DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS

BYLAWS, POLICY STATEMENTS AND GUIDELINES

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - LA CROSSE

Revised March, 2010 (Format Changes)

<div align="center">**Table of Contents**</div>

B. Instructional Academic Staff
C. Contingency Workforce (Pool Search)
D. Non-Instructional Academic Staff (if applicable)

X. Student Rights and Obligations
A. Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures (can reference an appendix)
B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct
C. Advising Policy (if applicable) (can reference an appendix)

XI. Other
XII. Appendices
A. Department statement on scholarship
B. UWL CBA Scholarly Productivity Guidelines
C. Approved University Committees

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

Approved: September, 2009

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 Information Systems program is designed to achieve a healthy balance between management knowledge and computer skills. With solid coursework in the computer science area before entering the professional portion of the program, students will have developed a technical foundation to attain strong abilities to solve business problems. Students complete courses in computer programming languages, systems analysis, design and implementation, data communications, decision support systems, and e-commerce. Faculty continuously evaluates the curriculum to maintain a cutting-edge program that meets students and the profession's needs. Since the fall of 2001, the department has been housed in the newly renovated Wing Technology Center. The IS faculty work closely with the Computer Science Department to deliver a curriculum balanced between computer science education and business management.

As all other business programs, IS students will complete an extensive array of courses in liberal arts and science, including courses in communication, humanities, multicultural issues and social sciences. Majors must also take core business courses in economics, accountancy, management, marketing and financial management. The vast majority of IS majors participate in an internship experience in their junior or senior year. The internships are worth university credit that applies to the major program. Most are paid and many lead directly to employment with the firm following graduation.

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.doj.state.wi.us/AWP/OpenMeetings/2005-OML-GUIDE.pdf, summary at http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/recruit/Academic_Recruitment/OPENMEETING.htm).

Minutes will be recorded by a voting member or the departmental ADA and distributed in a timely fashion to department members. Copies of the minutes of department meetings and committee meetings shall be in a secure location by the department.

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.

D. Definitions of Quorum and Majority

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.

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

These by-laws may be amended by the following procedures: A two-thirds majority of the current department membership present and eligible to vote on by-laws is required to amend the by-laws; Any proposed amendment(s) shall be presented and distributed in writing at a department meeting and voted on at the next subsequent meeting; policies pertaining to personnel issues, which are the responsibility of the ranked-faculty (tenure-track or tenured), or of the tenured faculty may only be changed by those voting. Second readings can be waived for by-laws that do not pertain to personnel decisions.

III. Faculty/Staff Responsibilities

A. Faculty

Faculty responsibilities are referenced in section IV of the Faculty Senate by-laws entitled "Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons." A complete set of the by-laws are available off the Senate webpage under "Senate Articles and By-laws" http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/.

Regular Teaching Loads

The Departmental Policy concerning teaching loads is consistent with the University and College of Business Administration policies. The teaching load standard for the University is twelve credit hours per semester (Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook 1991-92, pp. 25-26). However, actual teaching loads vary within the university and are influenced by such things as curricular constraints, physical facilities, and accreditation requirements.

Faculty in the College of Business Administration whose teaching performance is deemed satisfactory by the department and whose scholarly activities meet the guidelines usually will be assigned a nine hour teaching load per semester. A nine hour load usually will consist of two preparations. The department chair may assign newly appointed faculty a nine hour load to stimulate scholarly activities. 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.

Normally academic staff will be assigned a twelve credit teaching load.

The Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean, is responsible for establishing the teaching load for each faculty member and for managing the overall department work load in compliance with university and college guidelines (College of Business Administration Teaching Guidelines).

Intersession Scheduling

Intersession scheduling and staffing refers to the following: J-Term and Summer sessions.

The goal of the Information Systems Department regarding intersession teaching loads is to provide teaching opportunities to all tenured and tenure track faculty whenever possible and to serve the needs of the students. The intersession class schedule, developed by the Department Head, should be based on the academic strengths and teaching preferences of the involved faculty in conjunction with the historical "drawing power" of each class. Compensation received for teaching MBA classes and other outside sources of funding shall NOT be included in the consideration of undergraduate course assignments. Only full-time, tenure track, faculty are eligible for intersession teaching positions. Remuneration is based on College of Business guidelines that specify a level of compensation in fixed dollar terms based on the number of enrolled students.

The method of allocating teaching positions among eligible faculty is a rotation list. Each intersession (Summer and J-Term) will have a separate rotation list. The department chair maintains the rotation list. The initial rotation list is based on a random process. A newly hired faculty member who possesses the terminal degree is added to the top of each rotation list at the start of his/her first academic term on campus. A newly hired faculty member without the terminal degree is added to the bottom of the list at the start of his/her first term. In the event that more than one new faculty are hired with the same terminal degree status and starting in the same academic term, their respective places on the list are

governed by date of acceptance. Upon completion of the terminal degree, an eligible faculty member is moved to the top of the list prior to assignment of teaching positions for the <u>subsequent</u> intersession (e.g. Completion of the degree during the 2008/2009 academic year – June 1, 2009 through May 31, 2010 -- allows movement to the top of the list prior to assignment of teaching positions for the May and Summer sessions of 2011).

The department chair determines the number of classes, their type, and their schedule, that are likely to meet minimum College of Business enrollment requirements.

Eligible faculty members, in sequential list order, will be offered an opportunity to select a course from the schedule until the schedule for the session in question is staffed.

When a faculty member accepts an intersession position, his/her name is removed from its current position and placed at the bottom of the associated list. However, if subsequently the class is cancelled, that faculty member maintains his/her original position on the list

A faculty member who, when offered, declines to select a position, maintains his/her current position on the list.

If a first pass through the list does not meet staffing needs, a second pass may be made. If the second pass does not meet staffing needs, the department chair may seek other instructors to teach needed classes.

B. Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations

Requests for IAS hiring will be presented to the college dean. The request will indicate one of the standard titles from the lecturer or clinical professor series http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/committees/ias/pages/titling.html and will outline specific duties including teaching and any additional workload. Total workload for IAS is defined as a standard minimum teaching load plus additional workload equivalency activities. http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/41st/3-29-07/IAS%20Appendix%20B.htm.

The following policy statement has been adopted to officially establish the rights, privileges and retention criteria of academic staff within the Department of Information Systems.

Department Full-time Academic Staff Policy Statement

Full-time academic staff in the Department of Information Systems shall have the same rights and privileges of ranked faculty as they relate to department governance. Therefore, academic staff shall be entitled to vote on matters, both procedural and substantive requiring a department wide vote and serve, as a voting member, on department committees. Finally, academic staff shall be evaluated annually on teaching and service performance by the PRT Committee*. See performance outcomes and behavioral guidelines under "Criteria for Reappointment and Tenure." Participation in scholarship activities by Academic Staff is viewed positively but Academic Staff are not required to meet minimum scholarship requirements.

Department Part-time Academic Staff Policy Statement

Part-time academic staff are not eligible to take part in department governance. Therefore, such academic staff shall not be entitled to vote on matters requiring a department vote, or serve as members on

department committees. Finally, such academic staff shall not require annual evaluation by the PRT Committee.

*Academic Staff may not serve on the Merit and By Law Committee or the Promotion, Retention, and Tenure Committee.

C. Non Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations

Not applicable

D. Student Evaluation of Instruction

The department will follow the UW-L SEI policy and procedure available off the Faculty Senate webpage http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/.

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

IAS renewal and career progression. The same information as above is reported; however, no TAIs are generated for IAS.

IV. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)

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. Faculty

The following bylaws relating to merit evaluation were adopted by the Department of Information Systems to establish a system for evaluating faculty and continuing academic staff within the department. The following bylaws are used for the determination of merit pay for tenure-track faculty. The merit evaluation process employs a single merit score in the range of 0 to 1,000 points for each candidate. The IS Merits Evaluation Committee computes this score according to the criteria specified in the Evaluation Categories and Weights and Evaluation Criteria sections herein, and submits all candidates' scores to the Chair of the department. The Chair then compiles the departmental distribution list and submits it to the Dean of the CBA. The "Information Systems Department Annual Evaluation Form" is the main document for merit reporting. Because the merit review covers a different time period than the annual review, candidates should modify their annual reports generated via Digital Measures to reflect their service records pertaining to the correct review period, which is from June 1 to May 31.

Definitions

The Department of Information Systems recognizes two distinct classes of Merit salary adjustments: Solid Performance and Extraordinary Merit.

Solid performance

Solid performance merit adjustments are earned insofar as faculty are meeting the minimum expectations of their position as a member of the Department. Individuals qualifying for solid performance, will receive the state-allotted solid performance raise. To earn "solid performance" an individual must have solid teaching performance (Rank 2) and earned a minimum of 400 points as determined by the merit committee.

Extraordinary Merit

Extraordinary Merit recognizes the need to differentially reward faculty for levels of performance and individual accomplishments that exceed the minimum expectations of the Department. To be eligible for merit compensation, an individual must have excellent teaching performance (Rank 1) as determined by the merit committee and meet CBA Research Productivity Guidelines.

Merit Eligibility

The merit evaluation process shall be based upon teaching, research, professional and public service, and contribution to the University. To be considered eligible for solid performance and merit, a member must:

- Have conducted a Information Systems Department Student Evaluation of all courses taught during both semesters of each year (not including summer),

- Each faculty/staff member will complete the standard department Merit Evaluation Form.

- Be able to provide written documentation for any activity for which a faculty member wishes to receive merit points.

Merit Evaluation Committee

The evaluation process of all tenured and tenure track members, including the chair of the department, will be conducted by the Merit Evaluation Committee. The Merit Evaluation Committee shall be comprised of all tenured and tenure-track members in the department subject to the merit evaluation process. The committee will elect a chair to manage the evaluation process. The Department Chair is not eligible to chair the committee. Each member of the committee will evaluate all other members' written materials. No committee member will evaluate his/her own materials.

Merit Evaluation Criteria

The three areas of greatest importance to the merit evaluation process will be weighted as follows:

- Teaching - 45 percent
- Scholarship - 35 percent
- Service - 20 percent

In evaluating a full-time teaching (FTT) faculty member's performance, the Merit Committee will weight the three areas as follows: Teaching, 45%, Research, 35%, and University and Professional Community Service, 20%. Research output for new faculty members occurring after the date of their contract, but before the beginning of the reporting year, will be considered. However, first-year new faculty are not allowed to compete in teaching and service.

In evaluating department members with administrative duties, teaching load reductions, or teaching overloads, the Merit Committee will adjust its procedure to recognize these activities.

Faculty on Leave

     a. Department members who take one-year or longer leaves of absence for any reason will receive a merit score during their absence of at least 400 if a completed merit form is submitted.

     b. The merit committee shall have discretion to deviate from normal evaluation procedures in assessing the performance of department members on one year or longer leaves of absence. For example, a department member on leave who is developing significant skills that will contribute to departmental objectives may be rewarded for those activities with a merit score in excess of 400.

     c. Merit scores for department members on one-year or longer leaves of absence will not be reported outside the department. The report will simply indicate an on leave status.

     d. Department members who take one-semester leaves of absence for any reason will receive a merit score for the academic year based on a normal evaluation of their performance during the active semester. In addition, their SEI scores and

committee service will be annualized and any research conducted or published during the leave will be counted.

Specific Merit Guidelines

Teaching (450 points maximum)

➢ **SEI (200 points)**

Classroom performance of all faculty members in the department shall be evaluated for both semesters during each academic year (see Information Systems Administrative Assistant for a copy of the Student Evalation Form instrument). The composite fractional median for items 5-9 will be used as the measure of faculty member performance. A faculty member's annual performance measure is the simple average of the composite fractional medians for items 5-9 earned for both semesters during the calendar year.

Classroom performance will be evaluated using the following SEI guidelines:

- Rank 1 - Excellent performance   4.0 and higher*   200 points
- Rank 2 - Solid Performance   3.0 -3.9*   125 points
- Rank 3 - Marginal Performance   2.0-2.9*   75 points
- Rank 4 - Weak Performance   Less than 2.0*   0 points

* A faculty member within .10 points of the cutoff for a given rank may be awarded the higher rank if deemed appropriate by the merit committee due to extraordinary circumstances facing the faculty member in a given semester. Examples of extraordinary circumstances include, but are not limited to: a new course preparation; substantially new teaching method (style/ project); course content; personal or family illness or disability.

➢ **Peer Evaluation (200 points)**

This is a subjective measure of teaching performance, which must be carried out with extreme care. Merit Committee members are required to consider the following inputs in performing peer evaluation; it is the goal of the department to increase emphasis on outcome assessment as an ingredient of teaching evaluation.

- Course portfolio
- Outcome assessment
- Academic standards
- Faculty development related to IT knowledge and skills acquisition

➢ **Supervision of Independent Study and Internship (50 points maximum)**

IS faculty are encouraged to supervise independent studies and internships. Supervision of each quality independent study or internship for credit course that is well documented will receive 20-point and 10-points scores, respectively, up to a maximum of 50 points for all cases.

Research (350 points maximum)

- ➢ **Academic Journal Articles**

    Category A: 200 to 350 points per article
    Category B: 150 to 250 points per article

    Category A consists of internationally renowned journals that are business related, whereas Category B consists of other academically rigorous journals. The identification and recognition of referred journals is a duty of the Merit Committee.   Refereed Journal Articles include all articles published in journals listed in the current <u>Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Business and Economics,</u> consistent with the College of Business Administration's Productivity Guidelines. Other acceptable journals will be considered subject to those guidelines.

    * IS faculty are allowed to bank up to two articles for consideration in the following year merit evaluation. All publications will be considered for the year or year +1 in which they are <u>published</u>. **Co-authored papers count as a "full" hit for each author.

- ➢ **Referred Conference Proceedings**

    National /International: 50 to 100 points per regular article
    Regional: 30 to 60 points per regular article

    Examples of National/International Conferences are AMCIS, DSI, HICSS and ICIS.

- ➢ **Book Chapters, Monograms, and Technical Reports**

    50 o 100 points per item

- ➢ **Conference Presentations Without Proceedings Papers and Invited Research Presentations**

    National/International: 20 points per incidence
    Regional/Local: 10 points per incidence

- ➢ **Funded Research Grants**

    External to the University: 30 to 50 points per grant
    Internal to the University: 20 to 30 points per grant

- ➢ **Research in Progress (Informational: no points assigned)**

    The determination of the publication date of any research output pertaining to Items 1, 2, and 3 above is at the discretion of the reviewed candidate. Either and only one of the dates can be used: the acceptance date or the actually publication date.

Service (200 points maximum)

- ➢ **Departmental (120 points maximum)**
    Service performance will be classified into four levels and assigned the corresponding scores.

- Outstanding: 120 points
- Solid: 90 points
- Acceptable: 70 points
- Unacceptable: 0 points

➢ **College and University (50 points maximum)**

➢ **Local Community and Academic Community (30 points maximum)**

* The specific guidelines provided are not intended to serve as rigid criteria for merit categories. They emphasize only certain aspects of performance and should not be interpreted as exhaustive. All information provided on a department member's merit evaluation form must be evaluated by the merit committee in accordance with these bylaws.

2. Instructional Academic Staff (if included in merit processes, otherwise see VI)**.**

    Not Applicable

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

    Not Applicable

4. Department Chair (if applicable)

The department chairperson participates in the faculty merit evaluation process in a similar manner as all other faculty. In evaluating the department chair's performance, the Merit Committee will assess the following three categories: Teaching, Research, and Administration/University /Community (hereafter A/U/C) Service. The Merit Committee will rate the department chair by computing the sum of the weighted value of each aspect of the department chair's performance according to the following equation: (.3) Teaching + (.35) Research + (.35) A/U/C Service. Teaching and research performance will be evaluated using the same standard as for FTT faculty members. Evaluation of A/U/C services will require consideration of, but is not limited to:

       a. activities reported by the chair on the department evaluation form related to his/her chair assignment,
       b. a letter from the dean of CBA assessing the level of service outside the department, and
       c. a census of department members for assessment of the chair's administrative activity performance.

B. Distribution of Merit Funds

Total points will be divided into the total dollar pool to calculate the value per point. If the rank order of the departmental members is consistent across all members of the merit committee, the per-point-value will simply be multiplied by the average number of merit points assigned to each faculty member by the Merit Committee as-a-whole.

If the rank ordering of departmental members is inconsistent across the merit committee, the chair of the merit committee will distribute the results to the committee members and reconvene the committee to discuss the scores. Committee members will abstain from discussions about themselves. After the discussions, committee members may revise their merit evaluations and resubmit them to the committee chair. The chair will recalculate the merit scores to obtain the final overall point ratings.

* This merit pay increase will have no impact on other monies for which a faculty member may be eligible.

B. **Appeal Procedures** (if applicable)

Faculty members will be notified of their merit status at least two weeks prior to the transmission date of salary decisions from the Department to the Dean. The transmission date is established each year by the vice-chancellor. Members who wish to appeal a no merit decision are required to do so within one week of notification. The Department Chair must receive, in writing, a request to schedule a meeting of the Merit

Committee to reconsider the requesting member's no merit status. Only a decision of no merit is subject to review.

V. Faculty Personnel Review

The department will follow the policies regarding retention and tenure described in the Faculty Personnel Rules (UWS 3.06 - 3.11 and UWL 3.06 -3.08) http://www.uwlax.edu/HR/F_Handbook.htm.

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

> August 1, 2008

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

A. Retention (procedure, criteria and appeal)

i.   Faculty under review will generate an electronic portfolio via Digital Measures demonstrating their teaching, scholarship, and service activities extracted from their date of hire to date of review. Hyperlinked syllabi are required and the candidate may choose to provide additional evidence. Additional materials may be required for departmental review and will be indicated in these by-laws.

ii.   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 SEIs by individual course and semester (which are only available after completing a full academic year) and departmental comparison SEI data; and 3. Merit evaluation data (if available).

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

iv.   Starting with tenured-track faculty hired effective Fall 2008, all first-year tenure-track faculty will be formally reviewed in the spring of their first year. A departmental letter will be filed with the Dean and HR. Formal reviews resulting in contract decisions will minimally occur for tenure-track faculty in their 2nd, 4th and 6th years.

The following policy statement and bylaws as they relate to promotion, retention, and tenure, were adopted by the Department of Information Systems in accordance with the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse Faculty Handbook and the Faculty Personnel Rules. The policy statement establishes a Department Promotion, Renewal, Tenure Committee (PRT Committee). The bylaws establish procedures and criteria for promotion, reappointment and tenure.

Department Policy Statement on the PRT Committee:

The Promotion, Reappointment, and Tenure Committee for the Information Systems Department shall consist of all tenured members in the Department. In such case that the PRT committee has fewer than 3 members, in consultation with the tenured and probationary faculty of the Information Systems department, a pool of committee members (of size N+1, where N represents the number of committee members needed outside the Information Systems Department) will be drawn from tenured faculty

members in the College of Business Administration and/or Deans office. Committee members from outside the department shall serve a one-year, renewable term on the committee. The candidate will be allowed to review the committee member candidate pool and remove one or zero potential committee members from consideration at his or her discretion.
.
No member of the Committee who is eligible for promotion shall take part in his or her promotion decision. The PRT Committee bylaws are written and approved by members of the PRT committee, subject to the following exception. If there are less than three faculty that meet the criteria specified the PRT bylaws are written and approved by tenured and probationary faculty of the Information Systems department.

The PRT chair will be elected by a simple majority of the committee members voting. The term of office will be one year. The PRT chair will be the official and sole spokesperson for the committee.

In compliance with the Open Meetings Law, meetings relating to promotion and tenure should be announced in the Campus Connection to serve as an open meeting notice. The notice should indicate that the meeting might go into closed session to discuss personnel matters.

Categories of University Criteria For Evaluation of Faculty for Retention/Tenure

1. The retention (tenure) decisions by the committee are peer judgments of future performance. Consequently, in making a retention (tenure) decision, the committee will consider all matters bearing on the potential of the candidate

2. In evaluating a faculty member's performance, the committee will consider teaching, research, and professional, public, and university service.

3. The committee has established minimum performance levels applying to a faculty member's record at UW-L prior to the tenure recommendation. These levels serve to identify a floor below which a favorable tenure recommendation is highly unlikely.

   a. Teaching:

   Evidence of a systematic and on going program focused on assessing student learning at the course level. This program should include specification of student learning objectives, measurement of student outcomes related to those objectives, and analysis of such measurement results. Evidence of the establishment and maintenance of high academic standards expected of students.

   b. Research:

   Meet College of Business Administration Scholarly Productivity Guidelines.

   c. Service:

   Professional and Public Service - at least six from among the following: attendance at professional meetings (workshops, seminars, etc.), discussion of papers at professional meetings, and/or public service activities in a professional capacity (e.g., presentations or assignments with the BDC, Reviewers for peer reviewed journals, Reviewers for professional conferences, conference session chair.

University Service - membership on at least six committees from among the following: standing committees, significant ad hoc committees, and/or Faculty Senate.

4. Satisfactorily meeting the minimum performance levels does not guarantee a favorable tenure recommendation. In evaluating a probationary faculty member's performance in excess of the minimum levels, the committee will weight the three areas as follows:

- ➢ Teaching 45%,
- ➢ Research 35%, and
- ➢ Service 20%.

This weighting scheme constitutes a statement of values adopted by the PRT committee.

5. Except for the use of SEI results in evaluating teaching effectiveness, evaluation will be performed by peers. The areas and activities to be considered under each of the three categories include, but are not limited to:

a. Teaching:
   o SEI results
   o Curriculum and course development
   o Innovative approaches to instruction
   o Quality of syllabi, exams, and assignments
   o Maintenance of academic standards and integrity
   o Teaching workload and course variety
   o Supervision of student research and internships
   o Attendance at workshops and seminars on teaching effectiveness
   o Improvement of instruction grant application and funding
   o Preparation of materials employing various media for instructional use
   o Student advising and counseling

b. Research: (See Dept. of I-S definition of Scholarship)
   o Articles, books, and book reviews submitted and/or accepted by refereed and/or non-refereed journals
   o Papers presented at professional programs
   o Research grant applications and funding
   o Working papers and research in progress
   o Maintenance of academic standards and integrity
   o Development activities that contribute to a faculty member's subject matter competence in the rapidly changing environment of Information Technology.

c. Service:
   Public and Professional Service
   o Participation as discussant or chair at professional conferences
   o Offices held in community organizations
   o Speeches and workshops conducted
   o Consulting
   o Attendance at professional conferences
   o Attendance at institutes and seminars
   o Participation in University Outreach programs
   o Membership in professional organizations and community organizations in a professional capacity

o Honors and awards

University Service
o Faculty Senate
o University committees
o Department committees
o College committees
o Advisor to campus groups
o Developing library resources
o Other services to university programs

The Philosophy Underlying the Stated Minima

The following stated criteria for tenure and reappointment 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 or reappointment. Performance well above the minimum level is expected in one or more of the three categories to be evaluated.

* The following statements of minimum criteria are based on the assumption of sufficient resources to support the kinds of activities specified.

Procedure for Reappointment and Granting of Tenure

The Department chairperson shall give written notice of the Department 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 PRT Committee with the following information:

A completed copy of the Annual Evaluation Form (via Digital Measures), which summarizes relevant activities for the most recent academic year. For second year faculty contract decisions and for tenure decisions, relevant activities for all years at UW-L will be reported
- Copies of any scholarship materials the faculty member wishes to be considered by the Committee.

- Any other material the faculty member wishes to be considered by the Committee.

- Any other material requested by the Committee.

The department chairperson shall provide the chairperson of the PRT Committee with the following information for each reappointment or tenure candidate:
- Student evaluation analysis computer printout for Fall and Spring semesters during the year. (Exception: for tenure, all available printouts from previous years will be provided).

- Course syllabi from the Department Course Syllabi file.

- Any other information requested by the committee which could have a bearing on the potential performance of the renewal/tenure candidate.

The Philosophy/Guidelines Underlying Reappointment Decisions

The reappointment decision requires that, in the judgment of the PRT committee, the 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.

Criteria for Reappointment

<u>Performance Outcomes Expected of Faculty</u>

- Teaching Competency as evidenced by student ratings

- Scholarship activity meeting or exceeding CBA productivity guidelines. Productivity guidelines are subject to change when revised by the College of Business Administration. (See Appendix B)*.

- Reasonable progress should be made toward meeting CBA productivity guidelines as evidenced by having a minimum of one accepted manuscript by the end of 3 years at UWL*.

- The faculty member must have a minimum level of service activity in three of the following areas:

    a) The faculty member must be a member of at least one national and/or regional professional organization that is related to the faculty member's discipline, whose mission is consistent with the Department's current goals and must have attended at least one of such organization's conferences within the last two academic years.
    b)
       The faculty member must have demonstrated participation in one of the following areas within the last two academic years:

       - SBDC/BBER work
       - consulting
       - community volunteer

    c) The faculty member must demonstrate involvement with students through advising and career counseling, acting as an advisor to a professional student organization, or through some other means.

    d) The faculty member must take an active role in a departmental ad hoc and/or standing committee.

    e) The faculty member must take an active role in one of the following College committees:
       - Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
       - Graduate Committee
       - Technology Advisory Committee
       - Scholarship Committee
       - International Business Advisory Committee
       - any ad hoc committees or working groups designed to address specific issues

    f) The faculty member must take an active role on any university committee listed by the Committee on Committees or any ad hoc or working group designed to address specific issues. (See Appendix C)

- Scholarship expectations do not apply to academic staff

<u>Behavioral Guidelines Expected of All Faculty</u>

Teaching:

- Hold class as scheduled in the timetable
- Conduct rigorous classes*
- 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

*The faculty member may develop a teaching portfolio that would enable the faculty member to display his/her teaching accomplishments for examination by the PRT committee.

Service:

- While the department recognizes the ability of 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, faculty are expected to work on campus a reasonable number of hours per week.

- Faculty members are expected to **actively** engage in service as evidenced by regular attendance and participation on committees and/or positions of leadership.

I have read and understand the performance outcomes and behavioral practices expected of faculty in the Information Systems Department at the University of Wisconsin – La Crosse. The 9/20/02 departmental meeting minutes, which further clarify the expectations of fellow Information Systems faculty regarding reasonable behavior, have been made available to me. I understand that any faculty member with a documented disability (e.g., physical, learning, psychiatric, vision, or hearing, etc.) has a responsibility to notify the Chairperson of the Department and the Disability Resource Services Office (165 Murphy Library) so reasonable accommodations can be arranged. I understand that failure to meet the performance outcomes or comply with the behavioral expectations may affect promotion, retention and tenure decisions.

Faculty Member Name _____ Date _____

B. Tenure Review and Departmental Tenure Criteria

Differences in Focus for Tenure Decisions vs. Promotion Decisions

A major distinction between the decision for tenure and the decision for promotion lies in the future orientation of tenure. The tenure decision follows and is based on two complementary judgments:
(1) The competency and promise of the faculty member, and
(2) The future needs of the University.

Thus, the decision for tenure involves a prediction of future faculty performance and future University need, along with an assessment of performance to date. In contrast, the decision for promotion focuses only on performance to date. **The same categories of performance are used for both types of decisions.**

C. Post-tenure Review

Tenured faculty review and development is an opportunity for assessment with the objective of facilitating continued development of faculty members. Each tenured faculty member in the Department is to be reviewed once every five years. The review should include an evaluation of previous performance and a plan for future performance. The faculty member to be reviewed will choose one or more colleagues from the Department and optionally additional reviewers from outside the Department to work on the review. The review team may consist of a single individual or all faculty of the IS Department.

The review team will meet with the faculty member to become familiar with his or her goals and objectives, ongoing activities in teaching, scholarship, and service. The review team will review scholarly materials, teaching materials, and service activities submitted by the faculty member under review. The team has the right to request additional information and it may interview students or graduates and otherwise gather information which can be used to assist the reviewee in process improvement. The Department Chair will provide the review team with the reviewee's merit scores by category for the last five years as well as department wide scores for the same period. During the information gathering process, it is expected that the team will meet informally with the reviewee to exchange information.

The review team will generate an initial written report for the reviewee which will:
1. describe the information gathered on the reviewee's work.
2. point out areas of particular strength that were found.
3. summarize the merit scores for the last five years.
4. point out potential areas for development and suggest steps the reviewee might consider, resources available, etc.
5. Identify goals and objectives for the next five (or more) years

The team will meet with the reviewee to go over the initial report. The team and the reviewee will create the final written report and a summary of that report. The former will be forwarded to the chairperson of the Department to be kept as an internal document separate from the main personnel file. The summary shall include an evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service as well as plans for the next five years. The summary will be forwarded to the Department Chair and Dean. The reviewed faculty member shall have all the rights of appeal that are outlined in the UWL Faculty Personnel Guidelines 6.01 and 6.02.

To encourage optimal effectiveness in process improvement, the review will not be used for purposes of merit or promotion without the faculty member's permission. The Department chair will forward a summary of the report to parties required by CBA rules, University rules or statute.

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

The department will follow the guidelines and schedules regarding faculty promotion available at http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/promo-resources.htm

Evaluation Criteria for Promotion

1. In evaluating a faculty member's performance, the committee will consider teaching, research, and professional, public, and university service.

2. The committee has established minimum performance levels applying to a faculty member's record at UW-L prior to the promotion recommendation. The minimum levels for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor are as follows:

   a. Teaching:

   SEI scores equal to or above the overall fractional median of the Department for items 4-17 on the old SEI instrument or 5-9 on the new SEI instrument for at least 1/3 of the semesters proceeding the promotion review semester.

   Evidence of a systematic and ongoing program focused on assessing student learning at the course level

   b. Research:

   Meet College of Business Administration Scholarly Productivity Guidelines (Appendix B).

   Four refereed journal articles (in total with the last two at UW-L).

   c. Service:

   Professional and Public Service - at least five from among the following: attendance at professional meetings (workshops, seminars, etc.), discussion of papers at professional meetings, reviewing articles for academic journals, and/or public service activities in a professional capacity (e.g., presentations or assignments with the BDC.)

   College and University Service - membership for a total of at least 75% of the semesters they have been in service at UW-L from among the following: standing committees, significant ad hoc committees, and/or Faculty Senate.

3. The minimum levels for promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor are as follows:

   a. Teaching:

SEI scores equal to or above the overall fractional median of the Department for items 4-17 on the old SEI instrument or 5-9 on the new SEI instrument for at least 1/3 of the semesters proceeding the promotion review semester.

b. Research:

Meet College of Business Administration Scholarly Productivity Guidelines (Appendix B).

Six refereed journal articles (in total with the last three at UW-L).

c. Service:

Professional and Public Service - at least eight from among the following: attendance at professional meetings (workshops, seminars, etc.), discussion of papers at professional meetings, reviewing articles for academic journals, and/or public service activities in a professional capacity (e.g., presentations or assignments with the BDC.)

College and University Service - membership for a total of at least 75% of the semesters they have been in service at UW-L from among the following: standing committees, significant ad hoc committees, and/or Faculty Senate.

4. Satisfactorily meeting the minimum performance levels does not guarantee a favorable promotion recommendation. In evaluating a faculty member's performance in excess of the minimum levels, the committee will weight the three areas as follows:

- o Teaching 40
- o Research 40%, and
- o Service 20%.

Note that this weighting scheme places a heavier weight on research than that used for tenure and retention reviews stipulated in IIIC.4.

5. Except for the use of SEI results in evaluating teaching effectiveness, evaluation will be performed by peers. The areas and activities to be considered under each of the three categories include, but are not limited to:

a. Teaching:
- o SEI results
- o Curriculum and course development
- o Innovative approaches to instruction
- o Quality of syllabi, exams, and assignments
- o Maintenance of academic standards and integrity
- o Teaching workload and course variety
- o Supervision of student research and internships
- o Attendance at workshops and seminars on teaching effectiveness
- o Improvement of instruction grant application and funding
- o Preparation of materials employing various media for instructional use
- o Student advising and counseling

b. Research: (See Dept. of I-S definition of Scholarship)

- o Articles, books, and book reviews submitted and/or accepted by refereed and/or non-refereed journals
- o Papers presented at professional programs
- o Research grant applications and funding
- o Working papers and research in progress
- o Maintenance of academic standards and integrity
- o Development activities that contribute to a faculty member's subject matter competence in the rapidly changing environment of Information Technology.

c. Service:
   Public and Professional Service
   - o Participation as discussant or chair at professional conferences
   - o Offices held in community organizations
   - o Speeches and workshops conducted
   - o Consulting
   - o Attendance at professional conferences
   - o Attendance at institutes and seminars
   - o Participation in University Outreach programs
   - o Membership in professional organizations and community organizations in a professional capacity
   - o Honors and awards

   University Service
   - o Faculty Senate
   - o University committees
   - o Department committees
   - o College committees
   - o Advisor to campus groups
   - o Developing library resources
   - o Other services to university programs

VI. Instructional Academic Staff Review

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

B. Career Progression Procedures
Policies and procedure guiding career progression for IAS are available at http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/committees/ias/pages/CareerProgression.html.

C. Appeal Procedures (re: Annual Review)

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. The Individual Development Plan (IDP) form will accompany the department's evaluation. IDP Form: http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/IDP/IDP.General.Info.html.

VIII. Governance

  A. Department Chair

    1. Election of the Department Chair

    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 By-Laws (revised 2006) http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate 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 Faculty Handbook http://www.uwlax.edu/HR/F_Handbook.htm.

  C.   Standing Departmental Committees *(e.g., personnel (for any matters not covered above) equipment, travel, space, budget, curriculum, assessment, etc).*

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

  E.   Additional departmental policies

By-laws must include a departmental salary equity policy. Include the following two statements:

Sickleave. Department members will account for sickleave in adherence to the most current UW System guidelines: http://www.uwsa.edu/hr/benefits/leave/sick.htm.

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

IX. Search and Screen Procedures

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

A. Tenure-track faculty

The approved UW-L tenure track faculty recruitment and hiring policy & procedures are found at http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/recruit/Faculty_Recruitment/Faculty.Recruitment.Hiring.Guidelines.pdf.

Additionally, UW-L's spousal/partner hiring policy can be found at http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/unclasspp.html#spouse.partner.employment.

B. Instructional Academic Staff
Hiring policy and procedures are found at http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/fac.recruit.html.

C. Contingency Workforce (Pool Search)
Hiring policy and procedures are found at http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/instr.acst.POOL.search.htm

D. Academic Staff (if applicable)
Hiring policy and procedures are found at http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/acst.recruit.html.

X. Student Rights and Obligations

A. Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures

Any student or group of students who has a complaint about faculty or instructional academic staff 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 other faculty members and/or instructional academic staff,
• 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 the Office of Student Life, either orally or in writing and following the procedures described at http://www.uwlax.edu/studentlife/Policies.htm.

B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct11
Academic and nonacademic misconduct policy referenced:
http://www.uwlax.edu/StudentLife/eagle_eye.htm
http://www.uwlax.edu/StudentLife/academic_misconduct.htm
http://www.uwlax.edu/StudentLife/nonacademic-misconduct.htm

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

XII. Appendices
    A. Department statement on scholarship
    B. UWL CBA Scholarly Productivity Guidelines
    C. Approved University Committees

Appendix A.
Information Systems Definition of Scholarship (should we do this or follow CBA), we reference both, kind of confusing

University of Wisconsin–La Crosse is defined to be any effort that contributes to the *Research* and *scholarly activity* within the Information Systems Department at the common body of knowledge in the theory, development, and application of information systems. In particular, these activities shall include

- Writing and publishing scholarly papers in **referred** journals of information systems, or closely-related disciplines;

- Presentation of scholarly work at **or publish in proceedings of** recognized information systems–related meetings or conferences;

- Authoring of texts, or other copyrighted or patented work, contributing to the information systems profession

- Editing or refereeing publications or presentations for a recognized information systems-related journal, textbook, conference, symposium, or workshop;

- Proposing, receiving, and administering grants for the support of information systems at UW-L;

- Participating in information systems-related consulting;

- Developing software or software tools of significant contribution to the information systems discipline;

- Supervising student research or serving on graduate student thesis or research project committee;

- Collaborating on interdisciplinary projects and/or scholarly activity involving the use of information systems;

- Contributing to the offering of information systems-related institutes, short courses, seminars, or workshops;

- Actively participating in professional organizations of information systems discipline; and

- Refreshing and renewing personal knowledge of the discipline of information systems through self-study, or attendance at appropriate institutes, short courses, seminars, or workshops.

Appendix B
UWL CBA Scholarly Productivity Guidelines

The mission statement of the CBA emphasizes personal and professional development of its students. The CBA objectives state that appropriate pedagogic, scholarly and service activities are instrumental in supporting the mission of the institution and that the CBA supports all forms of research. The mission and objectives imply that scholarly activities can focus on discipline-based scholarship, contributions to practice, or learning and pedagogical research. Faculty can utilize many different avenues and combinations of activities to meet the scholarly productivity guidelines. The following guidelines have been developed to facilitate an awareness of the expected types and level of scholarly activity among all CBA faculty.

Each faculty member is expected to author one refereed journal article in the last three years and:

1. A second journal article in the last four years, including discipline-based articles, articles in practitioner journals, and articles on teaching innovation and cases published in refereed journals   **or**

2. One significant published, peer reviewed scholarly activity (typically a scholarly book or monograph) in the last five years   **or**

3. Received a significant external grant in the last three years (the grant should be subject to a review process and external to UW-L)   **or**

4. Served as journal editor or had significant editorial responsibility for at least a two year period in the last five years (see note c for further clarification)   **or**

5. Two other scholarly activities in the last three years including such activities as refereed paper presentations at international, national or regional meetings and/or documented instances of empirical program assessment resulting in recommendations for curricula development in the past three years   **or**

6. Three other scholarly activities in the last three years including such activities as:
   - Book chapters or book reviews
   - Non-refereed journal articles
   - Study guides
   - Professional/technical reports
   - Presentations at practitioner seminars or conventions
   - UW-L grants such as faculty research
   - Supervision of research by undergraduate or graduate students or fellows unrelated to teaching responsibilities
   - Sponsored research reports on practice issues
   - New course creation
   - Executive education course creation
   - Case authorship (not published in journal)
   - Documented practice software
   - Editorial responsibilities not meeting criteria #4
   - Other significant professional research projects

Notes and Clarifications:

a. In cases of joint authorship, each author will receive full recognition of the work.
b. Accepted and/or published scholarly works will receive full recognition.
c. Refereed journals include those listed in any current Cabell's <u>Directory of Publishing Opportunities,</u> as well as other publications that have a review process consisting of two or more peer reviewers. Electronic mediums meeting these requirements are acceptable.
d. Publications in proceedings are normally considered as only part of a presentation; that is, additional recognition will not accrue for work published in proceedings following a presentation that has no subsequent review process.
e. Completion of a dissertation does not apply toward any of the criteria.
f. Classification of scholarly activities is the judgment of the assoc. dean along with department chairpersons and authors.

g. New assistant professors to the CBA will be granted 3 years from the effective date of their appointment to satisfy the productivity requirements. During this 3-year period, new faculty will be granted release time regardless of whether they meet the scholarly productivity guidelines.

Appendix C

Approved University Committees

- Academic Policies & Standards
- Administrative Appointments
- Academic Program Review
- Articles & Bylaws
- Budget
- Complaints, Grievances, Appeals & Academic Freedom
- Continuing Education & Extension
- Faculty Development
- Faculty Senate
- General Education
- Graduate Council
- Graduate Curriculum
- Hearing
- Honors Program
- Information Technology Services (Joint)
- Institutional Review Board
- Legislative/Regents Relations (Joint)
- Library
- Minority Affairs (Joint Committee on)
- Physical Facilities (Joint)
- Planning & Program Review
- Promotion, Tenure & Salary
- Research and Grants
- Scholarship and Awards
- Travel & International Education
- Undergraduate Curriculum
- Undergraduate Research
- University Services
- Faculty Senate