I. DEPARTMENT OF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATION BY-LAWS (05/2018)

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. UWL 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 Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education (SAA) graduate program at UWL has been in existence since 1967 and received UWL Faculty Senate approval for departmental status in 2012. The Department consists of a mix of tenured, tenure track, instructional academic staff (IAS), and adjunct faculty (see Section III B). Ranked faculty, IAS, and some adjunct faculty are involved in curriculum and program policy development, teaching, selection of new students, as well as organizing special events. The majority of other adjunct faculty only teach courses for the department. The combination of ranked and adjunct faculty is an effective staffing model that students consistently note as a strength of the program. As of July 2017, the following are voting adjunct faculty members of the department based on their previous membership as Core faculty: Dr. Larry Ringgenberg, Dr. Mary Vahala, and Nizam Arain.

In 2007, the SAA program received Higher Learning Commission (HLC) approval to offer the SAA degree online, thus becoming the first online graduate program offered by UWL with no partner institution collaboration. The program also adheres to the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) for masters-level student affairs preparation programs.

In 2013, SAA engaged in a partnership with UW-River Falls to host a group of students in Graduate Student Internship (GSI) positions on UWRF's campus, all of whom are enrolled in our online program. UWRF cohort students receive a blended form of M.S.Ed. education and our faculty travel to UWRF a few times per term.

In 2015 (and ratified with an MOU in 2018), SAA engaged in a partnership with UW-Eau Claire and UW-Stout to host a group of students in GSI positions on UWEC's and UW-Stout's campus. All students in these positions are enrolled in SAA's online program.

In 2015-16, the SAA program received UW System and Higher Learning Commission (HLC) approval to offer a Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree in Student Affairs Administration & Leadership. This is a 54-credit program that includes a dissertation.

By the Fall of 2018, SAA will operate 2 on-campus M.S.Ed. cohorts, 1 UWRF blended M.S.Ed. cohort, 2 online M.S.Ed. cohorts, and 2 online Ed.D. cohorts for a student total of about 100. To this SAA will add one more doctoral cohort in the fall of 2019.

Our mission is to advance the field of student affairs by preparing scholar-practitioners for leadership in the multifaceted context of higher education.

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/sites/default/files/dls/open-meetings-law-compliance-guide-2010.pdf) summary at (https://www.wisconsin.edu/general-counsel/legal-topics/open-meetings-law/).

Minutes will be recorded by the departmental ADA or a voting member and distributed in a timely fashion to department members. Copies of the minutes of department meetings and committee meetings shall be kept in a secure location in the department. Minutes from closed meetings will be taken by the Department Chair and written within one week of the proceedings. They will be available by request.

C. Definitions of Membership & Voting Procedures

In general, the department functions as a committee-of-the-whole, headed by an elected or appointed Department Chair. Members of the department are defined as ranked (tenured and tenure-track), instructional academic staff with at least a 50% contract, non-instructional academic staff with 100% appointments, and clinical-faculty for the purpose of conducting business at any regular meeting. Adjunct faculty are not voting members of the department.

1. Unless specifically indicated otherwise, a simple majority of those voting carries the vote (50% + 1). 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. Department members who join virtually using an online medium and who have heard all the deliberation are eligible to vote. "Robert's Rules indicates that abstentions do not affect the voting outcome (they are non-votes)." Paper balloting will be allowed upon request by any voting member of the department. All members of the department (as defined above) have equal voting privileges on departmental matters except for ranked faculty personnel decisions. Paper ballots must be signed and kept securely for seven (7) years.

2. Late or non-received ballots, a non-response to a vote, or improperly marked ballots shall be treated the same as a non-vote and will not be counted in determining the vote. In addition, abstentions and blank votes are treated as non-votes and are ignored. (For example, if 20 ballots were cast with 2 voting yes, 1 voting no, and 17 abstaining, the motion would pass). Abstention votes in retention, promotion, or tenure matters are discouraged except when a conflict of interest exists or the voter has no or little knowledge of the person being considered.

D. Definitions of Quorum and Majority '

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

E. Changing by-laws

The by-laws in this document were adopted by the members of the Department of Student Affairs Administration in accordance with the University of Wisconsin System (UWS) and University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (UWL) Faculty and Academic Staff Personnel Rules.

1. These by-laws maybe be amended according to the following procedures: A 2/3 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 (tenured or tenure-track) may only be changed by the voting of the ranked faculty. Second readings can be waived for by-laws that do not perstain to personnel decisions. Amendments to these by-laws shall become effective five days following their adoption.

III. FACULTY 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" (http://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/).

All faculty in the department are expected to maintain high levels of professional competency in areas of teaching, scholarship and service. Faculty are expected to be contemporary in content areas related to their expertise.

1. Teaching

All faculty members of the department are required to keep current in their subject and profession. Additional information may be found in individual position descriptions. Faculty members are required to work with the Department Chair to facilitate student evaluation of instruction in each course they teach (see Section III F). See Appendix A for department definition of teaching.

2. Scholarship

Ranked faculty members of the department are required to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship. Clinical faculty are encouraged to pursue scholarly activity (see Appendix B for department definition of scholarship).

3. Service

All faculty members of the department are required to serve their department by leading or participating in routine committee work, regularly attending program and department meetings, advising students as assigned, and attending special events including Capstone Day, and the SAA Graduation Celebration. See Appendix C for department definition of service.

4. Outside Activities

Faculty may engage in outside activities such as research, consulting, or other activities that are not part of their required university responsibilities. These activities shall not interfere with university responsibilities and must conform to policies governing outside activities as explained in Appendix D.

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 https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/classification/ 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. https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B5olNNrU5bquTmdYZDRmcHl5UHM/view.

1. Teaching
Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) members of the department are required to keep current in their subject and profession. IAS are required to work with the Department Chair to facilitate student evaluation of instruction in each course they teach (see Section III F).

2. Scholarship
IAS members of the department are not required to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship. They are, however, encouraged to pursue their own line of research and publication, or to collaborate with other SAA faculty on scholarship.

3. Service
IAS members of the department are required to serve their department by leading or participating in routine committee work, regularly attending program and department meetings, advising students as assigned, and attending special events including Capstone Day, and the SAA Graduation Celebration.

4.Outside Activities
IAS members of the department may engage in outside activities such as research, consulting, or other activities that are   not part of their required university responsibilities. These activities shall not interfere with university responsibilities and must conform to policies governing outside activities as explained in Appendix B.

C. Non Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations

Responsibilities and expectations for potential non-instructional academic staff are based on their individual position description or contracts. SAA typically does not employ non-instructional academic staff.

D. Clinical Faculty

As of the 2018/19 academic year, the clinical faculty members of the department are Dr. Larry Ringgenberg, Dr. Mary Beth Vahala, and Nizam Arain. These are voting members of the department in non-personnel contexts. Clinical Faculty members meet the following criteria: a) be currently employed in an administration or student affairs position orhave retired from that position, b) teach SAA courses, and c) participate regularly in the business of the department, including being present at faculty meetings, serve on or chair departmental committees, engaging in the M.S.Ed. recruitment process and Visit Day, engaging in curriculum and policy development.

E. Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty are non-voting members of the department who are recruited and hired for the purpose of teaching courses in the M.S.Ed. and/or Ed.D. programs. Adjunct faculty are not expected to participate in the regular business of the department.

F. Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) *revised and passed April 28, 2018*
The department will follow the UWL SEI policy and procedure available on the Faculty Senate webpage (https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/#tm-student-evaluation-of-instruction---sei) Results from the Faculty Senate approved SEI questions are

required for retention, tenure, and promotion for ranked faculty and for renewal and promotion of Instructional Academic Staff in the form of (1) the single motivation item and (2) the composite SEI consisting of the 5 common questions. For ranked faculty contract-renewal and both faculty and IAS promotion 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).

SAA recognizes that SEI rankings of faculty have limited value in a small department. The Department Chair will gather collected SEI data and disseminate results to individual faculty. SEI scores for tenure track faculty will be compared as a group and IAS will be compared as a group, and a final comparison of all teaching faculty will be compiled. Information on the rankings of all individuals teaching in SAA will also be computed and retained for informational purposes.

1. SAA asks six additional questions on SEIs. Four of these additional questions are structured on the 5-point scale (Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree): a) the instructor fostered an environment of inclusive excellence by presenting multiple perspectives, b) the instructor encouraged me to consider issues of privilege, oppression, and social justice, c) the instructor provided feedback that improved my performance and/or learning, and d) the instructor incorporated both theoretical and practical elements in this course. The remaining two questions are open-ended questions: a) what did the instructor do that contributed the most to your learning or skill development, and b) comment on what your instructor could do to improve this course for the benefit of future students.

G. Program Directorships
Ranked faculty and full-time IAS in SAA are eligible to assume the role of program director. Faculty serve in this role for one year, but can renew their role from year to year in consultation with the other faculty and the Department Chair. The Department Chair shall not serve in the role of a program director. Directing a program carries with it a 1-course reassignment for the specific academic year. In consultation with the Department Chair, the Program Director can choose during which semester they take the course reassignment.

1.   M.S.Ed. Program Director Responsibilities
The M.S.Ed. Director provides leadership for the recruitment, admissions, enrollment, orientation, and retention of students in the SAA master's programs. Each spring, this involves recruitment of on-campus and online cohorts of about 35 students. The Director oversees the campus visit day experience and interview process for on-campus cohort applications. The Director oversees the virtual interview process for online cohort applicants. The Director directs all marketing and recruitment efforts, including attending graduate school fairs and professional conferences, visual recruitment materials, social media presence, and management of recruitment website. The Director directs all face-to-face and online orientation efforts for all enrolled master's students at the beginning of their first semester in the program. The Director establishes plans to recruit students from traditionally underrepresented or marginalized populations. The Director is responsible for the "SOS Process" to navigate potential student-supervisor conflicts. The Director leads all efforts to recruit M.S.Ed. assistantship providers on- and off-campus and to place

students into these positions. The Director directs all efforts to recruit M.S.Ed. practicum providers on- and off-campus, and leads the placement of students into these positions.

2. Ed.D. Program Director Responsibilities

The Ed.D. Program Director represents the department on Collaborative Ed.D. Program Steering committee at state meetings of the Collaborative Ed.D. Program and makes decisions on behalf of the department. The Director coordinates faculty development of the new doctoral courses. The Director leads all marketing and recruitment efforts, including attending graduate school fairs and professional conferences, visual recruitment materials, social media presence, and management of recruitment website. The Director establishes plans to recruit students from traditionally underrepresented or marginalized populations. The Director oversees the management of the application process, ensuring that application materials are complete or, if not, prospective students are notified. The Director organizes virtual interview process. The Director coordinates advising assignments for newly admitted doctoral students and leads all orientation and cohort-development efforts for all enrolled doctoral students at the beginning of their first semester in the program. The Director collects data and analyzes trends in enrollment, including demographics, completion rates, loan rates to drive recruitment efforts for doctoral applicants.

IV. MERIT EVALUATION (ANNUAL REVIEW)

The results of merit reviews for all ranked faculty who have completed at least one academic year at UWL are due to the Dean's Office on December 15 annually. Merit reviews reflect activities during the prior academic year ending May 31. All faculty and IAS with .5 FTE or greater annual appointments 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).

The purpose of merit evaluation is to recognize, celebrate, and award outstanding faculty productivity in the department, allowing colleagues to understand and appreciate the work of one another.

A. EVALUATION PROCESSES & CRITERIA

The Department Chair will designate a ranked faculty member as the chair of the Merit Review Committee. Preferably, this person is a tenured faculty member and will serve a term of three years. Alternatively, the Department Chair will designate the convener by the first Friday of the fall semester in a given academic year.

The merit review process begins no later than September 15 when the convener schedules a meeting with all faculty engaged in merit review. This meeting shall occur no later than November 1 each fall. In the e-mail invitation for the review meeting, the convener will share the annual activity report from the previous academic year and will ask each faculty member to submit the merit assessment rubric (Appendix E).

Additional information, including peer evaluation of instruction forms (Appendix F), a summary of activities completed while on sabbatical, etc. should also be submitted when applicable. The Department Chair may seek colleague feedback about their own activities and submit this information with their merit materials.

Each faculty member will complete the merit review rubric for themselves by October 15. In anticipation of the merit review meeting, each faculty member should review the activity report of each other colleague to be assessed. Though completion of the rubric for colleagues is not required, faculty may find the rubric useful to reference in preparing points of strength and questions for their colleagues.

In the actual review meeting, the convener will lead a discussion on how faculty assessed themselves using the merit review rubric. Presentations by each faculty member are not necessary, but feedback and comments are encouraged. At the end of the discussion on each faculty member's merit, all faculty will together determine the merit designation

(not meritorious, meritorious, or highly meritorious)[1] for each colleague based on the rubric (self-assessment) and on the discussion in the merit review meeting (peer assessment). Voting may be necessary should the self and peer assessment of merit differ from one another per faculty member.

The convener will keep notes and merit designations and provide these to the Department Chair who will create the notices/letters to each faculty member. These merit designation notices must be sent to each faculty member by November 15. This must occur so a faculty member may appeal their merit designation to the Department Chair in writing within 7 calendar days of the receipt of the merit notice. The Department Chair will send merit designations to the Dean by December 15.

1. **Ranked Faculty and IAS in Permanent Budgeted Instructional Lines**
   Consistent with UWS 3.05 and UWL 3.05, the performance of all ranked faculty and IAS in the department will be reviewed annually. Areas to be evaluated for IAS include teaching, scholarship, and service to the department, college, university, profession and/or community as defined by the department (see Appendices A, B, and C). Specific dates for completion of annual evaluations of faculty and IAS are specified by UWL administration. These dates are listed on the UWL academic department calendar (https://www.uwlax.edu/info/academic-department-calendar/)

   a. *Purpose*: The purpose of annually reviewing faculty and IAS is to provide constructive feedback to guide professional development needed to support the program, department, college, and institution. The results of this review process will be used for multiple purposes including promotion, retention, tenure, post-tenure review, construction of the departmental annual report for the college, and updating professional development plans.

   b. *Teaching*: The definition of teaching can be found in Appendix A. Teaching includes traditional classroom instruction and advising of graduate students, their program of study, and their research. Teaching is ranked as the area of greatest importance in terms of faculty and IAS responsibility.

   Teaching effectiveness will be assessed using student Learning Environment Survey (LENS) submissions obtained from each of the courses in which the individual is instructor of record . Other evidence of successful teaching or teaching improvement may be submitted for

---

[1] Prior to revisions in 2024, the SAA bylaws included a fourth merit designation, "exceptionally meritorious," which may appear within previous personnel records.

consideration including, but not limited to, peer evaluation of teaching, teaching awards, published educational materials, and development of unique teaching resources.

c. *Scholarship*: The definition of scholarship can be found in Appendix B. To be considered meritorious, the department requires ranked faculty to have a record of ongoing scholarly activity.

d. *Service*: The definition of service can be found in Appendix C. Service contributions shall be judged by the impact on and contribution to the program, department, college, university, community, and/or profession. Service can include serving on committees as well as committees in the community and professional involvement in national, regional, or state organizations.

2. **Department Chair (if applicable)**
   The Department Chair is part of the merit review process like any other faculty member of the department.

Each faculty and IAS member's merit designation will be classified as "not meritorious," "meritorious," or "highly meritorious." To gain a designation of "highly meritorious," faculty must show outstanding performance in at least two of the three areas evaluated (i.e., teaching, scholarship, and service). To gain a designation of meritorious, faculty must show satisfactory performance in at least two areas. Should a faculty member not perform satisfactorily in more than one area, they will be designated as not meritorious.

Merit Category	Characteristics
Not meritorious	Unsatisfactory performance in 2 of 3 areas
Meritorious	Satisfactory performance in at least two areas
Highly Meritorious	Outstanding performance in at least two areas

B. DISTRIBUTION OF MERIT FUNDS

If available, merit funds distributions or base salary adjustments will follow UW System and UW-La Crosse policies approved by Faculty Senate.

C. APPEAL PROCEDURES (IF APPLICABLE)

A faculty or IAS member may request a reconsideration of their merit designation. This request must be made in writing to the Department Chair within 7 calendar days of the Department Chair's distribution of merit designations. The Merit Review Committee will reconvene within 1 week following the request for reconsideration, and the committee's final evaluation decision will be communicated in writing to the faculty or IAS member. The Department Chair may similarly appeal their merit designation within 7 calendar days of the initial notice.

Appeals beyond the departmental level may be presented to the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals, and Academic Freedom Committee (see Section I. E. of the Faculty Senate Bylaws).

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)
https://kb.uwlax.edu/104775

NOTE: UWS 1.0 indicates that "days" refers to calendar days rather than working or business days—with references to how to treat holidays.

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. Criteria outlined in Section V. A & V. B. in these bylaws should be applied to faculty with a contract date after:

<div align="center">

03/31/2024

</div>

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)

1. Faculty under review provide an electronic portfolio related to their teaching, scholarship, and service activities extracted from their date of hire to the date of departmental 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 bylaws.

2. The department will provide the following materials to the dean:

   a. Department letter of recommendation with vote

   b. Teaching assignment information (TAI) data sheet that summarizes the courses taught, workload data, and grade distribution

   c. Merit evaluation data

   d. Teaching evaluation data (e.g., SEI/LENS summary reports[1]) by individual course and semester

---

[1] "NOTE: SEI data will be provided for candidate TAI forms through Spring 2023. TAI information from Fall 2024 and beyond will not include student survey on instruction as part of the form. LENS information will be provided in a separate format from TAIs."
https://kb.uwlax.edu/104534

3. The initial review of tenure-track faculty shall be conducted by the tenured faculty of the appropriate department in the manner outlined below. The Retention/Tenure Review Committee will consist of all tenured members of the department. If the department does not have at least three tenured individuals, a committee of at least three will be recommended, comprised of tenured faculty from a closely aligned discipline. Review committees are also encouraged to include one tenured faculty from outside the Department, selected by the Department Chair in consultation with the tenure-track faculty member.

4. All first-year tenure-track faculty will be 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. In the non-contract review years (1st, 3rd, 5th) tenure-track faculty will be reviewed by the same Retention/Tenure Review Committee mentioned above. The Department Chair will send the review letters to the faculty member under review, the Dean, and HR by the due dates listed in UWL's Academic Department Calendar (https://www.uwlax.edu/info/academic-department-calendar/).

B. TENURE REVIEW AND DEPARTMENTAL TENURE CRITERIA

1. **Retention Process**
   a. *Notice***:** Subsequent to the call of the Provost, the Department Chair shall establish a review date and inform all tenure-track faculty with at least 20 calendar days' notice to prepare a set of materials describing performance in the following areas: (a) teaching, (b) scholarly and research activity, and (c) service—including service to the department, the college, the university, and the community and profession.

   b. *Meeting***:** The date, time, and place of the meeting shall be conducted in compliance with the Wisconsin Open Meeting Rule. For a retention and tenure meeting to take place, attendance by 2/3 of the Retention/Tenure Review Committee constitutes a quorum. The Department Chair presides over the meeting and keeps detailed minutes of the action and vote. These minutes must be retained in a secure location for 7 years. The tenure-track faculty shall have the opportunity to make a written and/or oral presentation at the meeting to provide highlights regarding teaching, scholarship, and service.

   c. *Materials***:** Candidates under review for retention should provide two reports from the electronic portfolio system:

      i. A personnel report drawn from the date of hire at UWL as a

ranked faculty member (with appropriate evidence hyperlinks) with a 3–7 page narrative statement provided addressing the candidate's teaching philosophy, teaching development, and appropriate context for scholarly and service work.

    ii.   An annual activity report from the most recent year (June 1 – May 31), the candidate can exclude summer if they wish.

    iii. The Department Chair will provide merit, SEI and/or LENS, and TAI summary information for the review period.

d. *Action*: After the faculty member under review gives a brief five-minute oral presentation highlighting their accomplishments in teaching, research, and service and responds to any questions from the committee, the Department Chair will excuse the faculty member under review from the meeting. Prior to the beginning of the review of the candidate, the meeting will go into closed session according to Section 19.85 in the Wisconsin Statutes. However, candidates under tenure consideration can also request an open meeting. During the review meeting, the Chair shall entertain a motion regarding the retention of the candidate(s). The Chair will lead the review meeting through the criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service for each faculty member being considered for retention or tenure. Passage of a motion to retain a candidate(s) (and, if appropriate, to recommend tenure) shall require a 2/3 majority of those present and voting. A written record of votes (e.g., faculty name, signature, and vote) is required and is public record and subject to data retention rules.

e. *Communication of Vote*: The faculty member under review will be informed verbally and in writing of the decision of the Review Committee within 7 days of the vote taking place. The Department recommendation and decision (actual vote) shall be reported in writing with supporting documentation to the Dean. Retention requires a 2/3 majority vote by tenured faculty.

2. **Tenure**
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 faculty member's intellectual vitality and future contributions will continue to be of high quality for many years to come. Tenure-track instructors should not expect an award of tenure solely on the fact that their contracts have been consistently renewed; however, the procedures for making tenure decisions and recommendations for tenure-track faculty parallel procedures for retention and are based on the body of

work evidenced during the individual's time in rank. The process for tenure follows the retention process outlined above. Tenure will be granted with a 2/3 majority vote by the Retention/Tenure Review Committee.

The decision to recommend a faculty member for tenure in the SAA Department is based on an appraisal of the candidate's overall contribution from their date of hire at UWL in a tenure-track position. Achieving tenure in SAA reflects the following: consistent evidence of a strong commitment to student learning and quality teaching, program of scholarly inquiry, and service to the department, university, and/or the faculty member's profession (see Appendices A, B, and C for statements of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, respectively.)

Specifics regarding departmental expectations demonstrating evidence of strong teaching, scholarship, and service are indicated in the details of the merit and retention segments of these bylaws. Tenure-track faculty should pay close attention to retention letters as guides for working toward positive promotion and tenure recommendations from the department.

3. **Reconsideration**
   Any candidate wishing to appeal their own department retention or tenure decision is required to submit a written petition to the Department Chair carefully detailing the basis on which this appeal is being made. This appeal must be filed with the Department Chair within two weeks of the notification of the contested retention/tenure decision. The Retention/Tenure Review Committee will then hold a special closed-session hearing to review all evidence pertinent to this petition in the presence of the appellant. Subsequent to this hearing of the facts the Retention/Tenure Review Committee will dismiss the appellant from the hearing room and will render its final decision on the appeal.

C. POST-TENURE REVIEW

The department follows the UWL procedure and schedule regarding post-tenure review https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/post-tenure-review-policy/

1. **Relationship to Annual Review and Other Personnel Review**
   The post-tenure review may coincide or overlap with other forms of department-level personnel review. However, a separate letter regarding post-tenure review using the structure indicated below must be provided to the Dean (Provost/HR), and the procedure for post-tenure review as described below must be followed.

2. **Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee**

The departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee shall be comprised of all tenured faculty members in the department, with a minimum of 3 tenured faculty members. This committee may not be the same as the Retention/Tenure Review Committee described in prior sections, as the department may have more or different tenured faculty since tenure was granted.

The Department Chair serves as a committee member and chair of the committee unless the department chair holds tenure in another department or is being reviewed. In either of these two cases, the committee shall elect a chair to complete the administrative components of the process. In the event that there are not three tenured department members, the Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean and the faculty member under review, shall meet to select outside members. If there is not a mutual agreement, the Dean shall have the final say in the selection of the outside members.

3. **Post-Tenure Review Notification**
The Post-Tenure Review Committee will meet to review the faculty member's materials and determine whether the faculty member (a) meets expectations or (b) does not meet expectations. The faculty member must receive at least 21 calendar days' notification of the time/date of the meeting and the deadline (7 days prior to the meeting) for which the materials will be due. Electronic notification through official UWL email is appropriate. The faculty member is not required to be present for deliberations and the committee will move into closed session following WI open meeting laws.

4. **Materials**
Material for Consideration by the Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee: 7 calendar days prior to the committee meeting, the faculty member under consideration for post-tenure review needs to provide to the committee via its chair, at minimum an electronic report from the electronic faculty activity portfolio system (e.g., annual activity report with hyperlinks) drawn from the last date of tenure (use January 1 of the tenure year if first post-tenure review) or last post-tenure review to the date of the committee review, and the faculty member must ensure that the report is up-to-date on 5 years of activities and includes the following materials:

- hyperlinks to at least one syllabus for each course (not each section of each course, or each term of each course) taught in the past 5 years,
- hyperlink to at least one peer review of teaching from the past 5 years,
- hyperlinks to evidence of scholarly activities associated with the specific entry (e.g., publication, grant, presentation)

- no hyperlinks for service are required

The department chair will provide TAI and SEI scores/LENS reports covering the dates since the last review.

5. **Post-Tenure Review Categorization**
   After moving to close the meeting following the proper state statute WI Statute 19.85(1)(c) for personnel review, the departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee will consider a motion regarding the faculty member under post-tenure review "meeting expectations" or "not meeting expectations." A 2/3 majority vote is needed for the motion to pass. The motion and the numerical results of the vote should be indicated in the minutes and the letter to the Dean. Depending on the result of the department vote, the faculty member will be considered to be in one of the following two categories:

   a. *Meets expectations*: This category is awarded to those tenured faculty members whose performance reflects the expected level of accomplishment based on departmental bylaws and is likely to be met by faculty who maintain satisfactory merit reviews annually.

   b. *Does not meet expectations*: This category is assigned to those tenured faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment below the expected departmental level and which requires correction. All reviews resulting in "does not meet expectations," unless overturned upon further review, will result in a remediation plan as described below.

6. **Procedure when Faculty Member "Meets Expectations"**
   The departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee chair provides a letter to the Dean and the faculty member within 14 calendar days of the personnel meeting (no later than December 15) with the following information:

   - The date and the numerical result of the vote indicating the overall categorization of "meets expectations" for the faculty member. The letter should include the names of all of the tenured faculty who voted and the committee chair's signature.
   - A brief description of the consensus points of the committee regarding the faculty member's strengths in teaching, scholarship, and/or service that formed the basis for the committee's "meets expectations" decision. The faculty member can request a meeting with the committee chair to discuss the evaluation further, if the faculty member wishes.

The Dean forwards the letter to HR and the Provost (Chancellor's designee) no later than February 1.

7. **Procedure when Faculty Member "Does Not Meet Expectations"**
   Details regarding a "Does Not Meet Expectations" finding by the Post-Tenure
   Review Committee are provided in the UWL procedure and schedule
   regarding post-tenure review approved by the UW System Board of Regents in
   November 2016, available at the following link: https://kb.uwlax.edu/104244

8. **Departmental Post-Tenure Review Criteria**
   a. *Teaching*: For the category of "Meets Expectations", the department
      expects each faculty member to teach courses in their areas of
      expertise; the expected teaching load is the equivalent of 9 semester
      hours for graduate faculty without other duties involving reassignment
      from teaching. Faculty shall:

      - develop a syllabus for each course that meets UWL and
        department requirements
      - develop acceptable and fair methods of evaluation for each
        course
      - meet with students as scheduled for classes or make provisions
        for acceptable alternative activities
      - keep up with current curriculum requirements and participate
        in advising students;

      Performance in Teaching may be deemed "does not meet expectations"
      if there is a pattern of any of the above (or similar) activities not
      occurring at a satisfactory level, something which should have been
      raised in merit reviews as concerns arise, so performance issues can be
      addressed prior to the post-tenure review.

   b. *Scholarship*: For the category of "Meets Expectations", the Department
      expects each tenured faculty member to engage in scholarly activities
      that may include any scholarly activity indicated in the Statement of
      Scholarship in the Department of Student Affairs Administration
      (Appendix B).

      Performance in Scholarship may be deemed "does not meet
      expectations" if there is a pattern of the above (or similar) activities not
      occurring at a satisfactory level.

   c. *Service*: For the category of "Meets Expectations", the Department
      expects each tenured faculty member to volunteer for and serve on
      committees that contribute to the success of the Department, College,
      University, community, and/or profession in fulfilling their missions.
      The Department expects faculty to:

- regularly attend and participate as an active member in department and committee meetings, including chairing committees, volunteering for administrative roles, and equitably sharing the assessment, recruitment, and other administrative duties
- attend at least one UWL graduation ceremony per year unless extenuating circumstances prevent attendance
- engage in any service activity indicated in Appendix C: Statement on Service Activity.

Performance in Service may be deemed "does not meet expectations" if there is a pattern of any of the above (or similar) activities not occurring at a satisfactory level.

D. FACULTY PROMOTION PROCEDURES (PROCEDURE, CRITERIA, AND APPEAL)

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

Review Process

The Promotion Committee for faculty pursuing promotion to Associate Professor will consist of all ranked faculty. First-year faculty may participate in the process but should abstain from voting. The Promotion Committee for faculty pursuing promotion to Full Professor will consist of faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor. In cases where a committee consists of fewer than three tenured faculty members at the rank required, members of the original Retention/Tenure Review Committee of the candidate under review may serve and/or the Department Chair may designate new members to serve on the committee. The committee will vote by roll call unless a signed ballot is requested by any committee member. The Department Chair presides over the promotion consideration review. Should the Department Chair be up for promotion, they will work with the Dean to designate an appropriate chair of the Promotion Committee.

Human Resources is the official source of promotion eligibility information for faculty and is responsible for annually informing individual faculty (and department chairs and deans) of where to access up-to-date information regarding eligibility status. These lists will be reviewed for accuracy by the Department Chair. The Department Chair will notify the faculty members who are eligible in writing of their eligibility and upon request will provide copies of the university and departmental regulations on promotion and information on the provisions of the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law. Optionally, the

department chair may choose to also provide a letter of recommendation to be included in the department materials section of the Faculty Promotion Report (see Section 5.2.2 of the Guide to Faculty Promotion https://kb.uwlax.edu/104534)

The Department Chair will notify in writing faculty eligible for promotion of the date of the promotion meeting with at least 20 calendar days' notice. Faculty who are eligible and wish to be considered for promotion must submit their portion of the Faculty Promotion Report (see Section 5.1 of the Guide to Faculty Promotion https://kb.uwlax.edu/104534) and a CV to the Department Chair at least 7 days prior to the date of the promotion consideration meeting. The Department Chair will forward these materials and student evaluation information to the members of the Promotion Committee prior to the promotion meeting date. Faculty may submit other written materials and/or make an oral presentation at the consideration meeting. The requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meeting law shall apply to this meeting.

The Joint Promotion Committee requires that a faculty member who has had reassigned time to fulfill a position outside the expectations of a standard faculty member (e.g., director of a center or program) must provide two related documents in their promotion report[2]:

   a. One or more letters from their supervisor(s) (e.g., department chair, Dean, etc.) that outlines their job description with respect to each reassigned time appointment.

   b. Documentation that illustrates their level of success in the role fulfilled by the appointment, such as performance reviews or other data that show how the aims of the appointment are being met. The candidate is responsible for uploading these documents in their promotion report.

Before the promotion meeting, a tenured faculty member will be chosen by the department chair to write the Promotion Committee's assessment of the candidate (i.e., promotion letter). This person will have the required 7 days to complete the forms. In the event of more than one candidate, one personnel

---

[2] This does not include the department chair. The description of the department chair's duties (item a, above) does not need to be supplied because it is contained within the Faculty Senate Policies. However, the department promotion committee letter should reflect indicators of performance evaluation (item b, above).

member will be chosen for each candidate.

During the promotion review meeting, the ranked faculty will review and discuss the faculty member's promotion file and any presentation made at the promotion meeting. The department chair will lead the promotion meeting through the criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service for each faculty member considered for promotion. Only materials relevant to the criteria established for promotion by the department, college, and the university will be considered.

The committee will vote by roll call unless a signed ballot is requested by any committee member.

Within 7 calendar days of the promotion meeting, the Department Chair shall notify each candidate of the committee's recommendation. For positive recommendations, the Department Chair shall include a letter of recommendation on behalf of the committee as part of the Faculty Promotion Report. With these materials, the Department Chair shall also transmit a written recommendation to the Dean. A copy of these letters shall be provided to the candidate at least 7 days prior to the submission of the promotion file to the Dean.

1. **Criteria**
   To be considered for promotion to a higher rank, faculty must meet the minimum university criteria (see [Provost website for Faculty Promotion](#) and [HR website for Faculty Promotion Resources)](#) as well as the minimum departmental criteria.

   a. *Associate Professor***:** For the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must provide evidence of teaching excellence, establishment of a program of scholarship, and a record of service. Evidence of teaching excellence shall include the results of self, peer, and student evaluation of teaching (see Appendix A). Scholarship shall be consistent with the department's definition of scholarly activity (see Appendix B). Service shall also be consistent with the department's definition of service (see Appendix C).

   b. *Professor***:** For the rank of Professor, a faculty member must show evidence of continued excellence in teaching, significant scholarly productivity, and substantial service activity. Continued teaching excellence is measured by the results of self, peer, and student evaluations. Significant scholarly productivity is judged by the quality and quantity of presentations, publications, and grant activity. Substantial and sustained service activity will include applied service,

service to the department, college/university, professional service, or contributions to the profession.

2. **Reconsideration.**
   After receiving the Chair's notification, the promotion candidate will have 14 days to request reconsideration by the Promotion Committee. Each promotion candidate will have the right to appeal the Department's reconsideration decision to the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals, and Academic Freedom Committee (CGAAF). Written notice of the reconsideration decision will be transmitted to the candidate and the Dean within 7 days of the reconsideration meeting.

VI. INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF REVIEW (Lecturer or Associate Lecturer and Clinical Faculty)

A. Annual Review
In accordance with Faculty Personnel rules UWS 3.05-3.11 and UWL 3.08, academic staff will be evaluated annually. https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/faculty-and-staff/performance-

The Department Chair serves as the supervisor for IAS and will preside over the annual IAS review process. The Department Chair may choose to involve ranked department members in the IAS review process, specifically if they have observed or evaluated a course of the IAS. Evaulation will be based on review of syllabi and SEIs, and any additional evidence a candidate wishes to provide in the categories related to career progression. All IAS are required to have an annual review based on their contract and/or position description.

1.Annual Review Expectations

Teaching: IAS members engaged in graduate instruction typically teach between one and three courses per contract terms.

Scholarship: IAS members are not expected to engage in scholarly activities. However, if an IAS member desires career progression, scholarship requirements must be met according to career progression guidelines found at at http://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/ias-promotion-resources/

Service: IAS members are not expected to engage in service activities, other than serving or chair departmental committees, being engaged in the regular business of the department, and advising M.S.Ed. and/or Ed.D. students. Clinical faculty are expected to chair or serve on departmental committees and be engaged in the business of the department. If an IAS member desires career progression, service requirements must be met according to career progression guidelines found at at http://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/ias-promotion-resources/

B. IAS Promotion Procedures
Policies and procedure guiding promotion for IAS are available at http://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/ias-promotion-resources/

IAS may choose to advance through Career Progression. All ranked members of the department shall serve on the IAS Promotion Committee. IAS desiring career progression are evaluated on the basis of their teaching, scholarship, and service.

C. Appeal Procedures re: Annual Review

Each career progression candidate will have the right to appeal the department's reconsideration decision to the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals and Academic Freedom Committee (CGAAF). Written notice of the reconsideration decision will be transmitted to the candidate and the Dean within seven (7) days.

VII. GOVERNANCE

A. Department Chair

1. Election of the Department Chair

The Dean appoints the Chair of the SAA Department in consultation with the ranked and clinical faculty until the department has two or more tenured faculty. At that point, the Department Chair will be elected by the department members. For Chair eligibility information, refer to the Articles of Faculty Organization. All department members as determined by department bylaws (i.e., all ranked, IAS, and clinical faculty) are eligible to vote. The Dean shall send out nominating ballots to all eligible to vote. Any candidate who consents to serve and receives 60% of the ballots will be elected chair. If this does not occur, there will be a runoff between the two persons with the most nominations who have consented to run. If no one chooses to run for Department Chair, the Department Chair will be appointed by the Dean.

2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair

The department will adhere to the selection and duties of the Chair that are delineated in the Faculty Senate Policies (revised 2008) http://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/ 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 stated indicated in the Employee Handbook http://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Employee-handbook/

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

1. **Assessment Committee**

   The Committee shall consist of three department members who shall have responsibility for developing, conducting, and reporting the results of appropriate assessments of all department programs. The chair of the committee is appointed by the Department Chair. Members serve for one year and can be reappointed.

2. **Curriculum Committee**

   The committee shall be composed of four department members. The M.S.Ed. and Ed.D. Program Directors must both serve on this committee. The duties of the committee are to recommend to the department: a) the content of the departmental curricula for the Ed.D. and M.S.Ed. Programs, b) new courses and deletion of unneeded ones, c) any policies which affect instruction. The chair of the committee is appointed by the Department Chair. Members serve for one year and can be reappointed.

   The committee shall also: e) periodically review the content of courses required for the Department and of approved courses, f) develop and supervise the advising program

3. **Merit Evaluation Committee**

   The Merit Evaluation Committee shall include all ranked faculty and IAS members of the department. The chair for the committee will be appointed each year by the Department Chair. Each committee member will review the teaching, scholarship, and service activities of all members in the department, excluding the review of their own activities. The chair of the committee is appointed by the Department Chair. Members serve for one year and can be reappointed.

4. Student Appeals Committee
The Appeals Committee hears student grade appeals and program dismissal appeals. The committee shall include three members of the department and the Department Chair. The Department Chair will appoint the chair of the committee and the Department Chair will function as a neutral observer during any appeal hearing. The chair of the committee is appointed by the Department Chair. Members serve for one year and can be reappointed.

5. SAA Commencement Committee
The Commencement Committee organizes and implements SAA's Capstone Day and SAA Graduation Celebration. The committee shall include 3 to 4 faculty member. One member has to be one of the SAA 790 instructors; that member may or may not share the committee.

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

1. Mission
Our mission is to advance the field of student affairs by preparing diverse scholar-practitioners for leadership in the multifaceted and complex context of higher education.

2. Program Goals
The Student Affairs Administration faculty is committed to helping students meet the basic level of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) Professional Competencies as approved by NASPA and ACPA in July 2010. The SAA curriculum is aligned with these competencies. The national competencies can be found at the following website: http://www.naspa.org/programs/profdev/default.cfm and can be found on the SAA website: http://www.uwlax.edu/saa/competencies.htm

3. Philosophy of Assessment
The Student Affairs Administration Graduate Program assessment activities provide valuable information that guides program innovation and change. The results of assessment are used to improve student learning, program competencies, course level learning outcomes, program quality, internship experiences, and the teaching effectiveness of the faculty.

The following broad national (2010 NASPA/ACPA) competencies categorize the areas around which the program and course learning outcomes are developed. These competencies provide the foundation for SAA program planning and assessment. Student learning outcomes identified in each course are linked to specific competencies.

    a. Advising and Helping
    b. Assessment, Evaluation, and Research
    c. Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
    d. Ethical Professional Practice
    e. History, Philosophy and Values
    f. Human and Organizational Resources
    g. Law, Policy, and Governance
    h. Leadership
    i. Personal Foundations
    j. Student Learning and Development

4. Assessment Methods and Practices
The SAA Department uses several direct and indirect measures to assess program goals and graduate student learning outcomes.

a. Electronic Portfolios: Students are introduced to the professional competencies and the electronic portfolio in SAA 700 during the first semester of the program. Over the course of the degree, students are required to demonstrate proficiency in each competency through submission of artifacts and reflective statements in the electronic portfolio. Portfolio submissions are required and assessed in every SAA class. In addition, each semester, the students confer with their SAA advisors to review and discuss the electronic portfolio. In addition, a pre and post assessment of student understanding and skill in the professional competencies is conducted.

b. Research Projects: Each student is required to complete a terminal project that includes a thesis or applied research project. The project requires students to demonstrate mastery of a number of the professional competencies.

c. Graduate Assistant/Internship Supervisor Data: To ensure that the graduate assistantship and internship experiences are contributing to the mastery of the professional competencies (basic level), those supervising students in this type of fieldwork meet periodically with the coordinator of the internship experience (an SAA faculty member). Data collected from these meetings are used to enhance the field experiences of SAA students.

d. Competency Assessment: Each academic year, the SAA faculty select one or two competency areas that receive increased assessment emphasis. For 2010-11, the focus was on "Critical Thinking & Problem Solving" and "Communication" skills. The department also participates in a study that involves UniLOA (University Learning Outcomes) assessment measures of SAA student growth, learning, and development. The results of this research enhance SAA faculty understanding of how well students are meeting critical learning outcomes.

e. SWOT Analysis: During annual summer retreats, SAA faculty typically engage in a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis process to continually monitor and enhance the quality of the program. Data from the SWOT analysis is used to improve the program.

f. Student Surveys: To learn more about what attracts students to the SAA department an annual survey of students who have applied for admission is conducted. The department also gathers data from students who were admitted but who decided not to come. This data is used to assist in improving the admissions process. Similarly, the department also conducts periodic alumni surveys in order to also identify strengths and weaknesses of the SAA faculty, curriculum, practical experience and post-graduation experience.

g. Academic Program Review: The department participates in the UW-L Academic Program Review process. The next Review is scheduled for Fall 2016.

D. Additional departmental policies

1. Sick leave. 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.
2. Salary Equity Policy. a) The Salary Equity Policy of SAA is intended to be consistent with and implement the salary equity policy of the University, which states that: b) Consideration of individual equity requests will depend upon the availability of funding.

Equity requests will be based upon instances of inversion (substantially dissimilar salaries for individuals with substantially similar qualifications and records), compression (reduction in the spread of salaries within and between ranks over time, often the result of hiring salaries increasing faster than pay plan increases) and retention (individuals who are offered higher salaries for comparable positions at other institutions). c. Requests for equity adjustments may be initiated by individuals or as a result of departmental review. If the Department does not support an individual request the individual may appeal directly to their Dean. d. Departments will be provided with salary data for their units, which allows them to make comparisons and judgments about equity adjustments.

3. Graduate faculty status. All SAA faculty must obtain graduate faculty status as granted by UWL Graduate Council and/or the Director of Graduate Studies. The Department Chair will initiate this process for each new faculty member.

4. Course assignment. Course assignments are made by the Department Chair in consultation with the individual faculty member.

5. Summer teaching. Summer teaching for faculty in SAA is not guaranteed. The Department Chair will approach departmental faculty members about summer teaching. Faculty do not have to teach over the summer if they choose not to.

6. Peer Review of Teaching. Probationary ranked faculty will have their teaching evaluated by two peers visiting a classroom or reviewing their online class during each of the first five years of their employment in the department. For years one and two, peer review must occur during each semester. For years three through five, peer review must occur at least once each year. Peer reviewers will be selected by the Department Chair in consultation with the ranked faculty being reviewed. Clinical faculty or IAS will be reviewed once annually and peer reviewers can be selected from experienced faculty or IAS within the department, or be selected in consultation with the Department Chair. A peer reviewer may also serve as a mentor (see Section IV.D.1) assigned to the faculty or IAS being reviewed. Adjunct faculty will be reviewed and evaluated by the Department Chair after each course taught.

In addition to classroom visitation or online class review, syllabi and evaluation instruments will be reviewed. An evaluation form (Appendix F) will be completed by each peer reviewer and submitted to the ranked faculty, IAS, or clinical faculty member, and Department Chair along with a letter summarizing the review. This review will be considered evidence of teaching effectiveness and progress.

At any time, ranked faculty, IAS, or clinical members may elect, or be required by the Department Chair to have their teaching reviewed by peers. For example, peer review of teaching is one component of the promotion process and may be used as evidence to support post-tenure review.

VIII. SEARCH AND SCREEN PROCEDURES

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

A. Tenure-track faculty

Approved UWL tenure track faculty recruitment and hiring policy and procedures: https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/recruitment/#tab-recruitment-processes

A tenure-track faculty member search and screen committee must be chaired by a tenured or tenure-track faculty member. The Department Chair appoints the committee. In case a panel search is chosen as the venue to select the tenure-track faculty member, the Department Chair chairs the IAS search and screen process.

Additionally, UWL's spousal/partner hiring policy can be found at http://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Spousal-and-partner-hiring/

B. Instructional Academic Staff

Hiring policy and procedures: https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/recruitment/#tab-recruitment-processes (same for IAS & NIAS)

The search and screen procedures followed for an IAS position are identical to those that are utilized for faculty searches. An IAS search and screen committee must be chaired by a tenured or tenure-track faculty member. The Department Chair appoints the committee. In case a panel search is chosen as the venue to select the IAS, the Department Chair chairs the IAS search and screen process.

C. Pool Search (See also D)

Hiring policy and procedures: https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/recruitment/#tab-recruitment-processes.

Candidates who apply to the SAA pool of instructors may not be contacted by SAA, depending on current teaching need as deemed by the Department Chair or faculty. All potential adjunct faculty must apply to the pool and be officially hired through the HR process before they can begin teaching.

D. Adjunct Faculty

Potential adjunct faculty must be nominated by a member of the department or the Department Chair. Candidates must submit a letter of interest and CV to the SAA pool of instructors on the HR website. A simple majority vote of the voting department members is required to obtain adjunct faculty status. The Department Chair will provide reasons in writing when adjunct faculty status is not recommended.

IX. STUDENT RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS

A. Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures

1. Grade Appels (Appendix G)

Students may appeal a course grade if they deem the grade they received for a course does not reflect their performance in that course. This appeal must take place before the end of the term immediately following the term in which the grade was recorded and the student must send a letter of appeal to the Department Chair in that timeframe. Students can expect an initial

response within 30 days. If additional time for review is needed the Department Chair will notify the student.

2. Academic Non-grade Appeals
Students may initiate and submit complaints regarding a faculty member. Such complaints shall be submitted in writing to the Department Chair within 90 days of the last occurrence. SAA follows the procedures for non-grade appeals as outlined in UWL's Student Handbook.

3. Program Policy Appeals
Students may appeal a program policy or decision. In this case, students should send a letter of appeal to the Department Chair within 30 days of the occurrence. Students can expect an initial response within 30 days. If additional time for review is needed the Department Chair will notify the student.

B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct (Academic and nonacademic misconduct policy referenced: https://www.uwlax.edu/student-life/student-resources/student-handbook/)

Students who enroll in the on-campus option of the M.S.Ed. in SAA are expected to attend and participate in all classes. Students who attend the online options are expected to actively participate in all online discussions within the time frame designated, and to complete all course assignments in a timely manner. The department expects that students will devote sufficient non-class time (typically, two to three times the amount of credit hours in which they enroll per week) to complete all course assignments in a timely manner and to undertake additional study of the material(s) as necessary to demonstrate satisfactory mastery of the material as required by each course.

Students are responsible for demonstrating a high level of knowledge, skills, and professionalism in the SAA program. The department expects all students to demonstrate competency in all competencies specified by the department and reserves the right to dismiss students who fail to attain sufficiently high levels of competency in any of these categories.

Incomplete Grades
As a matter of University policy, grades of "Incomplete" are issued to students strictly on the basis of illness or other unusual circumstances beyond the student's control, which have rendered the student unable to complete a limited amount of coursework. The department adheres to the university policy on incomplete grades. Incomplete grades will be granted at the instructor's discretion pursuant to departmental guidelines. It is the responsibility of students to initiate a request an incomplete with the instructor of that course. In case an incomplete is granted, the faculty member will provide the timeline for completion of the course. That timeline will not extend more than 1 year past the original course end date.

Academic Misconduct
SAA follows the procedures outlined by the university for academic misconduct.

Non-Academic Misconduct
SAA follows the procedures outline by the university for non-academic misconduct. Should a student be found responsible for non-academic misconduct, the department reserves the right to ex-matriculate the student from the academic program.

C. Advising Policy

Each student enrolled in the M.S.Ed. option of SAA will be assigned a faculty advisor. Faculty are expected to confer with their advisees at least once each semester to discuss their academic

progress, career interests, and course schedule. Faculty should connect with online advisees each semester virtually or via phone. All faculty members are expected to be accessible to students throughout the academic year and to respond to all advisee questions with 48 hours.

In the Ed.D. Program, all students are assigned a program advisor. The above statement holds true for Ed.D. program advisors as well. Dissertation advisors may be different from program advisors and are chosen by the student in conjunction with the faculty program advisor.

XI. OTHER

A. FACULTY SABBATICALS

Approved 11/14/2023

The Department will keep an updated list of sabbatical-eligible faculty, based on CASSH's definition of eligibility. Determination of faculty sabbaticals will follow these steps:

In April, the Department Chair will determine how many sabbaticals the Department can support in the next round. All eligible applicants will be forwarded information about applying for sabbaticals.

1. All faculty members planning on applying for sabbaticals must express their interest (in writing) to the Department Chair by May 1st.

2. If more faculty express interest than can be supported by the Department for the year of the sabbaticals, the Department Chair will facilitate a discussion at one of the May Department meetings to go over the priorities (see below) and determine if a consensus can be reached on the timing of proposal submissions.

3. The decision of who may submit a proposal will be based on the number that the Department can support and the following priorities:

   a. First priority will be given to those who have not applied for a sabbatical (including those with first-time eligibility). If multiple people have not applied for a sabbatical, priority will be based on date of signed contract at UWL.

   b. Second priority will be based on length of time since previous sabbatical.

   c. Third priority will be based on individual needs, including, but not limited to, such factors as formal conditions/constraints of external grants, availability of programs, timing of data collection needs, and the like.

4. Full sabbatical proposals by approved department members must be submitted to the Department Chair at least two weeks prior to the September application deadline posted by CASSH. The Department Chair will write a letter of support.

Appendix A: Statement of Teaching in the Department of Student Affairs Administration Approved 03/24/23

Teaching is the primary focus for individuals in ranked and IAS positions in SAA, as well as for ad hoc faculty who are typically full- time student affairs or academic affairs professionals at UWL or elsewhere who teach SAA courses on overload or part-time appointments in any fall, spring, and/or summer term.

All SAA faculty guide graduate students who intend to become student affairs practitioners or advance their careers in higher education. Thus, SAA faculty implement good teaching practices with the goal of supporting scholarly practitioners as they acquire content knowledge, skill, and professional awareness. This includes incorporating innovative teaching techniques that are relevant to the higher education and student affairs setting, for example integration of relevant technology, making connections between theory and practice in the classroom, and implementing social justice pedagogy for all learners.

Minimal expectations for teaching activities:

All faculty are expected to set well-defined expectations, distribute syllabi (in electronic format), stay current in their field (including aligning objectives with competency standards), demonstrate competency in the applicable learning management system, return assignments and communicate with students in a timely manner, hold regular office hours or otherwise be available for regular student consultation, and implement the approved course curriculum.

Teaching in SAA

Effective Teaching:

For merit review and retention, tenure, and promotion decisions, ranked faculty are expected to demonstrate effective teaching and should provide evaluative evidence in their Digital Measures that aligns in accordance with JPC guidelines and substantiates teaching effectiveness. IAS and ad hoc faculty also must demonstrate effective teaching that will be reviewed annually by the Department Chair. Types of evidence documenting effective teaching may include, but is not limited to:

Self-assessment of teaching. This assessment may take the form of a narrative which addresses a teaching philosophy and statement of personal growth, course expectations, grading methodology, and other methods used for self-assessment. Any self-assessment should also articulate how responses to direct and indirect assessment outcomes inform teaching practices and affect student learning.

Peer evaluation of teaching. The teaching effectiveness of all faculty should be peer-reviewed semi-regularly and in consultation with Department Chair. Tenure-track faculty, faculty undergoing post-tenure review, and IAS should also recruit faculty colleagues external to the department to review a course annually.

Student evaluation of learning: Student evaluations given in each of the courses taught will also be used as *one* measure to judge teaching effectiveness. SEI or LENS results from the Faculty Senate policy are required for retention, tenure, and promotion. SAA used additional questions as part of the SEI instrument. SAA acknowledges that SEIs are inherently biased and subjective and tend to disproportionately underrate faculty who identify as women and/or persons of color. Instructors are encouraged to use additional methods of gathering student feedback while a course unfolds.

Additional Teaching Contributions:

Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) often make additional teaching contributions outside of the classroom. SAA highly values these contributions, which can take many forms, including, but not limited to:

- Course/curriculum development/revision/innovation

- Course/curriculum grants and/or teaching materials/assessments

- Professional development related to teaching and/or licensure

- Non-credit instruction

- Student program advising

Candidates for merit, retention, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review should provide evidence indicating the scope and impact of these types of contributions.

Further, SAA provides an instructional guide, Canvas site, Canvas policy modules, a syllabus checklist, and a sample syllabus for all instructors. Instructors are encouraged to use these resources to keep their courses current and consistent with departmental standards.

Statement on Grading:

The Teaching Assignment Information (TAI) reports used for retention, promotion, and post-tenure review for ranked faculty include grade distributions. Grading student performance in SAA involves assessing mastery. Faculty are responsible for determining if master's program students are proficient in all ten student affairs professional competencies, and for guiding doctoral students through a dissertation proposal, research, and final dissertation defense. Through this process, faculty provide

substantial feedback that is used by students to continually revise and expand their work to meet competency standards (master's program) and standards of high-quality scholarship and writing (doctoral program).

Further, grades in graduate programs tend to be higher because a C is the lowest passing grade in graduate programs. In SAA, compared to some undergraduate disciplines, grades tend to be high (typically As and Bs) because assessment is an iterative process that leads students to mastery. It is important for reviewers of faculty portfolios to appreciate mastery grading when reviewing SAA course grade distributions.

Appendix B: Statement of Scholarship in the Department of Student Affairs Administration Approved 03/24/23

Faculty in SAA are expected to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship. Scholarship activity reflects the faculty's role in student affairs practitioner preparation and development, which is to provide instruction to graduate candidates in a theory-to-practice curriculum that is relevant to professional positions in a multitude of functional areas in student affairs and academic affairs administration and can support both those seeking entry to the field of higher education as well as those who are already experienced professionals seeking to increase their scholarship and career potential.

Minimal Expectations for Scholarship:

Faculty members are expected to be actively engaged in scholarship. This could involve collecting and/or analyzing data, writing manuscripts and/or grants, presenting, reviewing, and/or publishing results. Active engagement will take different forms depending on the individual and their area of scholarship.

Scholarship in SAA:

The department's definition of scholarship reflects its commitment to a practitioner preparation program that is field-based and is dedicated to developing reflective practitioners. Student affairs is an applied discipline and as such our faculty reach different audiences in different ways. However, for all of our research, the value of reaching practitioners who do student affairs practice work is of equal value to

peer-reviewed research published in academic journals. Faculty may engage in content-focused research in their specific line of inquiry, and/or they may engage in self-study or use other rigorous research methods to carefully examine their *own* instruction. Both types of scholarship ultimately result in the dissemination of findings. Grants that focus on the act of teaching and/or instructional methods are also considered scholarly products.

Faculty are expected to report their scholarly activities and accomplishments on an ongoing basis in their Digital Measures database. Contributions are generally viewed as having a higher impact when subject to peer review and directed towards a student affairs practitioner audience. Narratives describing scholarly activity should contextualize the strength and audience of the publication outlet in which faculty are publishing when they submit their materials for review.

The Department of SAA values many levels of engagement in scholarship. Benchmarks for retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review are articulated in the body of these bylaws. A guide to the different scholarly activities and products is given below.

Primary Areas of Scholarly Activity are those that are highly competitive and subject

to rigorous peer review by individuals or organizations external to the University. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- Publication in a peer-reviewed forum, with contextualization of the forum and its impact

- Publication of textbooks, monographs, manuals, books, or book chapters

- Editor or Co-Editor of peer-reviewed journal or book

- Keynote or invited speaker at regional, national or international conferences

- Peer-reviewed research presentation for a national or international audience

- Principal or Co-Principal Investigator for an external grant (public or private funding) that is related to student affairs

  Chairing SAAL doctoral student dissertation committees

Secondary Areas of Scholarly Activity are those that are subject to less rigorous peer review by individuals or organizations external to the University or to review by peers at the University. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- Publication of a review of a book or media in a peer-reviewed journal

- Publication in a non-peer-reviewed forum, with contextualization of the forum and its impact

- Session leader at a national, regional, or local conference or webinar (e.g., scholarly paper sessions, poster sessions, leader of discussion or presentation panel)

- Peer-reviewed non-research based talk, poster, or paper presentation for a national, regional, local, or internal audience

- Principal or Co-Principal Investigator for an internal grant at the System or University-Wide level that is related to student affairs

- Supporting SAA master's student capstone projects

- Serving on dissertation committees at UWL or elsewhere

Tertiary Areas of Scholarly Activity are those that are not subject to external peer review but may receive some form of internal review. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- Reviews of books, articles, grants, dissertations, awards, or conference proposals

- Non-peer reviewed presentations at local conferences

- Serving as a Supporting Author on a grant

- Mentoring undergraduate research

- Attending conferences or symposia in support of scholarly development

- Conducting research (including collecting and analyzing data, writing manuscripts, applying for grants)

- Principal or Co-Principal Investigator for an internal grant in the College of Arts, Social Sciences, & Humanities, or at the Department/Program level, that is related to student affairs

Appendix C: Statement of Service in the Department of Student Affairs Administration Approved 03/24/23

SAA faculty are expected to participate in service that aligns with and informs practitioner preparation in student affairs. SAA faculty are also expected to serve the department and their profession in a collegial fashion.

The service obligations for the SAA faculty are greater than the obligations for most faculty. Given the applied nature of the program, increased emphasis is placed on relationships with the students, assistantship and practicum providers for master's students, and to a wide variety of local, state and national organizations.

Such service activities include:

- Serving on local community organizations

- Serving on regional or national professional associations, including serving in leadership roles

- Program Directorship, either as M.S.Ed. Program Director or Ed.D. Program Director

- Serving on or chairing department committees

- Serving on or chairing CLS-level committees or university-wide committees

- Developing partnerships and collaboration with practitioners who employ SAA graduate students in graduate assistantships/internships or practica

- Participating in SAA student recruitment, outreach, and support activities

- Serving as program advisor to SAA M.S.Ed. and/or doctoral students

- Delivering service presentations to constituents of the college, the university, the community, or the profession of student affairs

- Assisting in the continuous development of program alums

- Advising student organizations

Appendix D: Policy on Outside Activities

An outside activity is an activity in which a faculty or instructional academic staff (IAS) member engages that is not part of their required university responsibilities. It is further defined in the University of Wisconsin System "Guidelines for Reporting Outside Activities" which can be found at www.uwlax.edu/hr/Forms/OutsideActivities.pdf. The department recognizes that it can be mutually beneficial for our students, faculty, and instructional academic staff alike if classroom instructors maintain and enhance their skills through clinical practice, research, consulting, publications, and other outside activities.

In February 2003, the UW-L Faculty Senate passed a resolution on outside activities that may be accessed at http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/outside.activity/OutsideActivities.pdf. Faculty and IAS members have a professional responsibility to be aware of potential conflicts of interest or interference with meeting their University obligations that may result from their involvement in outside activities.   As a guideline for the purposes of these bylaws, outside activities that require use of more than 8 hours of University time per week may be considered excessive and likely to negatively impact on the individual's obligations to the University and department.

If a department member feels negatively affected by the outside activities of another member, multiple routes exist to address these concerns. Such concerns may be raised with the department member involved in outside activities, the appropriate program director, or the chair of the department. Alternative choices could include the UWL Ethics Advisory Committee, the dean, or chancellor. The aggrieved department member is encouraged to pursue resolution of the concern at the lowest levels and to attempt to resolve the issue within the department; however, whistle blowing is a legitimate mechanism for resolving ethical dilemmas and can be used if there is fear of retribution.

UWS 8.025 contains the annual reporting requirement for outside activities. The process for reporting is initiated by the UWL Human Resources Department in early spring of each year. Completed forms should be turned in to the Department Chair on or before April 30th. The chair then forwards these to the appropriate Dean. The reporting form requires signatures of the Chair/Director and Dean/Designee, and may be accessed at www.uwlax.edu/hr/Forms/OutsideActivities.pdf.

Faculty and IAS who are engaged in outside activities that may produce a perceived or actual conflict of interest should familiarize themselves with the requirements of Chapter 8, in particular those sections defining conflicts of interest, the role of the Ethics Advisory Committee (8.035), actions to avoid possible conflicts of interest (8.04), and the potential sanctions for violating the policy (8.05).

All outside activities that involve teaching at another institution, while under contract at UWL, require prior approval of the Chancellor. Ultimately, the Chancellor has the final authority to determine whether an outside activity is creating a conflict of interest.

Appendix E   Approved 03/26/24

Faculty Name: Year Reviewed:		Department of Student Affairs Administration Faculty Merit Review – Rubric	
Merit Designation: Highly Meritorious	Meritorious	Not Meritorious	
Section		Brief Explanation of Evidence (bullet points are encouraged)	
TEACHING Current syllabi for year of review LENS data Peer Assessment	Self-Assessment of Teaching (SLO Assessment, teaching development activities, curricular innovations, teaching grants, syllabi with SLOs, teaching professional development)		
	Peer Assessment of Teaching (observation SAA or external peer) if applicable		
	Student Evaluation of Teaching (LENS data, formal/informal feedback)		
	Teaching Grants		
	Teaching Awards		
SCHOLARSHIP	Publications & Presentations		
	Editorial Boards		
	MSEd or EdD student research guidance		
	Scholarship Awards		
	Scholarship Grants		
SERVICE	Department Service	• Yes (Indicate: Fall or Spring?) • No (Explain Below)	
	College Service	• Yes (Indicate: Fall or Spring?) • No (Explain Below)	
	University Service	• Yes (Indicate: Fall or Spring?) • No (Explain Below)	
	Professional or Community Service		
	Service Presentations		
	Service Awards		
REASSIGNED TIME (if applicable)	Briefly address terms/expectations of assignment		
	Letter of support (if applicable)		

Appendix F: Peer Review of Teaching Forms

1. Peer Review of Teaching Form for Online and Blended Courses

University of Wisconsin-La Crosse
Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education
Peer Evaluation Form for Online Courses

Instructor:_____   **Date:**_____

Evaluator:_____   **Course:**_____

Respond to each statement using the following scale:
  1- Not observed   2- More emphasis needed   3- Accomplished

Course Structure:

1.	The syllabus was complete and well designed.	1	2	3
2.	The course learning outcomes were clearly communicated.	1	2	3
3.	The course was well organized.	1	2	3
4.	Course requirements were clearly communicated.	1	2	3
5.	Rubrics for grading were provided for important assignments.	1	2	3
6.	Course content was appropriate for the time frame.	1	2	3
7.	The course format considered different learning styles.	1	2	3
8.	The course included meaningful resources.	1	2	3

Comments:
_____

_____

_____

Instruction:

1.	The instructor displayed enthusiasm in teaching this course.	1	2	3
2.	The instructor demonstrated command of the subject matter.	1	2	3
3.	The instructor utilized a variety of instructional activities.	1	2	3
4.	The instructor has the ability to communicate concepts.	!	2	3
5.	The instructor had an online presence in the course.	1	2	3
6.	The instructor was successful in communicating the subject matter.	1	2	3
7.	The instructor motivated students' critical thinking.	1	2	3
8.	The instructor promoted student-to-student interaction.	1	2	3
9.	The instructor encouraged student-to-instructor interaction.	1	2	3
10.	The instructor provided timely feedback.	1	2	3

Comments:
_____

_____

_____

What were the instructor's major strengths?
_____

Improvements for future courses:
_____

_____

2. Peer Review of Teaching Form for On-campus Courses

University of Wisconsin-La Crosse
Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education
Peer Evaluation Form for On-Campus Courses

Course:_____   **Date:**_____

Evaluator:_____

Respond to each statement using the following scale:
   1- Not observed   2- More emphasis needed   3- Accomplished

Course Structure:

9.	The syllabus was complete and well designed.	1	2	3
10.	The course learning outcomes were clearly communicated.	1	2	3
11.	The course was well organized.	1	2	3
12.	Course requirements were clearly communicated.	1	2	3
13.	Rubrics for grading were provided for important assignments.	1	2	3
14.	Course content was appropriate for the time frame.	1	2	3
15.	The course format considered different learning styles.	1	2	3
16.	The course included meaningful resources.	1	2	3
17.	The course incorporates issues of diversity and inclusion into the subject matter.	1	2	3

Comments:

Instruction:

11.	The instructor displayed enthusiasm in teaching this course.	1	2	3
12.	The instructor demonstrated command of the subject matter.	1	2	3
13.	The instructor utilized a variety of instructional activities.	1	2	3
14.	The instructor has the ability to communicate concepts.	1	2	3
15.	The instructor had a professional presence in the course.	1	2	3
16.	The instructor was successful in communicating the subject matter.	1	2	3
17.	The instructor motivated students' critical thinking.	1	2	3
18.	The instructor promoted student-to-student interaction.	1	2	3
19.	The instructor encouraged student-to-instructor interaction.	1	2	3
20.	The instructor provided timely feedback.	1	2	3
21.	The instructor intentionally facilitates discussions where all voices can be heard (practices inclusive excellence).	1	2	3

Comments:

What were the instructor's major strengths?

Improvements for future courses:

Rev 1/14

Appendix G: Procedure for Hearing Grade Appeals

Students who deem that a grade they received for a course does not reflect their performance in that course may appeal the disputed grade. This appeal must take place before the end of the term immediately following the term in which the grade was recorded. The student must first discuss this difference with the instructor. If a student-instructor meeting is not possible or if such a meeting does not result in a resolution of the disputed grade, the student should contact the Department Chair.

After meeting with the student, the Department Chair will discuss the student concern with the instructor, if possible. Following these meetings, the Department Chair will make a recommendation to the instructor regarding the potential grade change.

After the Chair's recommendation and the instructor's response, a student may file a written appeal for a grade change with the Department Chair. Upon receipt of the written request, the Chair will form a five-member ad hoc committee consisting of three department members (not including the Chair), the instructor, and one faculty or IAS member from outside the program to review the appeal. This committee may request additional information from the student and the instructor before forming and forwarding its recommendation to the instructor. The decision to change a grade remains the prerogative of the instructor unless the instructor is no longer available, in which case the decision to change a grade becomes that of the Department Chair.

When the student questions or disputes a final grade, it is expected that the student and course instructor will informally meet to discuss the situation. The student should come to the meeting prepared to explain why he/she believes the grade does not reflect his/her work and the instructor will explain the reasons for the grade given. The outcome of this informal meeting could be:

- Instructor recognizes an error or accepts student's and changes the grade
- Student acknowledges instructor's rationale for grade and accepts the grade
- Instructor does not change the grade; student does not accept the decision and begins a formal grade appeal.

Appeal Process:

The Department of Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education appeal process has three steps: Instructor, Department Chair, Department. The process will be detailed for each step:

Instructor

The request to appeal the grade will be put in writing and addressed to the individual course instructor. The appeal will contain the reason for the grade appeal and supporting materials. Acceptable reasons for appeal are limited to the following:
- Instructor used different grading standards for student work than for other students in the class
- Grading for student was biased, arbitrary, or capricious.

The instructor will acknowledge the appeal was received via e-mail within 1 working day of receipt of the appeal. The instructor will contact the student within 5 working days of receipt of the appeal and schedule a formal meeting with the student. This meeting will be attended by the course instructor, another SAA faculty member, the student, and anyone else the student wishes to bring (if desired). If the course instructor is the Department Chair, another faculty member or Department Chair from outside the department will be asked to attend the meeting. The meeting will be recorded by notes and audiotape.

The possible outcomes of this appeal hearing are:
- Instructor accepts student's and changes the grade
- Student acknowledges instructor's rationale for grade and accepts the grade

- Instructor does not change the grade; student does not accept the decision and decides to appeal to the next level.

The outcomes of the appeal will be documented by the course instructor with a copy send to the student and placed in their file.

Department Chair

The request to appeal the grade will be put in writing and addressed to the Department Chair. The appeal will contain the reason for the grade appeal and supporting materials. Acceptable reasons for appeal are limited to the following:
- Instructor used different grading standards for student work than for other students in the class
- Grading for student was biased, arbitrary, or capricious.
- Department Chair recommended a grade change to the instructor; instructor did not change the grade.

The Department Chair will acknowledge the appeal was received via e-mail within 1 working day of receipt of the appeal. The Department Chair will contact the student within 5 working days of receipt of the appeal and schedule a formal meeting with the student. This meeting will be attended by the Department Chair, the student, and anyone else the student wishes to bring (if desired). The meeting will be recorded by notes and audiotape. The Department Chair will speak to the course instructor after meeting with the student to gather information about the grading. The Department Chair may also formally seek additional information from the course instructor and /or student before rendering a judgment.

The possible outcomes of this appeal hearing are:
- Support for the instructor and a recommendation that the grade should stand as given.
- Recommendation to instructor to change the grade
- Student accepts the grade and ends appeal process.
- Student does not accept the grading decision and decides to appeal to the next level.

The outcomes of the appeal will be documented by the Department Chair with a copy send to the student and placed in his/her file.

Student Affairs Administration (SAA) - Department Level

If the student wished to pursue an appeal, the request for a formal appeal at the SAA Department Level must be filed in writing with the Department Chair. The appeal will contain the reason for the grade appeal and supporting materials. Acceptable reasons for appeal are limited to the following:

- Instructor used different grading standards for student work than for other students in the class
- Grading for student was biased, arbitrary, or capricious.
- Department Chair recommended a grade change to the instructor; instructor did not change the grade.

The Department Chair will acknowledge receipt of the written appeal within 1 working day. The Department Chair will appoint the five-member ad hoc committee to hear the appeal as indicated in the bylaws:
- Three faculty/staff of the department (whenever possible)
- The instructor

- One faculty/staff from outside of the program

The Department Chair will appoint one of the committee members (other than the course instructor) to chair the committee The Department Chair shall <u>not</u> be a member of this committee but will attend the committee meeting as observer and witness. This appeals committee will meet within 1 week of receipt of the written grade appeal. The committee members will be given copies of the documentation of the previous 3 levels of appeal prior to the appeal hearing.

The appeals hearing will be conducted as follows:
- Student will be given 15 minutes to describe the basis for the appeal and provide supporting documentation to the committee.
- Involved teacher will be given 15 minutes to describe the rationale for the grade and reason for not changing the grade.
- Department Chair will be asked to describe involvement in the situation and outcome of actions.
- Student will be excused and committee will deliberate actions.
- The committee may ask for additional information from any of the parties involved. The committee will specify the time frame for supplying the materials. The request for additional materials will be put in writing.
- If additional materials are requested, the committee meeting will be adjourned. The committee will reconvene within one week after deadline for receipt of the requested materials.
- The possible decisions the committee can make are:
    1. Support the appeal and make a recommendation to the course instructor to change the grade.
    2. Deny the appeal and support the grade as given.

The appeals committee chair will communicate the outcome of the appeal hearing in writing to the student, course instructor, and Department Chair within 5 days of the final committee hearing.   A copy of the student written appeal and the response of the committee will be given to the student and placed in the student's permanent record.

Adopted 8/2011