

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

Approved and adopted by the Department on:
May 14, 2010

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

Table of Contents

<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. Department of Accountancy Bylaws, Policies and Procedures	5
II. Organization and Operation	6
A. Preamble	6
B. Meeting Guidelines	6
C. Definitions of Department Membership and Voting Procedures	6
D. Definitions of Quorum and Majority	6
E. Changing the Bylaws	7
F. General Provisions	7
1. Definition of Faculty	7
2. Conflict of Interest	7
3. Dean's Office	7
4. AACSB Documents	7
III. Faculty/Staff Responsibilities	8
A. Ranked Faculty Responsibilities and Expectations	8
1. Teaching	8
2. Scholarship/Professional Development	8
3. Service	9
B. Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Responsibilities and Expectations	9
1. Teaching	10
2. Professional Development/Scholarship	10
3. Service	10
C. Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEIs)	11
1. Ranked Faculty and SEIs	11
2. IAS Renewal and Career Progression	11
IV. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)	12
A. Evaluation Criteria and Procedures	12
1. Ranked Faculty Annual (Merit) Review Criteria	12
a. Teaching	12
b. Scholarship/Professional Development	13
c. Service	13
d. Other Activities	13
2. Instructional Academic Staff Annual (Merit) Review Criteria	13
a. Teaching	13
b. Professional Development/Scholarship	13
c. Service	14
d. Other Activities	14
3. Annual (Merit) Review Procedures	14
a. Department of Accountancy Merit Review Committee	14

b. Merit Levels	14
i. Solid Performance	14
ii. Extra Merit	15
c. Notification of the Annual (Merit) Review Results	15
B. Distribution of Merit Funds	15
C. Appeal Procedures	16
V. Ranked Faculty Personnel Review	17
A. Retention	17
1. Departmental Review Materials	17
2. Dean’s Review Materials	17
3. Procedure	18
a. Criteria	18
b. Reconsideration	18
c. Appeals	19
4. Timeline	19
B. Tenure Review and Departmental Tenure Criteria	19
C. Post-tenure Review	20
D. Ranked Faculty Promotion Procedures	20
1. Review Process	20
2. Criteria	21
3. Standards	22
4. Reconsideration	22
VI. Instructional Academic Staff Review	24
A. Annual Review	24
1. Procedure	24
2. Criteria	24
B. Career Progression Procedures	25
1. Criteria	25
2. Standards	26
3. Appeal Procedures	27
VII. Governance	28
A. Department Chair	28
1. Election of the Department Chair	28
2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair	28
B. Standing Department Committees	29
1. Merit Review Committee	29
2. Promotion, Retention, and Tenure Committee	29
3. Curriculum Committee	29
4. Bylaws Committee	29
C. Departmental Programmatic Assessment Plan	29
D. Additional Departmental Policies	29
1. Salary Equity	29
2. Sick Leave and Vacation	29

VIII. Search and Screen Procedures	30
IX. Student Rights and Obligations	31
A. Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures	31
B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct	31
C. Advising Policy	31
X. Other	32
A. Summer and Winter Intersession Teaching Assignments	32
B. Faculty Leaves	32
C. Emeritus Status	32
XI. Appendices	33
Appendix A. Department Statement on Scholarship	33
Appendix B. College of Business Administration Scholarly Productivity Guidelines	34
Appendix C. Department Student Evaluation Instrument	35

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

Approved: May 14, 2010
Last approved April 6, 1998

Notes:

- 1) **Blue text** indicates text required by current University policy.

II. Organization and Operation

Department members are governed by six interdependent sets of regulations:

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

- A. Preamble.** These Bylaws were adopted by the members of the Department of Accountancy in accordance with the UW-System and UW-L *Faculty and Academic Staff Personnel Rules*.
- B. Meeting Guidelines.** Meetings of the Department of Accountancy and its Committees are conducted in accordance with *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised* and [WI state opening meeting laws](#).

Minutes will be recorded by a voting member ([see section II.C below](#)) of the department and distributed within two weeks to department members. Copies of the minutes of department and committee meetings shall be kept in a secure location by the department. Minutes from closed meetings will be taken by the department chair (or a designated faculty member) and written within one week of the proceedings. They will be available upon request.

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

- C. Definitions of Department Membership and Voting Procedures.** Members of the department are defined as all ranked (tenure-track or tenured) faculty (including those on leave or sabbatical who are in attendance) and instructional academic staff (IAS) members with at least a **50%** appointment for 4 or more consecutive semesters.

Those classified as members of the department are eligible to vote on matters requiring a department vote. IAS that are eligible to vote on departmental matters, however, are not eligible to vote on promotion, retention, and tenure issues. Part-time IAS are not eligible to vote on matters of department governance. Therefore, such IAS shall not be entitled to vote on matters requiring a department vote, or serve as members on department committees.

Proxy votes are not permitted in meetings of the department and its committees.

- D. Definitions of Quorum and Majority.** For meetings of the department and its committees, a **quorum** is defined as the majority of the entire membership eligible to participate. For personnel meetings a quorum is achieved with a majority of those eligible to vote. Within a meeting, a **majority** is the simple majority (>50%) of those present. Members who join by teleconference and have heard all the deliberation are eligible to vote.

- E. Changing the Bylaws.** Amendments or additions to these bylaws require a **simple majority** of the current department membership eligible to vote. Any proposed amendment(s) shall be presented and distributed in writing at a department meeting to provide an opportunity for a second reading and discussion. A vote will be taken at the next subsequent meeting. A second reading may be waived (by majority approval) for bylaw changes that do not pertain to personnel decisions.
- F. General Provisions.** In order to provide clarification and guidance to the Department of Accountancy, across all sections of the bylaws, the following paragraphs shall be applied in any and all situations and circumstances where their application will serve to better define the boundaries and parameters for a deliberation. It is the intent of the department that the application of one or more of the general provisions will lead to a more effective, efficient, and equitable outcome in the decision-making process for both the department and its members.
- 1. Definition of Faculty.** “Faculty” or “faculty member” includes Ranked Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff. Ranked faculty are individuals who generally hold a terminal degree in their field, and tenure or tenure-track teaching positions with the rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor. Instructional Academic Staff positions in the College of Business generally require a master’s degree, with primary responsibilities of providing credit instruction and training to students in an academic discipline.
 - 2. Conflict of Interest.** Department faculty members understand and accept the potential that exists for a real and/or perceived conflict of interest between related faculty members. A committee member or the department chair must be recused from voting when there is an actual conflict of interest, such as voting on any matter that directly affects a spouse, ex-spouse, relative, or domestic partner. The recusal shall be construed in a neutral manner, neither a vote for nor a vote against the spouse, ex-spouse, relative, or domestic partner. Any faculty member may also make a written request to the dean at least five (5) days prior to a committee vote, requesting a determination of whether a committee member must be recused for an actual or apparent conflict of interest. The dean may act in the capacity of department chair, if necessary, when the department chair is recused.
 - 3. Dean’s Office.** Management advisory documents created and maintained in the dean’s office are understood by the department’s faculty to have been prepared for the sole purpose of providing guidance to the decision-making across the various departments of the College of Business Administration (CBA) at UW-L. In any case or situation where a dean’s office management advisory document is in direct or indirect conflict with a provision of the department’s bylaws, the former document is to be considered fully operative and shall be given absolute preference.
 - 4. AACSB Documents.** The department’s faculty is fully aware of, understand, and accept the important role that AACSB accreditation has had and will continue to have for the CBA at UW-L. Further, the department is committed to maintaining this standard and will seek guidance from AACSB documents that are prepared and intended to assist colleges in their efforts directed at fulfilling the AACSB mission. In any case or situation where an AACSB accreditation advisory document is in direct or indirect conflict with a provision of the department’s bylaws, the former document is to be considered fully operative and shall be given absolute preference.

III. Faculty/Staff Responsibilities

A. **Ranked Faculty Responsibilities and Expectations.** Faculty responsibilities are referenced in section IV of the Faculty Senate bylaws entitled “Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons.”

1. Teaching. Teaching is the primary mission of the ranked faculty in the Department of Accountancy, and faculty members are expected to be active teachers throughout their careers. This teaching mission extends beyond traditional classroom instruction. It is expected that all faculty will take active roles in ensuring that all programs of study in the department (majors and minors) are meeting the contemporary needs of the students in terms of preparing them for entering the workforce, graduate schools, and/or professional training programs. Thus, faculty members are expected to contribute to this departmental mission in a variety of ways. Examples of teaching contributions may include, but are not limited to:

- Designing and implementing new courses aimed at increasing the knowledge of students in the department’s areas of responsibility.
- Advising students in undergraduate research, independent study projects and internships.
- Continuing professional teaching development by attending workshops and seminars aimed at improving teaching effectiveness. The faculty members of the Department of Accountancy are expected to be actively seeking new methods of challenging and motivating students as well as increasing student learning.

The faculty members of the Department of Accountancy are expected to keep current in their subject matter area and to participate in curriculum development by improving and updating the courses they teach. Faculty members are further expected to offer additional time to address student questions by holding office hours. Office hours and other course details should be part of a course syllabus that is made available to students at the beginning of a course. In addition, faculty members are expected to grade and return student assignments, including examinations, in a timely fashion. Finally, faculty members are expected to allow student evaluation of instruction in each course they teach (except research, independent study, and internships).

2. Scholarship/Professional Development. The CBA is unique in that its work is guided by AACSB accreditation standards. Standards have been promulgated that address faculty member qualifications. It is expected that ranked faculty in the Department of Accountancy will satisfy the guidelines and requirements to maintain Academically Qualified (AQ) and/or Professionally Qualified (PQ) status that are detailed in the *College of Business Administrations Criteria and Policies for Classification of Faculty Academic Qualifications and Sufficiency*.

The acquisition of new knowledge in the discipline and the discovery of new, effective ways to communicate it are key elements that characterize activities of university faculty. Consequently, it is expected that ranked faculty members will be active scholars. “Scholarship,” as outlined here, includes discipline-based scholarship, contributions to practice, or learning and pedagogical research. See **Appendix XI.A** for the departmental “Statement on Scholarship.”

It is entirely possible that the scholarly emphasis of an individual faculty member may vary over one's academic career. The department regards the items listed below as *typical indicators* of a successful scholarly program:

- Writing and publishing scholarly papers in refereed journals related to the discipline.
- Presenting scholarly work at national/international, regional, and local conferences.
- Authoring texts, or other copyrighted work contributing to the profession.
- Proposing, receiving, and administering grants.
- Developing tangible teaching materials including study guides and software.
- Working papers and other work in progress.

Ranked faculty members are expected to actively work toward meeting or exceeding CBA scholarly productivity guidelines. These scholarly productivity guidelines are subject to change when revised by the College of Business Administration (**Appendix XI.B**).

Department of Accountancy ranked faculty members understand and accept the importance of professional development activities in the development and maintenance of their personal knowledge base and professional capacity. To that end, department faculty members are encouraged to become involved with such scholarly activities as:

- Attaining and maintaining professional certification.
- Participation in workshops, seminars, and graduate courses.
- Participation in professional organizations and/or attendance at professional meetings.
- Formal coursework.
- Participation in continuing education.
- Mentoring.

3. Service. Ranked faculty members in the Department of Accountancy are expected to remain actively engaged in service to the university at all levels. It is also expected that the faculty maintain some level of commitment to professional service and/or service to the public. Examples of expected service activities include, but are not limited to:

- Serving on departmental and college committees, including search and screen and *ad hoc* committees.
- Advising majors and minors in the department.
- Serving on standing Faculty Senate and UW-System committees. Faculty members are encouraged to display leadership in university governance, *i.e.*, serving as chairs on university committees.
- Appointments with administrative responsibilities, including department chair, program directorships, *etc.*
- Volunteering in professional organizations.
- Editorial responsibilities.
- Reviewing manuscripts for professional journals or conferences.
- Participating in conferences as session chair or paper discussant.

B. Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Responsibilities and Expectations. [Requests for IAS hiring will be presented to the college dean. The request will indicate one of the standard titles from the lecturer or clinical professor series and will outline specific duties including teaching and any additional workload.](#) Typical titles include Associate Lecturer, Lecturer, and Senior Lecturer.

1. Teaching. *University Teaching Load:* Total workload for IAS is defined as a standard minimum teaching load plus additional workload equivalency activities.

IAS provide formal classroom instruction in an academic discipline. Effective classroom delivery, maintaining office hours, testing and grading are duties expected of IAS at all title ranks. The teaching expectations of IAS are similar to those of the ranked faculty, as described in section **III.A.1.**

2. Professional Development/Scholarship. The CBA is unique in that its work is guided by AACSB accreditation standards. Standards have been promulgated that address faculty member qualifications. It is expected that IAS members in the Department of Accountancy will satisfy the guidelines and requirements to maintain Professionally Qualified (PQ) or Academically Qualified (AQ) status that are detailed in the *College of Business Administration's Criteria and Policies for Classification of Faculty Academic Qualifications and Sufficiency.*

Department of Accountancy IAS faculty members understand and accept the importance of professional development activities in the development and maintenance of their personal knowledge base and professional capacity. To that end, department faculty members are encouraged to become involved with such scholarly or professional activities as:

- Attaining and maintaining professional certification.
- Participation in workshops, seminars, and graduate courses.
- Participation in professional organizations and/or attendance at professional meetings.
- Formal coursework.
- Participation in continuing education.
- Mentoring.

The acquisition of new knowledge in the discipline and the discovery of new, effective ways to communicate it are key elements that characterize activities of university faculty. The department encourages the IAS faculty members to participate in scholarship. "Scholarship," as outlined here, includes discipline-based scholarship, contributions to practice, or learning and pedagogical research. See **Appendix XI.A** for the departmental "Statement on Scholarship." The department regards the items listed below as *typical indicators* of scholarship:

- Writing and publishing scholarly papers in refereed or professional journals related to the discipline.
- Presenting scholarly work at national/international, regional, and local conferences.
- Authoring texts, or other copyrighted work contributing to the profession.
- Proposing, receiving, and administering grants.
- Developing tangible teaching materials including study guides and software.
- Working papers and other work in progress.

3. Service. The expectations for involvement in service activities by IAS members in the Department of Accountancy are similar to those of the ranked faculty, as described in section **III.A.3.** Examples of expected service activities include, but are not limited to:

- Serving on departmental and college committees, standing Faculty Senate and UW-System committees, including task forces.
- Advising majors and minors in the department.
- Appointments with administrative responsibilities.

- Volunteering in professional organizations.
- Reviewing manuscripts for professional journals or conferences.
- Consulting.

C. Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEIs). In each of the courses offered by the Department of Accountancy (except research, independent study, and internships) students will have an opportunity to evaluate their instructors. This evaluation will take place during the last three weeks of classes using the Department of Accountancy Student Evaluation Instrument (SEI) (**Appendix XI.C**). [The department will follow the UW-L SEI policy and procedures established by the Faculty Senate.](#)

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

2. IAS Renewal and Career Progression. [The same information as above is reported for instructional academic staff; however, no TAIs are generated for IAS.](#)

IV. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)

A. Evaluation Criteria and Procedures. Consistent with *UW-S 3.05*, and *UW-L 3.05*, the performance of all faculty (as well as continuing full-time instructional academic staff) in the Department of Accountancy will be reviewed annually. The areas of review shall include teaching, scholarship, and service activities (see sections **III.A-B** and **IV.A.1-2**). Each year during the first week of May, the department chair will remind the ranked faculty and full-time IAS to update their electronic portfolio in Digital Measures (DM) to reflect activities from the prior June 1st to the current May 31st. A Department of Accountancy annual activity report shall be generated using DM and submitted electronically to the department chair by June 1st. The annual activity report should include narratives relating to the three areas of responsibility. The annual activity report shall serve as a vehicle for self-evaluation, which, along with student and peer evaluations, will form the basis for the annual merit review. Merit reviews reflect activities during the prior academic year ending May 31. [The results of these merit reviews for all faculty who have completed at least one academic year at UW-L are due to the Dean's Office on Dec. 15 annually.](#)

Early in the fall semester, the department chair, working with the department **Merit Review Committee** (section **IV.A.4.a**), will use the completed annual activity reports, student evaluation of instruction (SEI) information, and peer evaluation information from the previous year to evaluate each department member's performance in the three areas of responsibility (teaching, scholarship and service) using the criteria specified below.

Within seven days of completion of the reviews, the chair shall notify each department member, in writing, of his/her overall merit ratings (solid performance and extraordinary merit).

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

The college dean will evaluate the department chair for merit. The department chair typically has various administrative appointments that alter his/her normal balance of teaching, scholarship, and service obligations, and this should be considered during the evaluation.

1. Ranked Faculty Annual (Merit) Review Criteria. The criteria used in the Department of Accountancy to evaluate a ranked faculty member's annual performance are designed to promote effective teaching, quality scholarship, and meaningful service. In ranking the importance of the areas of faculty responsibility, teaching is of greatest importance, followed by scholarship/professional development and service. It is expected that all faculty will direct some effort to all areas of faculty responsibility; however, considering the varied interests and talents of the faculty, it is not expected that all individuals will distribute their efforts in these areas in the same manner.

a. Teaching. In the area of teaching (section **III.A.1**), ranked faculty members are expected to motivate and challenge students to learn by using various pedagogical devices or techniques and by setting well-defined student learning objectives and outcomes. Efforts and accomplishments to these ends are to be reported in the Department of Accountancy annual activity report. Teaching effectiveness will be judged using the self-assessment

information as reflected in the annual activity report, peer evaluations of teaching, student evaluations of instruction (SEIs), and any other evidence provided by the faculty member. In the case of probationary faculty, peer evaluations based on classroom visitations will be maintained by the department chair for use by the Promotion, Retention, and Tenure Committee (see sections **V.A** and **V.B**). Especially meritorious performance in this area is typically evidenced by outstanding student and/or peer evaluations of teaching as well as documented exemplary performance in any of the other activities described in section **III.A.1**.

b. Scholarship/Professional Development. As stated in section **III.A.2**, ranked faculty members are expected to maintain an active program of scholarship. See **Appendix XI.A** for the departmental "Statement on Scholarship." All scholarship which helps the CBA achieve its mission is valued. Faculty members are expected to report their scholarly activities and accomplishments in their Department of Accountancy annual activity report.

c. Service. As noted in section **III.A.3**, the service component of a ranked faculty member's responsibility may take many forms: active service to the program or major, the department, the university, the profession, and/or the public. Service includes memberships and offices in professional organizations, participation in professional meetings, and consulting or volunteering when one's professional expertise has been recognized. Faculty members are expected to report their service activities in their Department of Accountancy annual activity report.

d. Other Activities. Any meritorious activities or accomplishments as a university citizen not explicitly included in review criteria **IV.A.1.a-c** above (or sections **III.A.1-3**) should be described in the appropriate section of the annual activity report or highlighted in an explanatory cover letter to that report.

2. Instructional Academic Staff Annual (Merit) Review Criteria. The performance of all continuing, full-time IAS in the Department of Accountancy will be reviewed annually for purposes of merit. In ranking the importance of the areas of responsibility for IAS, the merit evaluation of IAS will be based upon the quality of their classroom teaching (as described in section **III.B.1**), their professional development/scholarship activities (section **III.B.2**), and their service activities (section **III.B.3**).

a. Teaching. In evaluating the teaching performance of IAS, the same criteria should be considered as those outlined for ranked faculty in section **IV.A.1.a** above. IAS are expected to report teaching accomplishments in their annual activity report. As noted in section **IV.A.1.a**, especially meritorious performance in teaching is typically evidenced by outstanding student and/or peer evaluations of teaching as well as documented exemplary performance in any of the other activities described in section **III.B**.

b. Professional Development/Scholarship. As stated in section **III.B.2**, some level of professional development/scholarship activities allow an IAS member to remain current in accounting and to maintain professionally qualified (PQ) or academically qualified (AQ) status. IAS are expected to report their professional development/scholarly activities in their annual activity report.

c. Service. The service component of an IAS member's responsibilities is outlined in section **III.B.3**. IAS are expected to report their service activities in their annual activity report.

d. Other Activities. Any meritorious activities or accomplishments as a university citizen not explicitly included in review criteria **IV.A.2.a-c** above (or sections **III.B.1-3**) should be described in the appropriate section of the annual activity report or highlighted in an explanatory cover letter to that report.

3. Annual (Merit) Review Procedures. Department faculty members shall be evaluated annually for merit, and the distribution of any merit salary dollars shall be based upon this annual evaluation and on whether the position generates merit dollars. IAS will be evaluated by the CBA during the annual merit review. IAS will complete the department's annual activity report as it relates to them and the report will be forwarded to the dean's office.

The evaluation shall consider all of the criteria listed above in sections **IV.A.1-2** (and sections **III.A.1-3** and **III.B.1-3**). In addition, the annual merit evaluation of faculty must differentiate between levels of merit.

a. Department of Accountancy Merit Review Committee. The evaluation process of all ranked faculty members, including the chair of the department will be conducted by the Merit Review Committee. The committee shall consist of the department chair and the college dean.

b. Merit Levels.

i. Solid Performance. The committee shall conduct the solid performance review of all faculty members. A solid performance designation denotes satisfactory performance related to a faculty member's responsibilities and expectations (**III.A.1-3** and **III.B.1-3**). To receive solid performance, faculty members must perform their teaching responsibilities at a satisfactory level, as determined by students and peers, along with their basic departmental and professional responsibilities.

In addition, a faculty member must:

- Conduct a student evaluation for all courses taught during fall and spring semester for the prior academic year (including team-taught courses),
- Update teaching, scholarship and service activities for the prior academic year in the electronic portfolio system (Digital Measures) by June 1st,
- Prepare and submit the department annual activity report by June 1st reflecting activities from the prior year covering the period from June 1st – May 31st, and
- Upon request, provide written documentation for any activity for which a member wishes to receive merit points.

In general, the results of this solid performance review will be a simple "yes" (=100%), or "no" (=0%) designation.

Faculty members qualifying for solid performance will receive the state-allotted solid performance raise. Faculty on approved leave shall be considered for solid performance and may be considered for extra merit. Faculty in their first year shall be considered for

solid performance, but will not be considered for extra merit as there is no performance to evaluate for extra merit.

ii. **Extra Merit.** Considering the annual (merit) review criteria outlined in section **IV.A.1-2**, the committee shall evaluate all faculty members for extra merit. Extra merit recognizes the need to differentially reward faculty for levels of performance and individual accomplishments that exceed the expectations of the department in two or more of the three areas of responsibility. Extra merit activities, or **meritorious performance**, generally include exemplary teaching accomplishments, such as new curriculum development and high SEI scores, significant ongoing research and scholarly productivity, and/or notable service contributions to the university, profession, or public. Faculty are also invited to identify any other significant contributions that they would like considered extra merit (section **IV.A.1.d** & **IV.A.2.d**).

c. **Notification of the Annual (Merit) Review Results.** The department chair shall notify, in writing, all department members of their merit ratings within **seven** days of the completed actions of the Merit Review Committee.

All members shall be notified of their solid performance designation (yes = 100%, or no = 0%). Those persons not receiving solid performance shall be notified, in writing, of the reasons for this action.

All members shall be notified of their assigned extra merit ratings, along with the distribution numbers of department members in each merit category.

B. Distribution of Merit Funds. Annually, the department may be allocated merit monies as determined by the action of the state legislature, the Board of Regents, and/or the UW-System Administration as a percentage of the department total salary package. These monies shall be distributed to department members based on the merit ratings assigned through the annual (merit) review process (see **IV.A.4.b.i** & **ii**). The pool of merit funds for IAS is separate from the ranked faculty pool.

All faculty members judged by the Merit Review Committee to be meeting their basic responsibilities as “solid performance” and granted 100% (see **IV.A.4.b.i**) shall receive the state-allotted solid performance raise. If the state fails to designate a specific percentage for solid performance, the department will assume the solid performance allocation will be 2/3 of the total percentage allocated.

All faculty who receive an overall evaluation of “meritorious performer” will divide among themselves a proportional share of the remaining merit pool.

Note here that although a whole-department merit designation may be used for non-monetary reporting issues, the ranked faculty and IAS must be split into two separate merit category distributions because two separate sources fund these two different populations. At the appropriate time, the department chair (or Human Resources Office) will communicate the merit adjustment dollars awarded to each department member.

Merit pay increases will not be made in years the state does not provide merit funding. The Merit Review Committee will consider the annual merit ratings retroactive to the last year merit pay was provided, when the committee makes merit ratings for the first year merit funding becomes available after a lapse in funding for one or more years. For example, assume that the state did not provide any merit pay for years 2008, 2009 and 2010, and then provided merit funding in 2011. The committee will consider the annual merit ratings for years 2008-2010 when rating faculty members for year 2011, to make the merit pay increase equitable.

- C. Appeal Procedures.** A faculty member may request a reconsideration of his/her annual merit ratings. The department Merit Review Committee will reconsider a member's merit evaluation upon receiving a written request. This written request must include reasons for reconsideration and must be submitted to the department chair within **seven days** of notification of the annual review results.

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

The department chair may likewise make an appeal for reconsideration of his/her merit evaluation by submitting a written request to the college dean within **seven days** of notification of the merit evaluation results.

Appeals beyond the department level may be presented to the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals and Academic Freed (CGAAF) Committee (see **section I.E.** of the *Faculty Senate Bylaws*). As in all processes involving the evaluation of personnel, mechanisms for merit evaluation appeals beyond the department level are established on this campus. Your attention is directed to the *UW-System Administrative Code*, the local *UW-L Faculty Rules*, and the *UW-L Faculty Handbook*.

V. Ranked Faculty Personnel Review

The department will follow the policies regarding retention and tenure described in the Faculty Personnel Rules ([UW-S 3.06-3.11](#) and [UW-L 3.06-3.08](#))

Tenure/retention decisions will be guided by the criteria established in the bylaws at the time of hire unless a candidate elects to be considered under newer guidelines. The criteria outlined in Section **V. A & V. B** “Faculty Personnel Review” in these bylaws should be applied to faculty hired after May 14, 2010.

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

A. Retention. Retention reviews shall be conducted by the Promotion, Retention and Tenure (PRT) Committee, which shall consist of all tenured members of the Department of Accountancy. In the case where there are fewer than three tenured faculty members in the department, the committee shall work with the department chair and the dean to establish an appropriate committee. All retention decisions, including the ultimate retention through tenure, use past performance to predict future performance. In each retention decision, the PRT Committee must assess the promise as well as the competency of the candidate in meeting the purpose, vision, and mission of the department.

1. Departmental Review Materials. Faculty under review will provide an electronic portfolio related to their teaching, scholarship, and service activities extracted from their date of hire to date of review. Hyperlinked syllabi 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.

The department chair shall give written notice of the department review to each probationary faculty member subject to review at least 20 days prior to the review. At least seven (7) days prior to the date of the review, the probationary faculty member shall provide the department chair a recent copy of his/her **annual activity report** (completed the previous spring semester), and any **supplemental materials** deemed appropriate to the PRT Committee. This material is in addition to the electronic portfolio. The department chair will supply grade distributions, the results of student evaluations of instruction, and merit evaluation data for each probationary faculty member to the PRT Committee. Probationary faculty members may make oral or written presentations at the review meeting. The requirements of the *Wisconsin Open Meeting Law* shall apply to the review meeting.

2. Dean’s Review Materials. Subsequent to the departmental review, departments will provide the following materials to the dean:

- Department letter of recommendation with vote;
- Teaching assignment information (TAI) datasheet that summarizes the courses taught, workload data, grade distribution and SEIs by individual course and semester (which are only available after completing a full academic year) and departmental comparison SEI data; and
- Merit evaluation data (if available).

3. Procedure. The initial review of probationary faculty shall be conducted by the tenured faculty of the Department of Accountancy in the manner outlined below.

Using the criteria in section **V.A.3.a** (below), the PRT Committee shall evaluate each probationary faculty member's performance based on the completed annual activity report, *vita*, department annual (merit) review data, student evaluations of instruction (SEIs), and any other information, written or oral, presented to the committee. In addition, the committee will consider the expertise of the faculty member under review and the need for this expertise in support of its department programs.

In order to obtain a recommendation for reappointment, the probationary faculty member's performance must be judged to be satisfactory (see section **V.A.3.a**) and must show potential for continued professional growth.

Within **seven days** of the review meeting, each probationary faculty member shall be informed in writing by the committee chair of the results of the retention review. In the case of a nonrenewal recommendation, the committee shall consult with the college dean prior to notifying the faculty member. After consultation, the committee shall inform the faculty member early enough to allow time for possible reconsideration and appeal and adequate notice of nonrenewal. The committee shall formulate and retain written reasons for the decision. In the case of a positive retention decision, the written notice shall include concerns or suggestions for improvement identified by the committee.

a. Criteria. The members of the PRT Committee shall use the submitted self, peer, and student evaluation information to judge each probationary faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service using the criteria outlined in section **III**. It is expected that all faculty will direct some effort to all areas of faculty responsibility; however, considering the varied interests and talents of the faculty, it is not expected that all persons will distribute their efforts in these areas in the same manner.

A recommendation for retention and/or granting of tenure may be denied if:

- The probationary faculty member did not submit an annual activity report at the end of the previous spring semester (as required in section **IV.A**).
- The probationary faculty member did not submit all of the appropriate retention review materials at least **seven days** prior to the date of review (as required in section **V.A.1**).
- The probationary faculty member did not update teaching, scholarship and service activities for the prior academic year into the electronic portfolio system (Digital Measures) by June 1st
- The probationary faculty member does not show the potential for promotion to the upper faculty ranks (see section **V.D.3**).

b. Reconsideration. If a nonrenewal recommendation is made by the PRT Committee, the probationary faculty member may request reasons for the recommendation. This request must be made in writing within **10 days** of the nonrenewal notice. Written reasons shall be provided the probationary faculty member within **10 days** of the receipt of the written request. The reasons then become part of the official personnel file of the probationary faculty member.

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

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

c. Appeals. The probationary faculty member may appeal a negative reconsideration decision. Such an appeal must be filed, in writing, with the University Hearing Committee within **20 days** of notice that the result of the reconsideration has affirmed the nonrenewal decision.

Procedures regarding notice, reconsideration, and appeal shall be in accord with those described in **UW-S 3.07, 3.08** and **UW-L 3.07, 3.08** of the *Faculty Personnel Rules*.

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

B. Tenure Review and Departmental Tenure Criteria. 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. The tenure decision follows and is based on two complementary judgments: the competency and promise of the faculty member, and the future needs of the university. The procedure for a Tenure Review is the same as that of a Retention Review, which is described in section **V.A.**

The members of the PRT Committee shall use the submitted self, peer, and student evaluation information to judge each probationary faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service using the criteria outlined in section **III**. The criteria are guidelines to establish minimum performance in each category. As these are minimum criteria, the

achievement of the minimum in each category will not be considered sufficient for tenure. Performance well above the minimum level is expected in one or more of the three categories to be evaluated. A recommendation for reappointment that constitutes a **tenure decision** must receive the support of a simple majority of the PRT Committee.

- C. Post-tenure Review.** As required by ***UW-S 3.05*** and ***UW-L 3.05*** of the *Faculty Personnel Rules*, tenured faculty members no longer eligible for promotion also are evaluated in each of the three areas of faculty responsibility described in section **III.A**. To meet these requirements for post-tenure review, all tenured faculty members are required to submit an annual activity report and to participate fully in the evaluation process. This evaluation, which is carried out by the Merit Review Committee, is based on the results of the most recent annual review, but reviews of the five preceding years also may be considered. This review will be performed every five years to encourage and support the meaningful growth and development of faculty in ways that positively contribute to the missions of the University, the College of Business Administration and the Department of Accountancy.

The department chair shall give written notice of the department review to each faculty member subject to post-tenure review at least 20 days prior to the review. At least seven (7) days prior to the review, the faculty member shall provide the department chair with an electronic portfolio related to their teaching, scholarship, and service activities extracted from their date of hire to date of review, recent syllabi for all courses taught, and scholarship materials the faculty member wishes the committee to consider.

In the event that a tenured faculty member chooses not to participate in the post-tenure review process, they will not be eligible to participate in the merit process until they have participated in the post-tenure review process.

The department chair shall provide the PRT Committee with teaching assignment information (TAI) datasheets and merit evaluation data for the last five years along with the materials provided by the faculty member. The PRT Committee will write and submit the department letter summarizing the review to the dean and to the faculty member being reviewed advising him/her of the committee's findings.

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

1. Review Process. The review shall be conducted by a subcommittee of the PRT Committee consisting of all tenured faculty, at a higher rank, than the faculty rank to which a promotion is being considered. In cases where a committee consists of fewer than three faculty members, the department chair shall work with the dean to establish an appropriate committee.

Before the end of spring semester, lists of faculty who will meet the minimum university eligibility requirements for promotion in the coming academic year are distributed by the Human Resources Office to department chairs. These lists will be reviewed for accuracy by the chair. At this time, the department chair will notify the faculty members who are eligible of their

eligibility. A description of departmental promotion criteria is presented in section **V.D.2** (below).

Early in the fall semester, the names of eligible faculty members shall be forwarded to the appropriate PRT sub-committee. The department chair shall give written notice of eligibility for promotion to each faculty member eligible at least 20 days prior to the review. Faculty members choosing to seek promotion must provide all members of the PRT sub-committee with their promotion materials **no later than two weeks prior to the promotion consideration meeting**. A guide to developing the promotion portfolio is available through the Human Resources Office.

Public notice of promotion consideration meetings shall be made at least **10 days** prior to the meeting. Promotion candidates will be informed of their rights under the *Wisconsin Open Meeting Law*. If an open meeting is requested, only the portion of the meeting dealing with the faculty person requesting the meeting will be open to all persons. This portion of the meeting will be conducted in accordance with the open meetings rules of the State of Wisconsin.

After discussion of a candidate's performance with respect to the criteria in section **V.D.2** (below), votes shall be cast by a show of hands on a separate motion to promote for each promotion candidate. A **simple majority** is necessary for a positive promotion recommendation. The results of the vote shall be recorded by the committee chair and entered into the committee's portion of the Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report Form. The committee shall prepare written reasons for each of its recommendations.

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

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

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

2. Criteria. To be considered for promotion to a higher rank, faculty must meet the minimum university criteria provided in the *Employee Handbook*, the *Guide to Faculty Promotions and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse*, and the minimum departmental standards by rank (section **V.D.3**). Meeting the minimum is not a guarantee of promotion.

For the rank of **Associate Professor**, a faculty member must provide evidence of the following: teaching excellence, the establishment of a program of scholarship, and participation in service

activities. Evidence of teaching excellence shall include the results of self, peer, and student evaluations of instruction. Scholarship shall be consistent with the department's definition of scholarly activity (**Appendix XI.A**).

To be promoted to 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 of instruction. Significant scholarly productivity is judged using the department criteria for scholarly activity (**Appendix XI.A**). Substantial service activity will include service to the department and university, the profession, and/or the public.

3. Standards. In keeping with the promotion guidelines set forth by the Faculty Senate, and considering the mission of the university, the role of the Department of Accountancy within the university, and the nature of the discipline, the criteria used to evaluate faculty for promotion shall be the standard three areas of faculty responsibility outlined in section **III.A**: teaching, scholarship/professional development (as defined in **Appendix XI.A**), and service to the department and university, the profession, and/or the public. In ranking the importance of the areas of faculty responsibility, teaching is of greatest importance, followed by scholarship/professional development and service.

Using the above areas of evaluation, promotion recommendations shall be based on the following standards:

Associate Professor

- Earned doctorate degree or accepted terminal degree in the field of principal responsibility.
- Faculty member who is well respected within the department for excellence in teaching and who has taken an active role in improving the level of instruction in the department.
- Faculty member with an established scholarly program who has taken an active role in service to the department and participates in university and professional service.

Professor

- Earned doctorate degree or accepted terminal degree in the field of principal responsibility.
- Faculty member who is well respected within the department for excellence in teaching and who has taken a leadership role in enhancing the curriculum in the department.
- Faculty member with a continuing scholarly program.
- Faculty member who provides strong leadership in department service and is well respected at the school or college level for university and professional service.

(Standards taken from "A Guide to Faculty Promotions and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse", Appendix B: Rank, Promotion & Tenure Guidelines (Approved by Faculty Senate 5-8-08).

4. Reconsideration. Within **two weeks** of receiving notice of a negative decision by the PRT sub-committee, a candidate may request, by writing to the department chair, reconsideration by the committee. The faculty member will be allowed an opportunity to respond to the written

reasons using written and/or oral evidence and witnesses at the reconsideration meeting. Written notice of the reconsideration decision shall be forwarded to the dean within **seven days** of the reconsideration meeting.

Each promotion candidate has the right to appeal a negative reconsideration decision in a grievance filed with the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals, and Academic Freedom (CGAAF) Committee. Rules and procedures for filing a grievance are specified in ***UW-S 6.02*** and ***UW-L 6.02***. The Complaints, Grievances, Appeals, and Academic Freedom (CGAAF) Committee shall forward its recommendation to the chancellor (see ***UW-S 6.02***).

VI. Instructional Academic Staff Review

Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) in the Department of Accountancy are held to the same teaching expectations as tenure track faculty (see section III.A). Because IAS do not have the full range of tenure track faculty responsibilities (section III.B), their teaching load is usually larger than that of the tenure track faculty.

1. **Annual Review.** In accordance with Academic Personnel rules [UW-L 10.03](#), IAS will be evaluated annually. The Individual Development Plan (IDP) form will accompany the department's evaluation.

Evaluations of IAS will occur in the spring semester. Each IAS member will provide an electronic portfolio related to his/her teaching, professional development/scholarship, and service activities extracted either from the date of hire to date of review or from the previous two years of employment, whichever is less. The department chair will remind each instructional academic staff member to submit an **updated IAS Report-Individual** (from Digital Measures) including hyperlinked syllabi and any **supplemental materials** deemed appropriate at least **two weeks** prior to the date of the review. In addition, the department chair will evaluate grade distributions and the results of student evaluations of instruction for each IAS member.

1. **Procedure.** The review of IAS shall be conducted by the department chair in the manner outlined below.

The annual review will consist of two phases: creation of the IDP prior to the start of fall semester and a review for reappointment early in the spring semester.

Prior to the start of fall semester, the IAS member will meet with the department chair to discuss the IDP and create goals and objectives for the upcoming academic year, including the areas of teaching, professional development/scholarship and service. The IDP process related to professional development/scholarship should take into consideration AACSB's accreditation standards for PQ or AQ requirements (section III.B.2).

Toward the end of the spring semester, the IAS member will meet with the department chair to review the IDP created the previous fall along with the items listed above in VI.A. In order to obtain a recommendation for reappointment, the IAS member's performance must be judged to be satisfactory. A recommendation for reappointment is submitted to the dean.

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

2. **Criteria.** The department chair shall use the submitted self, peer, and student evaluation information identified in VI.A to judge each IAS member's performance in the areas of teaching, professional development/scholarship, and service using the criteria outlined in section III.B. It is expected that all IAS members will direct some effort to all areas of IAS responsibility as outlined on the IDP; however, it is expected that the primary focus of these efforts will be on teaching.

2. **Career Progression Procedures.** [Policies and procedure guiding career progression for IAS are available through the Instructional Academic Staff Committee.](#) The Department of Accountancy

follows the *Guide to Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Career Progression and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse*, approved by the UW-L Faculty Senate on 10/25/07 (as amended). For career progression purposes, the candidate's application portfolio must conform to the guidelines given therein.

The IAS career progression review shall be conducted by the PRT Committee along with any departmental Distinguished and/or Senior Lecturers.

During the fall semester, the department chair shall convene the PRT committee as needed. The committee chair shall establish the date for the career progression consideration meeting in accordance with established university deadlines for the IAS career progression process in a given year.

After discussion of a candidate's performance with respect to the criteria in section **VI.B.1** (below), and the results of the candidate's student, peer, and annual merit evaluations, votes shall be cast in writing on a separate motion to support career progression for each progression candidate. At least a **simple majority** is necessary for a positive career progression recommendation. The results of the vote shall be recorded by the committee chair, and entered on the committee's portion of the "Department IAS Career Progression Review Committee Transmittal & Signature Page" or contained in a similar letter written by the chair. The committee shall aid the chair in preparing written reasons for each of its recommendations. Within **seven days** of the meeting, the committee chair shall notify each candidate of the committee's recommendation in writing.

For positive recommendations, the committee chair shall include a written recommendation on behalf of the committee as part of the "Department IAS Career Progression Review Committee Transmittal & Signature Page." 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 **one day** prior to the submission of the progression files to the dean.

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

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

For the rank of **Lecturer**, a candidate must have completed 8 full-time semesters teaching in higher education or other appropriate experience with at least 2 full-time semesters teaching at UWL in title. The candidate must provide evidence of a strong record of *accomplishment* in teaching as evidenced by self-assessment, peer evaluations, annual/merit evaluations, and student evaluations. Evidence of professional development/scholarship and service as described in section **III.B** is also expected.

For the rank of **Senior Lecturer**, a candidate must have completed 12 full-time semesters teaching in higher education or other appropriate experience with at least 6 full-time semesters teaching at UWL in title. The candidate must be able to demonstrate a sustained record of *accomplishment* in teaching and a sustained record of *accomplishment* in the areas of professional development/scholarship and service as described in section **III.B**.

For the rank of **Distinguished Lecturer**, a candidate must have completed 20 full-time semesters teaching in higher education or other appropriate experience with at least 10 full-time semesters teaching at UWL in title. The candidate should have a sustained record of *excellence* in teaching and should be generally recognized as having made significant contributions in professional development/scholarship and service as described in section **III.B**.

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

Using the above areas of evaluation, progression recommendations shall be based on the following standards:

Lecturer

- Evidence of high quality teaching
- Involvement in instruction-related activities, such as developing course materials, advising, curriculum development, participation in departmental outreach programs, etc.
- Demonstrated commitment to developing a program of professional development and being a contributing member of the program and department

Senior Lecturer

- Advanced degree in field of principal responsibility
- Evidence of extensive teaching experience and subject matter expertise
- An IAS member who has gained a reputation among peers for demonstrably sustained superior teaching contributions (in addition to the qualities noted below)
- Continued involvement in professional development/creative activity/scholarship and/or service

Distinguished Lecturer

- Earned doctorate in field of principal responsibility
- Evidence of extensive teaching experiences and advanced knowledge and skills
- An IAS member whose expertise is commonly recognized by peers and whose reputation for that expertise extends beyond the program or department (in addition to the qualities noted below)
- Recognition for significant contributions in professional development/creative activity/scholarship and/or service

3. Appeal Procedures. Within **seven days** of receiving the written reasons for a negative progression decision, the candidate may, by writing to the department chair, request reconsideration by the departmental committee that made the decision. The reconsideration review shall take place within **10 days** of the filing date. The IAS member shall be given at least **seven days** notice of such review. The IAS member shall be allowed an opportunity to respond to the written reasons, to present written or oral evidence or arguments relevant to the decision, and/or to use witnesses. Reconsideration shall be non-adversarial in nature. The committee shall give fair and full consideration to all relevant materials. Written notice of the reconsideration decision shall be transmitted to the candidate and to the dean within **seven days**.

VII. Governance

A. Department Chair. The department will adhere to the selection and duties of the chair that are delineated in the Faculty Senate By-Laws (revised 2006, as amended) under the heading “IV. Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons” and “V. The Selection of Department Chairpersons” and “VI. Remuneration of Department Chairpersons.” In addition, references to chair-related duties are stated throughout the Faculty Handbook.

1. Election of the Department Chair. Any tenured faculty member of the department, at the rank of assistant professor or above and on staff at this university for at least three semesters, is eligible to serve as department chair. Under special circumstances, the department may seek to hire an external chair or nominate a non-tenured faculty member. In these cases, the department may request extensions to the above policies. The term of office is three years. All faculty members and academic staff with faculty status, and with a continuing appointment extending at least one year beyond the date of the election, are eligible to vote in the election for the department chair.

In brief, the procedures for electing the department chair are as follows: 1) elections shall be held during the month of February; 2) the dean shall send nominating ballots, containing the names of all members of the department eligible to serve as chair to each member of the department eligible to vote; 3) each person receiving a ballot shall nominate one person and return it to the dean, who shall tabulate the results; 4) the dean shall determine whether or not the two persons receiving the highest number of nominations are willing to serve if elected; however, if one person has received nominations from 60 percent, or more, of the eligible voters, that person shall be declared elected; 5) if a chair has not been selected in the nomination balloting, the dean shall place the names of the two persons receiving the highest number of nominations on a ballot and send it to the eligible voters for an election; 6) each person receiving the ballot shall vote for one person and return it to the dean; 7) the dean shall tabulate the results of the election and submit the name of the nominee receiving the most votes as the chair-elect to the provost/vice chancellor for approval, who in turn, shall submit it to the chancellor for approval. If approval is not given, the dean shall conduct another election under the provisions of this policy.

2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair. A thorough listing of the chair’s responsibilities is contained in the Faculty Senate Bylaws Section IV: Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons. These duties include preparing class schedules and teaching assignments; developing curriculum revisions; preparing and monitoring the department’s operating budget; administering foundation funds; arranging department meetings and appointing faculty to department committees; appointing and monitoring search and screen committees/activities for departmental vacancies; within the context of established policy, evaluating the performance of faculty, academic staff, and classified personnel within the department; preparing the department’s annual report; and, representing the department in various University matters.

B. Standing Department Committees

1. **Merit Review Committee.** See the departmental Annual (Merit) Review Procedures given in section IV.A.4.
2. **Promotion, Retention and Tenure Committee.** See section V.A.
3. **Curriculum Committee.** Responsible for review of all curriculum proposals and the eventual forwarding of recommendations to the department for approval.
4. **Bylaws Committee.** Responsible for maintenance and refinement of these *Bylaws*, as needed, and incorporation of any university or college policies that may impact these *Bylaws* and the procedures and policies herein.

Faculty and full-time instructional academic staff are expected to serve on departmental committees as assigned by the department chair, College of Business Administration committees as assigned by the department chair, and university committees.

Standing committees within the College of Business Administration requiring representation by Department of Accountancy faculty or IAS include: CBA Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, CBA Graduate Committee, Technology Advisory Committee, International Business Advisory Committee, and CBA Scholarship Committee.

C. Departmental Programmatic Assessment Plan

The Department of Accountancy Curriculum Committee will develop student learning outcomes for all programs housed within the department and will review these outcomes every two years. These student learning outcomes must be approved by the department faculty. Various direct and indirect assessment tools will be used to measure the achievement of these outcomes. The Curriculum Committee will be responsible for responding to the assessment results and, based on the results, will make recommendations to the department on an annual basis.

D. Additional Departmental Policies

1. **Salary Equity.** Faculty who believe they are entitled to an equity adjustment, for example in cases involving (a) recent acquisition of a Ph.D.; (b) gender or racial inequity; and/or (c) “inversion” and “compression,” may ask the department chair to consider recommending a salary equity adjustment to the Deans. The department chair will scrutinize salaries for evidence of inequity and make a decision whether to support a salary equity adjustment. A faculty member denied a salary equity adjustment recommendation by the chair shall have the right to appeal the decision of the chair to the tenured members of the faculty. The chair shall supply the tenured faculty data on salaries and will forward their recommendation to the Deans.
2. **Sick Leave and Vacation.** Department members will account for sick leave in adherence to the most current UW-System guidelines. For unclassified staff, 12-month employees garner vacation time, 9-month employees do not.

VIII. Search and Screen Procedures.

The department will follow hiring procedures prescribed by the University's Human Resources Office in conjunction with the Office of Affirmative Action & Diversity and UW-System and WI state regulations. These procedures apply to the recruitment and hiring of tenure track faculty, instructional academic staff, and temporary hires through a pool search. Additionally, UW-L has a policy related to spousal/partner hiring.

IX. Student Rights and Obligations:

A. Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures

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

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

The intention of such meeting is to clarify misunderstandings or miscommunications that may be the source of the complaint. If informal procedures are unsuccessful (or within 90 days of the last incident) or if the student chooses not to resolve the complaint using the informal procedures, a student or group of students who wishes to pursue a complaint can do so by informing the Office of Student Life, either orally or in writing and following the Office's set procedures.

B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct

[Academic and nonacademic misconduct policy is available through the Office of Student Life.](#)

C. Advising Policy

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

X. Other:

- A. Summer and Winter Intersession Teaching Assignments.** Summer and Winter Intersession teaching is subject to funding and student needs. The department chair will make teaching assignments based on contractual requirements, the retirement gambit, and faculty meeting CBA scholarly productivity guidelines.

Compensation for Winter Intersession follows the CBA Compensation policy. If multiple classes are offered during the summer, the department will share enrollment to determine compensation. Compensation will be based on both faculty salaries and credits taught. Classes may be canceled if there is insufficient enrollment.

- B. Faculty Leaves.** The Department of Accountancy encourages its members to seek leaves for sabbaticals, faculty development, scholarship, service, and other leaves that support the department's mission. In addition, departmental members may seek leaves for medical and other reasons.

The CBA has established sabbatical application and procedures.

- C. Emeritus Status.** The Department of Accountancy's PRT Committee may nominate qualified faculty members to the Chancellor for designation as emeriti. Committee members at the rank or higher of the qualified member, participate in the nomination process. These nominations shall be forwarded to the appropriate dean for endorsement prior to their submission to the Chancellor.

XI. Appendices:

Appendix A Department of Accountancy Statement on Scholarship

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

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

An essential aspect of all forms of scholarship is its external evaluation by peers. Consequently, a primary factor in the evaluation of scholarship of all types is the extent to which it has received peer review and dissemination. The principal ways that this is done are through publication and presentation of the results or products of scholarship and through peer review of competitive grant proposals for funds to support the scholarly work.

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

- Writing and publishing scholarly papers in refereed journals related to the discipline
- Presenting scholarly work at national/international, regional, and local conferences
- Authoring texts, or other copyrighted work contributing to the profession
- Proposing, receiving, and administering grants
- Developing tangible teaching materials including study guides and software
- Working papers and other work in process, published or accepted for publication by the time of tenure review

Appendix B UW-L CBA Scholarly Productivity Guidelines

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

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

1. A second journal article in the last four years, including discipline-based articles, articles in practitioner journals, and articles on teaching innovation and cases published in refereed journals **or**
2. One significant published, peer reviewed scholarly activity (typically a scholarly book or monograph) in the last five years **or**
3. Received a significant external grant in the last three years (the grant should be subject to a review process and external to UW-L) **or**
4. Served as journal editor or had significant editorial responsibility for at least a two year period in the last five years (see note c for further clarification) **or**
5. Two other scholarly activities in the last three years including such activities as refereed paper presentations at international, national or regional meetings and/or documented instances of empirical program assessment resulting in recommendations for curricula development in the past three years **or**
6. Three other scholarly activities in the last three years including such activities as:
 - Book chapters or book reviews
 - Non-refereed journal articles
 - Study guides
 - Professional/technical reports
 - Presentations at practitioner seminars or conventions
 - UW-L grants such as faculty research
 - New course creation
 - Sponsored research reports on practice issues
 - Supervision of research by undergraduate or graduate students or fellows unrelated to teaching responsibilities
 - Executive education course creation
 - Case authorship (not published in journal)
 - Documented practice software
 - Editorial responsibilities not meeting criteria #4
 - Other significant professional research projects

Notes and Clarifications:

- a. In cases of joint authorship, each author will receive full recognition of the work.
- b. Accepted and/or published scholarly works will receive full recognition.
- c. Refereed journals include those listed in any current Cabell's [Directory of Publishing Opportunities](#), as well as other publications that have a review process consisting of two or more peer reviewers. Electronic mediums meeting these requirements are acceptable.
- d. Publications in proceedings are normally considered as only part of a presentation; that is, additional recognition will not accrue for work published in proceedings following a presentation that has no subsequent review process.
- e. Completion of a dissertation does not apply toward any of the criteria.
- f. Classification of scholarly activities is the judgment of the assoc. dean along with department chairpersons and authors.
- g. New assistant professors to the CBA will be granted 3 years from the effective date of their appointment to satisfy the productivity requirements. During this 3-year period, new faculty will be granted release time regardless of whether they meet the scholarly productivity guidelines.

Appendix C
DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTANCY – STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

INSTRUCTIONS: Please put the department name, course and section number, instructor’s name, and date on the answer sheet. Also fill in the student ID section with the course and section number.

Scale for Questions 1-6:

Strongly Agree Strongly Disagree
 A B C D E

1. I was looking forward to taking this course.
2. The instructor was helpful to students.
3. The instructor was well prepared.
4. The instructor communicated the subject matter clearly.
5. I learned a great deal from this instructor.
6. Overall, this instructor was excellent.

Scale for Questions 7-16:

Strongly Agree Strongly Disagree
 A B C D E

7. **Course Objectives and Requirements:** course objectives and requirements were clearly stated.
8. **Organization of Course:** the instructor led the class through a logical and orderly sequence of material
9. **Organization of Course:** the classes and text supplemented each other.
10. **Class Discussion:** students were encouraged to ask questions and felt free to discuss the material in class.
11. **Real world Exposure:** relevant, practical applications were incorporated into lecture and discussion.
12. **Homework Assignments & Projects:** homework assignments were challenging and contributed to my understanding of the subject matter.
13. **Examinations:** examinations required me to adequately demonstrate what I have learned.
14. **Feedback on Exams and Homework Assignments:** prompt and informative feedback was given on exams and homework assignments.
15. **Fair and Equitable Treatment:** the instructor was fair in his/her grading and evaluation performance.
16. **Counseling and Assistance:** the instructor was accessible for extra help.
17. **On the basis of the factors considered above, and compared to all other college instructors I have had, on the following scale, I rate this instructor:**

Excellent Good Average Fair Poor
 A B C D E