS data 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 along with “closing the loop” and reassessment, plus samples of student work, and/or reflective commentary to aid the Committee.

D. Merit Review. 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 above in Sections III.A.-C. and IV.C. 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.](#)

1. Merit Review Procedures. Early in the fall semester, the Department Chair, working with the Committee, will use the completed annual activity reports, LENS data, and all other external evidence submitted by faculty members to evaluate each faculty member’s performance in the three areas of responsibility (Teaching, Scholarship/Professional Development, and Service) using the criteria specified above.

Within seven calendar days of completion of the reviews, the Department Chair shall notify each faculty member, in writing, of the results of the annual review, his/her overall annual merit ratings (solid performance or extraordinary merit).

Faculty members who are on professional leave are expected to submit a completed annual activity report at the end of the spring semester describing their leave and other professional activities.

The Department Chair typically has various administrative appointments that alter his/her normal balance of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service obligations, and this should be considered during the evaluation.

2. Merit Ratings

a. Solid Performance. A solid performance designation denotes satisfactory performance related to a faculty member’s responsibilities and expectations (Sections III.A-C. and IV.C.). To receive solid performance, faculty members must perform their Teaching responsibilities at a satisfactory level, as determined by students and peers, along with their basic minimum Scholarship and Service responsibilities. In general, the results of this solid performance review will be a simple “yes” (=100%), or “no” (=0%) designation. All faculty members shall be notified of their solid performance designation (yes = 100%, or no = 0%). Those persons not receiving solid performance shall be notified, in writing, of the reasons for this action.

Faculty members qualifying for solid performance will receive the state-allotted solid performance raise. Faculty on approved leave shall be considered for solid performance and may be considered for extra merit. Faculty in their first year shall be considered for solid performance, but will not be considered for extra merit as there is no performance to evaluate for extra merit.

- b. Extra Merit.** 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 2 areas of responsibility for IAS or 3 areas of responsibility for ranked faculty while having solid performance in the remaining area(s) of responsibility. Extra merit activities, or “meritorious performance,” generally include exemplary Teaching accomplishments, such as new curriculum development or evidence of high levels of student engagement/learning, or significant Scholarship/Professional Development, and/or notable Service contributions to UWS, UWL, the CBA, and/or 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.

- 3. 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 meeting their basic responsibilities as “solid performance” and granted 100% shall receive the state-allotted solid performance raise. If the state fails to designate a specific percentage for solid performance, the department will assume the solid performance allocation will be 2/3 of the total percentage allocated. All faculty who receive an overall evaluation of “meritorious performer” will divide among themselves a proportional share of the remaining merit pool.

Note here that although a whole-department merit designation may be used for non-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 the state does not provide merit funding. The Committee will consider the annual merit ratings retroactive to the last

year merit pay was provided, when the committee makes merit ratings for the first year merit funding becomes available after a lapse in funding for one or more years. For example, assume that the state did not provide any merit pay for years 2020 and 2021 and then provided merit funding in 2022. The Committee will consider the annual merit ratings for years 2020-2021 when rating faculty members for year 2022, to make the merit pay increase equitable.

4. **Reconsideration and Appeals.** 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.

The Department Chair may likewise make an appeal for reconsideration of his/her merit evaluation by submitting a written request to the Dean within seven calendar days of notification of the merit evaluation results.

Appeals beyond the Department level may be presented to the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals and Academic Freed (CGAAF) Committee (see Section I.E. of the *Faculty Senate Bylaws*). 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 *UW-L Faculty Rules*, and the *UW-L Faculty Handbook*.

- E. **Retention Review.** All retention decisions, including the ultimate retention through tenure, use past performance to predict future performance. In each retention decision, the Committee must assess the promise as well as the competency of the candidate in meeting the purpose, vision, and mission of the Department.

Faculty under retention 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 are required and the candidate may choose to provide additional evidence. Additional materials may be required for Department review and will be indicated in these bylaws.

1. **Retention Review Procedures.** The Department Chair shall give written notice of the review to each faculty member subject to retention review at least twenty calendar days prior to the retention review. At least seven calendar days prior to the date of the review, the faculty member shall provide the Department Chair and PRT a copy of his/her Annual Activity Report for the most recent academic year, Individual Personnel Report from

date of hire to date the report is generated, and any supplemental materials deemed appropriate to the Committee. This material is in addition to the electronic portfolio. The Department Chair will supply grade distributions, (or TAI data) LENS data, and merit evaluation data for each reviewee to the Committee. Reviewed faculty 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. In order to obtain a recommendation for reappointment, the faculty member's performance must be judged to be satisfactory (see Sections III.A.-C. and IV.C.) and must show potential for continued professional growth.

Subsequent to the Department review, the Department will provide the following materials to the Dean:

- Department letter of recommendation with vote;
- A TAI datasheet that summarizes the courses taught, workload data, grade distribution and Department LENS data; and
- Merit evaluation data (if available).

Within seven calendar days of the review meeting, each faculty member shall be informed in writing by the Committee chair of the results of the retention review. In the case of a nonrenewal recommendation, the Committee shall consult with the Dean prior to notifying the faculty member. The Committee shall formulate and retain written reasons for the decision. In the case of a positive retention decision, the written notice shall include concerns or suggestions for improvement identified by the Committee.

2. Timeline. All first-year Ranked Faculty will be formally reviewed in the spring of their first year. A Department letter will be filed with the Dean and HR. Formal retention reviews resulting in contract decisions will minimally occur for non-tenured Ranked Faculty in the fall of their 2nd, 4th and 6th years. Formal retention reviews resulting in contract decisions will minimally occur for IAS in the fall or spring of the year their current contract is expiring. For IAS with renewable contracts the retention review must be completed no less than 12 months before the contract expires.

3. Reconsideration and Appeals. If a nonrenewal recommendation is made by the Committee, the faculty member may request reasons for the recommendation. This request must be made in writing within seven calendar days of the nonrenewal notice. Written reasons shall be provided to the faculty member within seven calendar days of the receipt of the written request. The reasons then become part of the official personnel file of the faculty member.

If the faculty member wishes a reconsideration of the initial nonrenewal recommendation, he/she shall request a reconsideration meeting in writing within seven calendar days of the receipt of the written reasons for nonrenewal. The meeting for reconsideration by the Committee shall be held within twenty calendar days of the receipt of the request. The faculty member shall be notified a minimum of seven calendar days prior to the meeting.

The faculty member shall be present at the reconsideration meeting. Both the Committee and the faculty member may choose up to two members of the university community to be present also. These third parties may question either of the other parties and make comments to them. These third parties also shall file a report of the reconsideration meeting with the Committee and the faculty member. In later appeals, such third parties may be called as witnesses. The faculty member may make a personal presentation at the reconsideration meeting. The meeting shall be held in accordance with sub chapter IV of Chapter 19, *Wisconsin Statutes*. At the meeting for reconsideration, the faculty member is entitled to present documentary evidence. The reconsideration is neither a hearing nor an appeal and shall be non-adversarial in nature. Its purpose is to allow the faculty member an opportunity to persuade the Committee to change the recommendation of nonrenewal by challenging the stated reasons and/or by offering additional evidence. The burden of proof is on the faculty member requesting the reconsideration.

The faculty member may appeal a negative reconsideration decision. Such an appeal must be filed, in writing, with the University Hearing Committee within twenty calendar days of notice that the result of the reconsideration has affirmed the nonrenewal decision.

Procedures regarding notice, reconsideration, and appeal shall be in accord with those described in *UW-S3.07*, *3.08* and *UW-L3.07*, *3.08* of the *Faculty Personnel Rules*.

- F. Tenure Review.** The granting of academic tenure represents a long-term commitment of institutional resources which requires proof of excellence in past performance and a forecast that an individual Ranked Faculty member's intellectual vitality and future contributions will continue to be of high quality for many years to come. The tenure decision follows and is based on two complementary judgments: the competency and promise of the Ranked Faculty member, and the future needs of the university. The procedure for a Tenure Review is the same as that of a Retention Review, which is described in Section IV.E. above.

The members of the Committee shall use the submitted self, peer, and student evaluation information if available along with LENS data if available to judge each non-tenured Ranked Faculty member's performance in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service using the criteria outlined in Sections III.A.-C. and IV.C. The criteria are guidelines to establish minimum performance in each category. As these are minimum criteria, the achievement of the minimum in each category will not be considered sufficient for tenure. High quality teaching along with performance well above the minimum level is expected in scholarship and above the minimum level in service. A recommendation for reappointment that constitutes a tenure decision must receive the support of a simple majority of the Committee.

G. Post-Tenure Review. The Post-Tenure Review (“PTR”) policy, as approved by the UW System Board of Regents on November 11, 2016, can be found in its entirety at <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/post-tenure-review-policy/>. The process, deadlines, and procedure are noted in the Regents Policy Document 20-9 entitled “Periodic Post-Tenure Review in Support of Tenured Faculty Development” and should be followed accordingly. In keeping with UW System policy, faculty members undergoing PTR will submit an electronic portfolio on Digital Measures to the Committee reflecting the content submitted annually for merit review for the complete five-year PTR period. Faculty members undergoing PTR will be reviewed and determined to be in one of the following two categories:

1. **Meets Expectations.** This category is awarded to faculty who submit a complete PTR portfolio and who receive Merit or Exceptional Merit for five uninterrupted years during the PTR period.
2. **Does Not Meet Expectations.** This category is assigned to faculty who receive one year of Merit Deficient designation during the five-year PTR period, without evidence of improvement, as assessed by the Committee.

H. Promotion Review. Promotion is a privilege based upon qualifications exceeding established minimal criteria and is recommended by an informed collective peer judgment. [The department will follow the guidelines and schedules regarding faculty promotion available through the Human Resources Office.](#)

4. Promotion Review Procedures. Before the end of spring semester, lists of faculty who will meet the minimum university eligibility requirements for promotion in the coming academic year are distributed by the Human Resources Office to department chairs and applicable faculty. These lists will be reviewed for accuracy by the Department Chair.

The Department Chair shall give written notice of eligibility for promotion to each faculty member eligible at least twenty calendar days prior to the review. Faculty members choosing to seek promotion must provide all members of the Committee with their promotion materials no later than two weeks prior to the promotion consideration meeting. A guide to developing the promotion portfolio is available through the Human Resources Office.

Public notice of promotion consideration meetings shall be made at least twenty calendar days prior to the meeting. Promotion candidates will be informed of their rights under the *Wisconsin Open Meeting Law*. If an open meeting is requested, only the portion of the meeting dealing with the faculty person requesting the meeting will be open to all persons. This portion of the meeting will be conducted in accordance with the open meetings rules of the State of Wisconsin.

After discussion of a candidate’s performance, votes shall be cast by a show of hands on a separate motion to promote for each promotion candidate. A **simple majority** is necessary for a positive promotion recommendation. The results of the vote shall be

recorded by the Committee chair and entered into the Committee's portion of the Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report Form. The Committee shall prepare written reasons for each of its recommendations.

Within seven calendar days of the promotion consideration meeting, the Committee chair shall notify each candidate of the Committee's recommendation. For positive recommendations, the Committee chair shall include a letter of recommendation drafted collectively by the Committee as part of the Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report Form. With these materials, the Department Chair shall also transmit, in writing, the recommendation to the Dean. A copy of this letter shall be provided to the candidate at least seven calendar days prior to the submission of the promotion file to the Dean.

A positive recommendation from the Department is only the first step to achieving promotion. All candidates should understand clearly that eligibility status and Department and CBA recommendation do not assure or imply that a promotion will be made. Faculty Senate Bylaw I.P requires that members of the Joint Promotion Committee also judge each Ranked Faculty promotion candidate on his/her Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.

In cases of a negative decision by the Committee, a written notice including reasons for the negative decision will be prepared by the Committee and transmitted to the candidate within seven calendar days of the promotion consideration meeting.

- 2. Promotion Ranks.** To be considered for promotion to a higher rank, Ranked Faculty must meet the minimum university criteria provided in the *Employee Handbook*, the *Guide to Faculty Promotions and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse*, and the minimum Department standards by rank. To be considered for promotion to a higher rank, IAS must meet the minimum university criteria provided in the *Guide to Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Promotion - Revised 2013*. Meeting the minimum is not a guarantee of promotion.

IAS become eligible to apply for the rank of **Associate Teaching Professor** once they have completed ten full-time semesters teaching in higher education or other appropriate experience with at least six full-time semesters in rank at UW-L. The candidate must provide evidence of a strong record of accomplishment in Teaching as evidenced by self-assessment, peer evaluations, annual merit evaluations, and SEIs and LENS data available given the expectations stated in Section III.A. Evidence of Scholarship/Professional Development and Service as described in Sections III.B.-C. is also expected.

IAS become eligible to apply for the rank of **Teaching Professor** once they have completed twenty full-time semesters teaching in higher education or other appropriate experience with at least four semesters in rank of Associate Teaching Professor

at UW-L. The candidate must be able to demonstrate a sustained record of accomplishment in Teaching given the expectations stated in Section III.A. and a sustained record of accomplishment in the areas of Scholarship/Professional Development and Service as described in Sections III.B.-C.

For the rank of **Associate Professor**, a Ranked Faculty member must provide evidence of the following: Teaching excellence, the establishment of a program of Scholarship, and participation in Service activities. Evidence of Teaching excellence shall include the results of self, peer, and available SEI and LENS data given the expectations stated in Section III.A. Scholarship and Service shall be consistent with the Department's definition of Scholarship and Service in Sections III.B.-C.

To be promoted to the rank of **Professor**, a Ranked Faculty member must show evidence of continued excellence in Teaching, significant Scholarship, and substantial Service activity. Continued Teaching excellence is measured by the results of self, peer, and LENS data given the expectations stated in Section III.A. Significant Scholarship and substantial Service shall be consistent with the Department's definition of Scholarship and Service in Sections III.B.-C.

- 3. Reconsideration and Appeals.** Within seven calendar days of receiving notice of a negative decision by the Committee, a candidate may request, by writing to the Department Chair, reconsideration by the Committee. The faculty member will be allowed an opportunity to respond to the written reasons using written and/or oral evidence and witnesses at the reconsideration meeting. Written notice of the reconsideration decision shall be forwarded to the Dean within seven calendar days of the reconsideration meeting.

Each promotion 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 UW-System 6.02 and UW-L 6.02. The Complaints, Grievances, Appeals, and Academic Freedom (CGAAF) Committee shall forward its recommendation to the chancellor (see UW-System 6.02).

V. Governance

Department Chair. The Department will adhere to the selection and duties of the Chair that are delineated in the Faculty Senate Policies (revised 2021) under the heading "IV. Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons," "V. The Selection of Department Chairpersons," and "VI. Remuneration of Department Chairpersons. In addition, references to chair-related duties are indicated in the Employee Handbook.

A. Standing Department Committees

- 1. IAS Review Committee.** See the Department Review Committees in Section IV.A.

2. **Promotion, Retention and Tenure Committee.** See the Department Review Committees in Section IV.A.
3. **Curriculum Committee.** Responsible for review of all curriculum proposals and the eventual forwarding of recommendations to the Department for approval.
4. **Bylaws Committee.** Responsible for maintenance and refinement of these *Bylaws*, as needed, and incorporation of any UW-L or CBA policies that may impact these *Bylaws* and the procedures and policies herein.

Ranked Faculty and full-time IAS are expected to serve on Department committees as assigned by the Department Chair, CBA committees as assigned by the Department Chair, and UW-L committees as assigned by the Faculty Senate. Standing committees within the CBA requiring representation by Department faculty include: CBA Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, CBA Graduate Committee, Technology Advisory Committee, International Business Advisory Committee, and CBA Scholarship Committee.

- B. Department Programmatic Assessment Plan.** The Curriculum Committee will develop student learning outcomes for all programs housed within the Department and will review these outcomes every two years. Various direct and indirect assessment tools will be used to measure the achievement of these outcomes. Department student learning outcomes must be approved by the Department faculty.

In order to assist the CBA in providing assurance of learning with respect to CBA learning goals, the department will work to assure consistency in CBA pre-core courses that are housed within the department and participate in assurance of learning assessment efforts within these courses. In addition, the department will take part in the CBA's biennial assessment to measure competency in the major using department learning goals. The Curriculum Committee will be responsible for responding to the assessment results and, based on the results, will make recommendations to the department.

- C. Salary Equity.** 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/or (c) "inversion" and "compression," may ask the Department Chair to consider recommending a salary equity adjustment to the Dean. 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 Department Chair shall have the right to appeal the decision of the Department Chair to the tenured members of the faculty. The Department Chair shall supply the tenured faculty data on salaries and will forward their recommendation to the Dean.
- D. Sick Leave and Vacation.** Department members will account for sick leave in adherence to the most current UW-System guidelines. For unclassified staff, twelve-month employees

garner vacation time, nine-month employees do not.

- E. Search and Screen Procedures.** The Department will follow hiring procedures prescribed by the University's Human Resources Office in conjunction with the Office of Affirmative Action & Diversity and UW-System and WI state regulations. These procedures apply to the recruitment and hiring of Ranked Faculty, IAS, and temporary hires through a pool search. Additionally, UW-L has a policy related to spousal/partner hiring.
- F. Summer and Winter Intersession Teaching Assignments.** Summer and Winter Intersession teaching is subject to funding and student needs. The Department Chair will make teaching assignments based on contractual requirements, retirement circumstances, and faculty meeting CBA Scholarly Productivity Guidelines.
- Compensation for Summer Intersession follows UW-L compensation policy. Compensation for Winter Intersession follows CBA compensation policy. Compensation will be based on faculty rank and credits taught. Classes may be canceled if there is insufficient enrollment.
- G. Faculty Leaves.** The Department encourages its members to seek leaves for sabbaticals, faculty development, Scholarship, Service, and other leaves that support the Department's mission. In addition, faculty members may seek leaves for medical and other reasons. The CBA has established sabbatical application and procedures.
- H. Emeritus Status.** The Committee may nominate qualified Ranked Faculty members to the Chancellor for designation as emeriti. Committee members at the rank or higher of the qualified member, participate in the nomination process. These nominations shall be forwarded to the Dean for endorsement prior to their submission to the Chancellor.
- I. Travel.** All requests for travel funds and/or reimbursement must follow UW-L and CBA travel guidelines, as amended from time to time.
- 1. Procedures.** Department members should apply for funds from outside sources when appropriate. International travel should be funded by international travel grants. Department members should not expect to receive funding for international travel without having applied for an international travel grant. Travel for administrative purposes, such as search and screen, AACSB affiliation, or assessment related, etc. should be funded by the Dean's office.

Each academic year Anticipated Travel Forms should be filled out and presented to the Department Chair by September 15th for each conference the Department member would like to attend. Should a Department member wish to travel to more than one conference, they should rank order their requests. The Department Chair will then use the anticipated travel budget and the guidelines below to budget travel for the year. The Department Chair will then communicate to the Department members the requests that can be funded.

If travel plans change, faculty members should inform the Department Chair immediately so that the travel funds may be reallocated to unfunded travel proposals using the guidelines below. A Travel Expense Report (“TER”) should be filled out promptly upon return from travel. This ensures that the Department Chair can monitor expenditures relative to the anticipated budget and make necessary adjustments.

- 2. Priorities in Allocation of Travel Funds.** The first priority for the Department travel funds is to fully fund at least one professional conference for each Department member. Should the pool of travel funds be nominally oversubscribed based on the first choice of Department members, the Department Chair can approve travel requests for less than full funding so as to increase the number of Department members able to travel to at least one conference. If the pool is more than nominally oversubscribed, the Department Chair can distribute funds based on the prioritization below. Once all requesting Department members have at least one conference funded, the remainder of the funds should be distributed based on the prioritization below. Priorities for the Department Chair to weigh, in approximate order of importance:
- a. Papers accepted for presentation
 - b. Appearance on the conference program as chair or organizer or discussant
 - c. Untenured Ranked Faculty
 - d. Recent history of success with converting presentations into Publications
 - e. Longer amounts of time since last travel grant

VI. Student Rights and Obligations

A. Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures

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

- Meeting directly with the faculty member
- Meeting with the student’s advisor
- Meeting with other faculty members
- Meeting with the Department chair
- Meeting with an ad-hoc Department complaint committee charged to address the issue
- Meeting with any combination of such people

The intention of such meeting 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 the Office of Student Life, either orally or in writing and following the Office’s set procedures.

B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct

Academic and nonacademic misconduct policy is available through the UW-L Office of Student Life.

C. Advising Policy

Students are assigned to a Department advisor by the CBA Dean's office and may change their advisor upon written request to the same office.

VII. Appendices:

Appendix A

ACCOUNTANCY SCHOLARLY JOURNAL LIST

RANK A (9 points)

Abacus

Accounting and Business Research

Accounting and Finance

Accounting and the Public Interest

Accounting Education: An International Journal

Accounting Forum

Accounting Historians Journal

Accounting History

Accounting History Review (formerly Accounting Business & Financial History)

Accounting Horizons

Accounting Review (The)

Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal

Accounting, Organizations and Society

Advances in Accounting

Advances in Accounting Behavioral Accounting Research

Advances in Management Accounting

Advances in Public Interest Accounting

Advances in Taxation

Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory

Behavioral Research in Accounting

British Accounting Review

Business Ethics Quarterly

Business History

Business History Review

Contemporary Accounting Research

CPA Journal

Critical Perspectives on Accounting

European Accounting Review

Financial Accountability and Management

Information Systems and E-Business Management

Information Systems Management

International Journal of Accounting

International Journal of Accounting Information Systems

International Journal of Auditing

International Journal of Critical Accounting

Issues in Accounting Education

Journal of Accountancy

Journal of Accounting & Economics

Journal of Accounting & Public Policy

Journal of Accounting Education

Journal of Accounting Literature
Journal of Accounting Research
Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance
Journal of Behavioral Finance
Journal of Business Ethics
Journal of Business Finance and Accounting
Journal of Business Finance and Accounting
Journal of Business Law
Journal of Business Research
Journal of Computer Information Systems
Journal of Contemporary Accounting and Economics
Journal of Forensic & Investigative Accounting
Journal of Governmental & Nonprofit Accounting
Journal of Information Systems
Journal of Information Technology
Journal of International Accounting Research
Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation
Journal of International Business Studies
Journal of International Financial Management and Accounting
Journal of Management Accounting Research
Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting and Financial Management
Journal of Taxation
Journal of the American Taxation Association
Management Accounting Research
Managerial Auditing Journal
National Tax Journal
Research in Accounting Regulation
Research in Governmental and Non-profit Accounting
Review of Accounting Studies
Tax Advisor
Tax Law Review

RANK B (6 points)

Accountancy Business and the Public Interest
Accounting Educators' Journal
Accounting Information Systems Educator Journal
Accounting Perspectives
Accounting Research Journal
Accounting Systems Journal/Review of Business Information Systems
Accounting, Accountability & Performance
Accounting, Management and Information Technologies
Advances in Accounting Education
Advances in International Accounting
Advances in Management Accounting

Advances in Mergers and Acquisitions
Advances in Public Interest Accounting
Advances in Quantitative Analysis of Finance and Accounting
Australian Accounting Review
Corporate Governance: An International Review
Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society
Critical Perspectives on International Business
Current Issues in Auditing
Ethics and Information Technology
Forensic Examiner
Fraud Magazine
Global Perspectives in Accounting Education
Internal Auditing/Audit & Risk Magazine
Internal Auditor
International Business & Economics Research Journal
International Journal of Accounting and Information Management
International Journal of Business Information Systems
International Journal of Corporate Governance
International Journal of Disclosure and Governance
International Journal of Intelligent Systems in Accounting, Finance and Management
International Journal of Managerial and Financial Accounting
International Journal of Public Administration
International Tax Journal
International Tax Review
Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies
Journal of Applied Accounting Research
Journal of Applied Business Research
Journal of Applied Management Accounting Research
Journal of Applied Research in Accounting and Finance
Journal of Cost Management/Cost Management
Journal of Emerging Technologies and Accounting
Journal of Financial Crime
Journal of Financial Planning
Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance
Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting
Journal of Forensic Accounting
Journal of Forensic Economics
Journal of Forensic Studies in Accounting and Business
Journal of Government Financial Management
Journal of Management Accounting Quarterly/Strategic
Finance
Management Decision
Oil, Gas & Energy Quarterly
Pacific Accounting Review
Qualitative Research in Accounting and Management

Research in Accounting Regulation
Research on Accounting Ethics
Research on Professional Responsibility and Ethics in Accounting
Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting
Taxes - The Tax Magazine

Appendix B

LEGAL SCHOLARLY JOURNAL LIST

This list primarily relies upon the Law Journal Rankings compiled annually by Washington & Lee University School of Law using its Combined Score. The Combined Score is a composite of each journal's impact factor and total cites count during an eight year period. Impact factor shows the average number of annual citations to articles in each journal (rounded to two decimal places). The Combined Score is weighted with one-third of the score based upon the impact factor and two-thirds of the score based on total cites count. The resulting score is then normalized. Please see the website for the Law Journal Rankings compiled by Washington & Lee University School of Law for more information about the methodology used to compile these rankings: <http://lawlib.wlu.edu/LJ/>.

The list classifies some journals higher than their average Washington & Lee ranking among all law reviews would warrant because these journals are considered to have a significant impact in certain specialized areas that are most relevant to the CBA. These areas include banking and finance, bankruptcy, commercial law, comparative law, corporations and associations, economics, insurance law, international law, and taxation. In some cases, these journals were selected because they were among the top journals in these areas according to Washington & Lee. In other cases, these journals were selected because other disciplines within the CBA classify them as A or B journals.

While this list might seem like a large number of journals, most of the journals in the A and B tiers are general law reviews. Only about 15% of the articles published by general law reviews cover business law topics. In addition, many of the spaces, particularly in the top law reviews, are filled with invited articles. As a result, there are a relatively small number of slots available for unsolicited articles that focus on business law issues. In addition, several electronic services now help law professors, legal studies professors, and lawyers submit their articles to law reviews for their consideration. As a result, most law journals classified as A journals receive over 3000 unsolicited manuscripts annually and many of the law journals classified as B journal receive over 2000 unsolicited manuscripts annually. This results in acceptance rates of less than 2 percent for the top 50 law reviews and less than 5 percent for the top 100 law reviews. These acceptance rates are lower than or comparable to the acceptance rates for the premier journals in finance and economics. According to Cabell's, the American Economic Review has an acceptance rate of 7 percent and the Journal of Finance has an acceptance rate of about 4 percent.

Washington & Lee's rankings emphasize the value of current scholarship because they are based on the citations by academics, lawyers, and judges during a moving eight-year period. Given the rankings' variability from year to year, it is impossible to predict where a journal will fall within the Washington & Lee rankings in the future. Randomly electing a single year as the basis for an academic journal's ranking effectively transforms the prospects for promotion and tenure into a game of chance that can cost candidates tenure and deny the University highly qualified professors. To avoid this problem, this list relies upon the average

Washington & Lee rankings for the journals during the prior ten years when evaluating a journal's classification and when making promotion and tenure decisions rather than looking at the rankings in a single year.

Ranking	List of Journals	Points
A+ Journals	<p>The journals in this category consist of journals with an average ranking over the prior 10 years of between 1 and 50 on the Law Journal Rankings by the Washington & Lee University School of Law compiled using the Combined Score and the American Business Law Journal, a highly ranked peer review law journal and the flagship publication of the Academy of Legal Studies in Business, the professional organization for professors of legal studies and business law in AACSB-accredited business schools.</p>	9
A Journals	<p>The journals in this category consist of journals with an average ranking over the prior 10 years of between 51 and 100 on the Law Journal Rankings by the Washington & Lee University School of Law compiled using the Combined Score and the following subject matter journals:</p> <p>Journal of Law and Economics† Journal of Law, Economics & Organization† Journal of Legal Studies‡ American Law and Economics Review‡ Harvard Business Law Review§ Journal of Corporation Law§ Delaware Journal of Corporate Law§ Columbia Business Law Review§ The Business Lawyer§ Berkeley Business Law Journal§ New York University Journal of Law & Business§ Fordham Journal of Corporate & Financial Law§ North Carolina Banking Institute§ Review of Banking and Financial Law§ Journal of Empirical Legal Studies§ University of Pennsylvania Journal of Business Law§ Stanford Journal of Law, Business & Finance§ Antitrust Law Journal§ Connecticut Insurance Law Journal§ Harvard International Law Journal§ Virginia Journal of International Law§ Yale Journal of International Law§ Chicago Journal of International Law§ Michigan Journal of International Law§ Columbia Journal of Transnational Law§ American Journal of Comparative Law§ Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law§ University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law§ Virginia Tax Review§ Tax Law Review§</p>	9

B Journals	<p>The journals in this category consist of journals with an average ranking over the prior 10 years of between 101 and 541 on the Law Journal Rankings by the Washington & Lee University School of Law compiled using the Combined Score and the following subject matter journals:</p> <p>International Review of Law and Economics† Brooklyn Journal of Corporate, Financial & Commercial Law§ Ohio State Entrepreneurial Business Law Journal§ University of Miami Business Law Review§ DePaul Business & Commercial Law Journal§ Journal of Law and Commerce§ William and Mary Business Law Review§ Banking Law Journal§</p>	6
C Journals	<p>The journals in this category consist of journals with an average ranking over the prior 10 years of between 542 and 1381 on the Law Journal Rankings by the Washington & Lee University School of Law compiled using the Combined Score.</p>	3
Non-Qualifying Journals	<p>The journals in this category consist of journals with an average ranking over the prior 10 years of 1382 or lower on the Law Journal Rankings by the Washington & Lee University School of Law compiled using the Combined Score.</p>	0

†- Ranking on the Harzing Journal Quality List

‡- Journals that economics departments frequently classify as A journals.

§- Highly ranked journals by the Washington & Lee Rankings for the subject areas of banking and finance, bankruptcy, commercial law, comparative law, corporations and associations, economics, insurance law, international law, and taxation. These journals significantly influence business law scholarship and their rank among all law reviews does not accurately reflect their substantial impact on business law scholarship.

Appendix C

DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTANCY STATEMENT ON SCHOLARSHIP

The acquisition of new knowledge in the disciplines of accountancy and law and the discovery of new, effective ways to communicate this knowledge are key elements that characterize activities of Ranked Faculty. Consequently, it is expected that Ranked Faculty will be active scholars. Scholarship both supports the teaching function and is a valuable activity in its own right. Scholarship includes investigation of a subject prompted by a deep curiosity concerning it.

It is entirely possible that the scholarly emphasis of individual Ranked Faculty members may vary over their academic careers; however, it is expected that all Ranked Faculty will remain scholarly active throughout their academic career. The Department values all scholarship including discovery, integration, applied and instructional, but emphasizes applied and instructional scholarship.

Ultimately, the purpose of scholarship is to have an impact on the relevant discipline. The Department recognizes that the disciplines of accountancy and law can use different means for discerning how scholarship has impacted each discipline. An essential aspect of all forms of scholarship, however, is its external evaluation by peers.

In the disciplines of accountancy and many other business fields, a primary factor in the evaluation of scholarship is the extent to which it has received peer review and dissemination. In those areas, the principal ways that this is done are through publication and presentation of the results or products of scholarship and through peer review of competitive grant proposals for funds to support the scholarly work.

In the discipline of law, the principal ways of showing impact are through (i) the publication and dissemination of scholarly legal articles in professional journals, high impact law reviews, interdisciplinary journals, peer-reviewed journals in other disciplines, or conference proceedings; (ii) competitive grant proposals to obtain funds to support scholarly work; (iii) having legal scholarship used as a basis for drafting laws or regulations; and (iv) having legal scholarship cited in court opinions, legal briefs, administrative regulation documentation, and other policy-making documents. The Department defines “high impact law reviews” as those journals described in Appendix B as A, B, or C journals. The list in Appendix B is based upon the rankings of law journals determined by Washington & Lee University School of Law (“W&L Rankings”). The Department uses the W&L Rankings to identify high impact law reviews because standard business journal indexes, such as Cabell’s, the Association of Business Schools Academic Journal Quality Guide, or the Financial Times 45, contain very few or no law journals.

Expectations for Scholarship during the Probationary Period. During their probationary period, faculty are expected to establish a vibrant, sustainable research program. In order to further clarify expectations for probationary faculty, the department regards the items listed below as examples of *typical indicators* of a successful scholarly program. These criteria are not meant to

imply an absolute minimum standard but are presented to outline examples of a sustainable program of scholarship.

- Writing and publishing scholarly papers in academic journals (See Section III.B. and Appendices A and B);
- Presenting scholarly work at national/international, regional, and local conferences;
- Authoring texts, or other copyrighted work contributing to the accountancy and/or legal professions;
- Proposing, receiving, and administering grants;
- Developing tangible teaching materials including study guides and software;
- Working papers and other work in process, published or accepted for publication by the time of tenure review.