

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE
BYLAWS, POLICY STATEMENTS AND GUIDELINES

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - LA CROSSE

Approved May 2011

Table of Contents

I. Title with name of department and date of last bylaw adoption	4
II. Organization and Operation.....	5
A. Preamble which could include brief history of the department.....	5
B. Meeting Guidelines (e.g., Roberts' Rules, Open Meeting Laws).....	6
C. Definitions of Departmental Membership & Voting.....	6
D. Definitions of Quorum and Majority	6
E. Changing by-laws.....	6
F. By-laws revision history.....	7
III. Faculty/Staff Responsibilities.....	8
A. Ranked Faculty	8
B. Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations	9
C. Non-Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations	10
D. Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEIs).....	11
IV. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review).....	12
A. Evaluation Processes & Criteria.....	12
1. Faculty	12
2. Instructional Academic Staff (if included in merit processes, otherwise see VII).....	14
3. Non-Instructional Academic Staff (if included in merit processes, otherwise see VIII).....	15
4. Department Chair (if applicable)	15
B. Distribution of Merit Funds	15
C. Appeal Procedures (if applicable)	16
D. Confidentiality.....	17
V. Ranked Faculty Personnel Review	18
A. Promotion, Retention and Tenure Committee (PRT).....	18
B. Retention and Tenure (procedure, criteria, and appeal)	18
C. Post-tenure Review	21
D. Ranked Faculty Promotion Procedures (procedure, criteria and appeal)	24
VI. Instructional Academic Staff Review.....	26
A. General.....	26
B. Annual Review	26
C. Career Progression Procedures.....	27
D. Appeal Procedures.....	29
VII. Non-instructional Academic Staff Review (if applicable) – indicate NA otherwise	30
VIII. Governance	31
A. Department Chair	31
1. Election of the Department Chair	31
2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair	32
B. Standing Departmental Committees (e.g., personnel (for any matters not covered above), materials, equipment, space, budget, curriculum, assessment, etc).....	32
C. Departmental Programmatic Assessment Plan (if not included in VIII.B.).....	33
D. Additional departmental policies	33
IX. Search and Screen Procedures	34
A. Tenure-track faculty	34
B. Instructional Academic Staff	34
C. Contingency Workforce (Pool Search).....	34
D. Non-Instructional Academic Staff (if applicable).....	34
X. Student Rights and Obligations	35
A. Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures	35
B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct.....	35
C. Advising Policy	35

XI. Other	36
A. Class Scheduling.....	36
B. Summer Session Appointments	36
C. Sabbatical Leaves, Faculty Development Leaves, and Released Time for Research.....	38
D. Periodic Review.....	39
XII. Appendices	A1
Appendix A College of Business Administration Scholarly Productivity Guidelines	A1
Appendix B Faculty Merit Evaluation Outline (tenured & tenure-track)	A2
Appendix C Examples of Merit Distribution	A5
Appendix D UW-L Personnel Rules, Chapter 3.6-3.8.....	A8

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

Approved: May, 2011

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

II. Organization and Operation

Department members are governed by six interdependent sets of regulations:

1. Federal and State laws and regulations;
2. UW System policies and rules;
3. UW-L policies and rules;
4. College policies and rules;
5. Shared governance by-laws and policies for faculty and academic staff; and
6. Departmental by-laws.

A. Preamble

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

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

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

¹ <http://www.uwlax.edu/general/history.htm>

The Finance Department became an independent department on January 1, 1984. Prior to that date, a Department of Economics and Finance existed. According to University procedures, the by-laws of the Department of Economics and Finance will be those of the Department of Finance as of the date of the reorganization into two departments until amended.

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

B. Meeting Guidelines

Department meetings will be run according to the most recent edition of Robert's Rules of Order <http://www.robertsrules.com> and WI state opening meeting laws <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin/Tools/OpenMeetingsRules-Summary.htm>.

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

C. Definitions of Membership & Voting Procedures

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

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

D. Definitions of Quorum and Majority

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

E. Changing By-laws

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

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

F. By-Law Revision History

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

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

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

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

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

In 1999, new merit by-laws were adopted.

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

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

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

III. Faculty/Staff Responsibilities

A. Ranked Faculty

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

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

1. Teaching

Ranked faculty are responsible for teaching assigned courses and participating in faculty/teaching development activities such as attending workshops, updating course materials, and advising internship and independent study activities.

Regular Teaching Loads: The normal teaching load for ranked faculty in the College of Business Administration is three sections per semester provided that the person meets the scholarly productivity guidelines http://www.uwlax.edu/ba/faculty/AQ-PQ_CBA.pdf. A nine hour load usually will consist of two preparations. The department chair, in consultations with the dean, may assign newly appointed ranked faculty a nine hour load to stimulate scholarly activities. Ranked faculty whose scholarly output is below the College productivity guidelines normally will be assigned a twelve credit teaching load until they make satisfactory progress toward meeting the guidelines. However, actual teaching loads vary within the university and are influenced by such things as curricular constraints, physical facilities, and accreditation requirements.

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

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

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

2. Scholarship

Ranked faculty should be actively working toward meeting or exceeding CBA productivity guidelines. Productivity guidelines are subject to change when revised by the College of Business Administration. (See Appendix A).

3. Service

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

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

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

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 <http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/committees/ias/pages/titling.html> and will outline specific duties including teaching and any additional workload. Total workload for IAS is defined as a standard minimum teaching load plus additional workload equivalency activities <http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/41st/3-29-07/IAS Appendix B.htm>

1. **Teaching.** The teaching expectations of IAS are similar to those of the ranked faculty, as described in section III.A.1. Examples of teaching expectations and evidence for instructional academic staff are also provided in section 5.1.1.1 of the *Guide to Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Career Progression and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse*, as approved by the UW-L Faculty Senate on 10/25/07 <http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/42nd/FS Mtgs/10-25-07/IAS CPS Procedures.htm>

These include, but are not limited to:

- Self-assessment of teaching (i.e. teaching philosophy and personal growth statements, course expectations, approaches to grading and evaluation, methodology)
 - Peer evaluation of teaching
 - Student evaluation of instruction
 - Advising students
2. **Professional Development / Creative Activity / Scholarship.** As stated above, the primary responsibility of an IAS member is to provide quality teaching; however, since professional development activities allow an IAS member to remain current in finance,

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

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

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

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

C. Non-Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations

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

D. Student Evaluation of Instruction

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

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

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

IV. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)

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

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

A. Evaluation Processes & Criteria

1. Ranked Faculty

Merit Eligibility: The merit evaluation process shall be based upon an evaluation of teaching, scholarship, professional or public service, and service to the University. To be considered eligible for merit, a member must:

- a. have conducted a student evaluation of all courses taught during fall and spring of each year (not including team-taught courses),
- b. prepare and submit a standard department evaluation form, and
- c. provide written documentation for any significant activity which is to be reviewed and for which the committee has requested documentation.

Merit Process: The Merit Committee will conduct the evaluation process. The Merit Committee will be composed of all ranked faculty in the department. Faculty members who are on a terminal contract are not eligible to serve on the committee. The department chair will chair the Merit Committee.

The department chair is required to initiate the merit process. The department may hold a meeting at which the department will discuss the upcoming process and agree upon the supporting documentation that the ranked faculty will provide with their evaluations. Such documentation could include scholarship in progress or completed, samples of students' work, syllabi, tests, etc. If the department has not already done so by the time of this meeting, the faculty and teaching academic staff will discuss and agree upon the common objective(s) for our major and CBA business program.

All evaluations will be submitted confidentially to a person designated by the department to receive, summarize, and report the results. The Merit Committee will also evaluate the academic staff member(s) of the department and report the results to the dean of the CBA for his or her evaluation and compensation award(s) for solid performance and merit.

Areas of Evaluation:**Teaching Competency.**

This includes efforts to enhance students' understanding, thinking, and development. The evaluation will be based on a subjective assessment of the faculty's performance in the following areas:

- a. Having agreed as a department on the common objective(s) for our major and CBA business program, how successfully the faculty member's class supported the shared goals.
- b. Appropriate selection and use of current textbooks and other published teaching materials.
- c. Appropriate development and use of syllabi, tests, written assignments, and supplementary handouts provided by the faculty member under review.
- d. The courses taught and student contact hours.
- e. Classroom pedagogy.
- f. Preparation for class.
- g. Student Evaluation of Instruction.
Student responses to questions in part one and two of the assessment tool beyond the one used for SEI numerical purposes (assessing his/her current instructor in comparison to all other instructors the he/she has had) shall be reviewed in order to assess the instructor's preparation, and generation of student interest. The merit committee must consider differences in classes and sections with different class populations (required classes for majors, required classes for non-majors, and elective classes,) when assessing student evaluations of instruction.

Scholarship.

This includes basic, applied, and instructional scholarship. All Scholarship acceptable to the AACSB evaluators who will determine the CBA re-accreditation as a comprehensive university should be valued. A comprehensive university is one that focuses on applied and instructional research. Scholarship which helps the CBA achieve its mission should be additionally valued. Questions concerning the acceptable nature of specific scholarship will be referred to the chairperson of the department who may consult with the dean of the CBA.

[Please refer to the APPENDIX A: CBA Scholarly Productivity guidelines.]

Service (University and Professional).

This includes memberships and offices in professional organizations, participation in professional meetings, and consulting when one's professional expertise has been recognized. This also includes forms of service to the community and the university that create positive contributions to the University, such as securing grants; generating funds

for the Department or College of Business Administration; contributing to special efforts by the community; forms of service to students through formal and informal contacts as academic advisors and counselors; supervision of internships or independent studies; and participation in committees and task forces on the Department, College and University levels.

Scoring: Based on the criteria, each Merit Committee member will assign an evaluation to each individual for each category: teaching, scholarship, service, and overall. The possible evaluations which can be assigned to any of the three specific categories are: “not meeting solid performance criteria,” “strong performer,” “meritorious performer,” and “exceptional meritorious performer.” The overall category will be evaluated as either “not meeting solid performance,” “strong performer,” or “meritorious performer” criteria.

In the overall category, the faculty member will be assigned the highest overall score (not meeting the solid performance criteria, strong performer, or meritorious performer) given by one half or more of his or her colleagues. In the three specific categories, special note will be made of any faculty receiving an “exceptionally meritorious performer” rating by at least two-thirds of his or her colleagues.

APPENDIX C: ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEW AND EVALUATION REPORT for the Merit Evaluation Form adopted on 9/1/1988.

2. Instructional Academic Staff (IAS)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Not Applicable

- 4. **Department Chair** (if applicable)

The department chairperson participates in the ranked faculty merit evaluation process in the same manner as all other ranked faculty.

B. Distribution of Merit Funds

UW System is currently employing a salary plan which incorporates a "solid performance" and a "merit" component. When UW System specifically designates a percentage of the compensation increase for solid performance and the balance for merit, the department will employ the merit evaluation process described below. When UW System does not specifically designate percentage amounts for both solid performance and for merit, the department will assume the solid performance allocation will be 66.7% of the total amount allocated. The remaining 33.3% will be allocated based upon the merit allocation process described below.

All ranked faculty members whose overall evaluation is at least "strong performer" will receive the percentage increase in salary designated by UW System for strong performers. If UW System fails to designate a specific percentage for strong performance, the department will assume the strong performance allocation will be 66.7% of the total percentage allocated. All faculty who receive an overall evaluation of "meritorious performer" will divide among themselves an additional percentage such that the total allocation for both strong and meritorious performer will not be less than 90% of the total percentage allocated.

See APPENDIX C: EXAMPLES OF MERIT FUND DISTRIBUTION for examples reflecting the following three situations. No ranked faculty who receives the meritorious allocation can receive an amount for that allocation which is greater than the amount received for the strong performer allocation (Example 1). The exact amount will be a function of the number receiving the overall meritorious award and the number of ranked faculty, if any, receiving extra compensation/bonuses for "exceptional meritorious performance (Example 2). Any faculty who receive an evaluation of "exceptionally meritorious performer" in any of the three categories will receive an additional \$200 for each such evaluation. If the sum of all the \$200 awards would exceed the 10% maximum amount available, 10% will be proportionally distributed this year and the balance paid next year or at the earliest possible date (Example 3).

C. Appeal Procedures

Ranked faculty will be notified their evaluation by the Merit Committee no less than two weeks before the final date that the salary decisions are to be transmitted by the Department Chair to the Dean. The Provost establishes the transmission date each year. Members who wish to appeal a "not solid performer", overall evaluation are required to do so within one week of notification. Only an evaluation of "not solid performer" overall evaluation is subject to appeal. The Department Chair must receive, in writing, a request to schedule a department-wide meeting (consisting of all tenure-track department faculty) to reconsider the requesting member's "not solid performer" overall evaluation. A two-thirds vote to override is required. The burden of proof is the responsibility of the appellant and the scope of the review shall be limited to the question of whether the decision was based in any significant degree upon one or more of the following factors, with material prejudice to the individual:

- Conduct expressions, or beliefs that are constitutionally protected, or protected by the principles of academic freedom, or
- Factors proscribed by applicable state or federal law regarding fair employment practices, or
- Improper consideration of performance leading to a not solid performer evaluation. For purposes of this section, "improper consideration" of performance shall be deemed to have been given to the faculty member in question if material prejudice resulted because of any of the following:
 - a. The department merit by-laws were not followed, or
 - b. Available data bearing materially on the quality of performance were not considered, or
 - c. Unfounded, arbitrary, or irrelevant assumptions of fact were made about work or conduct.
- Written notice of the decision of the department evaluation committee shall be transmitted to the individual within seven days of the decision.

D. Confidentiality

In order to assure confidentiality, after the Academic Department Associate has compiled the comments,

1. Ranked faculty will receive back their copy of comments regarding other faculty members. Ranked faculty will retain and safeguard their own evaluations of the other department members
2. Ranked faculty will receive a typed copy of the comments made by other faculty members regarding their performance. Comments from other faculty will be randomly sorted to minimize the likelihood that faculty will be able to identify those making specific comments.
3. Ranked faculty will receive a summary of the rankings given to them by other faculty members and be informed of the distribution of overall and extra meritorious performance.
4. The chair will receive a copy of the individual overall and extra meritorious performance rankings solely for the purpose of making subsequent salary allocation determinations. The chair will provide a complete report each year to the department faculty which explains and details mathematically the percent pay increase that the faculty will receive when the UWL raise is known with certainty. A copy will be kept on file for potential retention, promotion, and post-tenure review purposes.
5. A copy of the overall and extra meritorious performance rankings will be sent to the Dean's Office by the chair with a letter indicating the merit process has been completed. In addition, the Dean will receive a copy of comments regarding academic staff performance with an appropriate letter from the chair.
6. All electronic copies of the comments will be deleted by the Academic Department Associate. This will end the merit process.

V. Ranked Faculty Personnel Review

The department will follow the policies regarding retention and tenure described in the Faculty Personnel Rules (UWS 3.06 - 3.11 and UWL 3.06 -3.08)

<http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/rules/index.htm>.

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

June 30, 2011

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

A. Promotion, Retention and Tenure Committee (PRT)

The Promotion, Renewal and Tenure Committee for the Finance Department shall consist of all tenured members in the Department who hold at least a one-half-time teaching position in the Department. Academic Staff, as well as other non-tenured members of the department, are not eligible to serve on the Promotion, Renewal and Tenure Committee.

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

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

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

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

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

1. Procedure for Retention

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

Faculty under review provide an electronic portfolio related to their teaching, scholarships, and service activities extracted from their date of hire to date of review. Additional materials may be required for the departmental review and will be indicated in the written notice of department review.

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

2. Procedure for Tenure

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

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

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

- a. Student evaluation analysis computer printout for each semester during the year. (Exception: for tenure, all available printouts from previous years will be provided).
- b. The information provided by the candidate to the department chair.
- c. Any other information requested by the committee which could have a bearing on the potential performance of the tenure candidate.

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

Hyperlinked syllabi are required and the candidate may choose to provide additional evidence. Additional materials may be required for departmental review.

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

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

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

Methods of Evaluation

- a. Evaluation of Area 1 includes both student and peer evaluation. Evaluation of Areas 2, 3, and 4 shall be accomplished by peer evaluation. More detailed versions of the methods of evaluations are presented in the UW-L Faculty Human Resource Rules, 3.05(2)(a)(b) <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/rules/Ch3.htm> and in the UW-La Crosse Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, 3.05(B) <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/rules/All.htm>.
- b. Members of the committee shall review renewal and required improvements letters from previous years and shall assess current and potential performance in part on the basis of recommendations made in these letters.
- c. Departments will provide the following materials to the dean:
 1. Department letter of recommendation with vote
 2. Teaching assignment information (TAI) datasheet that summarizes the courses taught, workload data, grade distribution and SEIs by individual course and semester (which are only available after completing a full academic year) and departmental comparison SEI data; and
 3. Merit evaluation data (if available).

Probationary faculty

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

The renewal (tenure) decisions by the committee shall be regarded as peer judgment of future performance. Consequently, in making a renewal (tenure) decision, the committee shall consider all things that have a bearing on the potential of the renewal (tenure) candidate. Since it is virtually impossible to quantitatively define and forecast future performance, each member of the committee must make a subjective evaluation of the relevant factors and arrive at a decision. After discussion of the relevant data, the committee shall vote on a motion to renew the candidate's appointment (grant tenure). Renewal (tenure) requires a simple majority. A tie vote, therefore, shall result in failure to renew (grant tenure).

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

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

3. Appealing a Retention or Tenure Decision

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

The text for these sections of Chapter 3, at the time these by-laws were written, is provided in Appendix D.

C. Post-tenure Review

The purpose of tenured faculty review and development is to encourage and support the meaningful growth and development of tenured faculty in ways that positively contribute to the goals of the university, the college, and the department. To accomplish this purpose, the activities and performance of each tenured member of the Department will be reviewed, in general, each five years. The timing of the reviews, the committee conducting the reviews and the processes involved are explained below. In the following text the term "tenured member" refers to the tenured member whose activities and performance are to be evaluated.

1. Procedure for Post-tenure Review

a. Timing of Reviews

For ranked faculty who have been tenured, but not promoted since the fall of 1989, the first review will be during the spring semester 1995, and the review will cover the activities and performance for the period summer 1989 through spring 1994.

Except for the case stated above, the timing of a review will be the period between the date for which the department's merit forms are due and August 31st of the same year. This period is referred to as "spring/summer."

For newly tenured faculty and for tenured faculty who have recently undergone review for promotion, the first review will be during the "spring/summer" of year 19XX + 5 where 19XX refers to the year of the fall during which the tenure/promotion becomes effective. These reviews will cover the activities and performance from the summer of 19XX through the spring of 19XX +5.

In all cases subsequent reviews will be during the "spring/summer" exactly five years since the last review, and each review will cover the performance and activities of the last five years, where the end of the five-year period is the spring of the year of the review.

b. Committee

The committee responsible for conducting the post-tenure reviews will be the Department of Finance Post-Tenure Review Committee (P-TR), and its composition will be similar but may not be exactly the same as the composition of the Department Promotion Retention and Tenure Committee. The P-TR Committee will consist of those tenured members of the department who are at the same or higher rank as the "tenured member" plus at most one tenured faculty from the department whose rank is exactly one level below that of the "tenured member," if such ranked faculty exist in the department and if the "tenured member" so desires. The latter member of the committee will be chosen by the "tenured member." If not included in the above composition, the department chairperson will be an ex-officio member of the P-TR Committee. If the P-TR committee consists of one or fewer members (not including any ex-officio members), the Dean and the Associate Dean of the CBA will join the committee as members. If the committee has only two members (not including any ex-officio members), the Associate Dean will join the committee.

Review Process

The review will be based on three types of data:

1. the 5 most recent merit files of the "tenured member" (including the merit file to be completed by the end of the particular spring semester),
2. any other information the "tenured member feels is relevant, and
3. a summary report completed by the "tenured member."

Similar to the criteria by which ranked faculty are reviewed for retention and promotion, the "tenured member's" activities and performance will be assessed in the areas of teaching, research and service (department, college, university, or professional). A guiding principle is that tenured faculty are expected to have demonstrated either strong performance in all areas, or very strong performance in one or more areas and at least an acceptable performance in the remaining areas. Other circumstances will also be considered in the review process.

After completing the review, the P-TR Committee will prepare a working draft. In the draft, the P-TR Committee will provide positive feedback as to how the "tenured member's" activities and performance are consistent with the University's needs and expectations. If any deficiencies are felt to exist, the draft will also contain such. The working draft will be shared with the "tenured member," and the P-TR Committee will schedule a meeting with the "tenured member" to discuss the elements of the draft. The fact that the first

communication is a working draft is important. Certain elements regarding the "tenured member's" activities may have not been clearly understood; the draft and subsequent meeting will serve to clarify issues. After this meeting, the P-TR Committee will decide whether to request a development plan and will formalize the draft into a report which will be transmitted to the "tenured member." If the P-TR Committee feels that a development plan is necessary, the final report will indicate such.

2. Criteria for Evaluating Tenured Faculty

Specific guidelines for post-tenure review will be the same as the guidelines for merit. If the faculty member has regularly met the standards for merit and conformed to the behavioral guidelines for the past five years, no developmental issues will be raised.

3. Development Plan and Subsequent Review

If a development plan is requested, the P-TR Committee will offer its assistance to the "tenured member." The completed plan should include a detailed set of activities and a time table for completion of these activities. If additional support beyond what is customarily available is requested, a justification should be included in the plan. The development plan should be completed within a reasonable period of time after the meeting between the "tenured member" and the P-TR Committee. Once the plan is completed, a subsequent meeting with the P-TR Committee will be scheduled to discuss the plan.

Each spring (summer) of the years following the review (or earlier in the year at the option of the "tenured member"), the "tenured member" will communicate to the P-TR Committee the progress made in the development. Once the committee feels that the proper amount of development has been attained, it will inform the "tenured member" that subsequent reports are not necessary. If the P-TR Committee feels that sufficient progress does not appear to be forthcoming, it may request an updated development plan.

4. Confidentiality

All correspondence relevant to the review process, other than the working draft shared with the "tenured member", will be kept in a confidential file within the Department, and the "tenured member" will have a copy of all such materials. These materials shall only be used for the purposes stated in this document including that the P-TR Committee will keep the Dean of the CBA apprised of its activities.

5. Consensus and Cooperation

Tenured faculty review and development is intended to provide a formative evaluation that will be positive and encouraging to faculty productivity. It does not provide the basis for summative review. If, however, the "tenured member" and the P-TR Committee fail to reach a consensus on any issue relative to the review (where lack of consensus includes failure on the part of the "tenured member" to respond to or communicate with the P-TR Committee), then

- a. The P-TR Committee will notify the Department Chairperson and the Dean, and
- b. The Department Chairperson, the Dean and the "tenured member" will meet to resolve the issues.

Lack of consensus or cooperation may result in the Dean's request for assistance or counsel from the appropriate bodies which are concerned with tenured faculty.

6. Appealing a Post-tenure Review Decision

In the case of a negative review, the faculty member shall have all the rights of appeal as outlined in the *UW-L Faculty Personnel Rules*, chapter 6.01 and 6.02
<http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/rules/All.htm>.

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

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

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

1. Departmental Procedure for Promotion

The timeframe for the following procedures must be in accordance with the university calendar available at <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/promo-resources.htm>.

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

2. Criteria for Promotion

The Fin. PRT Committee, when deciding to recommend (or not recommend) for promotion, will consider the University criteria for promotion as its primary criteria. (See Faculty Handbook, Part III Faculty Personnel Policy and Procedures: Faculty Rank, Promotion, Salaries, Tenure.)

3. Appealing a Promotion Decision

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

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

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

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

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

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

VI. Instructional Academic Staff Review

A. General

All academic staff must be evaluated on an annual basis as specified in the UWL Staff Handbook <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/index.htm> . The evaluation shall be done by the department chair. The academic staff member shall be evaluated in accordance with the applicable parts of the department merit form and will use the same time line as the rest of the department for submission of materials. A written notification of the evaluation shall be filed with the dean and a copy provided to the academic staff member within 14 days after the evaluation has been completed.

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

B. Annual Review.

In accordance with Faculty Personnel rules **UWS 3.05 -3.11** and **UWL 3.08**, academic staff will be evaluated annually. The Individual Development Plan (IDP) form will accompany the department's evaluation. IDP Form: <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/idp/idp.htm>.

Timing of Reviews

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

1. Review Procedure.

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

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

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

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

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

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

C. Career Progression Procedures.

The Department of Finance follows the *Guide to Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Career Progression and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse*, approved by the UW-L Faculty Senate on 10/25/07. Policies and procedure guiding career progression for IAS are available at http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/career_development.htm. Candidates for career progression must conform their application portfolio to the guidelines given therein.

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

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

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

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

section III.B

For the rank of **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. The candidate must provide evidence of a strong record of *accomplishment* in teaching as evidenced by self-assessment, peer reviews, annual/merit evaluations, and student evaluations. Evidence of professional development, scholarship and/or 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. The candidate must be able to demonstrate a sustained record of *accomplishment* in teaching and a sustained record of accomplishment in the areas of professional development, scholarship and/or service as described in section III.B.

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. 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/or service

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

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

Distinguished Lecturer

- Earned an advanced in finance or related field
- Evidence of extensive teaching experience 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, scholarship and/or service

Senior Lecturer

- Advanced degree in finance or related field

- 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, scholarship and/or service activities

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

D. Appeal Procedures.

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

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

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

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

VIII. Governance

A. Department Chair

1. Election of the Department Chair

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

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

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

- a) Tenured and of the rank of assistant professor or above.
- b) On staff of this university at least three full semesters.
- c) Not on terminal contract or temporary appointment.

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

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

- a) Elections shall be held during the month of February.
- b) The dean shall send nominating ballots, containing the names of all members of the department eligible to serve as chairperson to each member of the department eligible to vote.
- c) Each person receiving a ballot shall nominate one person and return it to the dean who shall tabulate the results.

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

Additional information on policies can be found at:

[http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/bylaws.html#FACULTY_SENATE_BY-LAWS_\(REVISED_2002\)](http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/bylaws.html#FACULTY_SENATE_BY-LAWS_(REVISED_2002))

2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair

The department will adhere to the selection and duties of the Chair that are delineated in the Faculty Senate By-Laws (revised 2006)

[http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/bylaws.html#FACULTYSENATEBY-LAWS\(Revised2002\)](http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/bylaws.html#FACULTYSENATEBY-LAWS(Revised2002)) under the heading "IV. Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons " and "V. The Selection of Department Chairpersons" and "VI. Remuneration of Department Chairpersons." in addition references to chair-related duties are stated throughout the Faculty Handbook <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/rules/index.htm>.

B. Standing Departmental Committees

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

Standing committees within the College of Business Administration requiring representation by Finance faculty or instructional academic staff include: CBA Undergraduate Curriculum Committee; CBA Graduate Committee; Technology Advisory Committee; International Business Advisory Committee and CBA Scholarship Committee.

C. Departmental Programmatic Assessment Plan (if not included in VIII. B.)²

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

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

D. Additional departmental policies

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

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

Bereavement: The department will offer funeral leave according to the most current UW System guidelines [http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/benefits/leaves/funeral leave policy.htm](http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/benefits/leaves/funeral_leave_policy.htm).

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

IX. Search and Screen Procedures

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

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

A. Tenure-track faculty

The approved UW-L tenure track faculty recruitment and hiring policy & procedures are found at <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin.htm>.

Additionally, UW-L's spousal/partner hiring policy can be found at <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/Unclassified/Spouse-HirePOL.pdf>.

B. Instructional Academic Staff

Hiring policy and procedures are found at <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin.htm>

C. Contingency Workforce (Pool Search)

Hiring policy and procedures are found at <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin.htm>

D. Academic Staff (if applicable)

Hiring policy and procedures are found at <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin.htm>.

X. Student Rights and Obligations

A. Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures³

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

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

The intention of such meetings is to clarify misunderstandings or miscommunications that may be the source of the complaint. If informal procedures are unsuccessful (or within 90 days of the last incident) or if the student chooses not to resolve the complaint using the informal procedures, a student or group of students who wishes to pursue a complaint can do so by informing the Office of Student Life, either orally or in writing and following the procedures described at <http://www.uwlax.edu/studentlife/Policies.htm>.

B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct⁴

Academic and nonacademic misconduct policy referenced:

http://www.uwlax.edu/StudentLife/eagle_eye.htm

http://www.uwlax.edu/StudentLife/academic_misconduct.htm

<http://www.uwlax.edu/StudentLife/nonacademic-misconduct.htm>

C. Advising Policy

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

³ THE UW-L STUDENT HONOR POLICY. STUDENT HONOR CODE ([HTTP://WWW.UWLAX.EDU/RECORDS/97-99/UG-CAT/REGULAT.HTML#GEN20](http://www.uwlax.edu/records/97-99/UG-CAT/REGULAT.HTML#GEN20)) "WE, THE STUDENTS OF UW-LA CROSSE, BELIEVE THAT ACADEMIC HONESTY AND INTEGRITY ARE FUNDAMENTAL TO THE MISSION OF HIGHER EDUCATION. WE, AS STUDENTS, ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE HONEST COMPLETION AND REPRESENTATION OF OUR WORK AND RESPECT FOR OTHERS' ACADEMIC ENDEAVORS. IT IS OUR MORAL RESPONSIBILITY AS STUDENTS TO UPHOLD THESE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND TO RESPECT THE CHARACTER OF THE INDIVIDUALS AND THE UNIVERSITY."

XI. Other

A. Class Scheduling

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

1. The first priority is the needs of the students. Department member needs, as they relate to class scheduling, are secondary.
2. UW-La Crosse prides itself on individual contact between teachers and students. Since large class sizes reduce the possibility of individual contact, every reasonable effort will be made to keep class section sizes below 45 students.
3. Every reasonable effort will be made to follow the "master plan of course offerings".
4. Given student needs, every reasonable effort will be made to match class offerings with department member preferences.
5. A "previously taught" listing of courses and sections by department members will be maintained. This list will also reflect new preparations.
6. An inventory of department member teaching qualifications and preferences will be maintained. It will include courses department members: (a) were hired to teach, (b) are qualified to teach, and (c) would like to teach.
7. Every reasonable attempt will be made to avoid assigning three preparations to an unwilling department member.
8. Every reasonable effort will be made to equitably balance the individual department member teaching loads. This balance includes such things as number of preparations, number of new preparations, number of students, and class meeting times.

B. Summer Session Appointments

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

At the time of this writing, compensation for summer courses is based on a set amount per student, not to exceed \$6,000 per J-term course or \$7,000 per summer course; however summer payment policies are subject to change and are set by the Dean's

Office. Compensation received for teaching MBA classes and other outside sources of funding shall NOT be included in the consideration of undergraduate course assignments.

Position Swaps

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

- A. If the person affected can work out a "swap" with another faculty member for that person's succeeding summer slot(s), he may do so; e.g., if person X does not wish to accept his slot(s) for summer 2013, he may work out a "swap" with anyone else in the department to take his allocation for summer 2014. Thus in summer 2014, person X would have his own slot and the one he had traded for. When summer appointments are swapped prior to the issuance of letters recommending appointments, the new salaries will be used in determining the number of slots. After the issuance of letters, the department chairperson will determine whether salary differentials are significant enough to warrant the distribution of any extra dollars.
- B. "Swaps" involve risks, particularly to the faculty member who is to receive a slot(s) in the future. All risks are to be assumed by the traders. Example: Suppose person X swaps a position in 2014 to person Y. If person Y leaves in 2015 and therefore is ineligible for a summer position in 2015), then person X loses out of the position that person Y was to return in 2015.
- C. If no such swap can be worked out, the slot(s) shall be allocated among the remaining eligible members.

Retiring faculty members

To provide maximum retirement benefits for all retiring members at the department, the retiring member will be allocated a full-time summer appointment in each of the last three years prior to retirement. This provision is subject to the following qualifications:

- A. The retiring member must have a minimum of ten years with the department by the date letters recommending appointment are to be forwarded to the dean.
 - B. A member who completes the three full summer appointments made available by the department for retirement is no longer eligible for summer appointments.
 - C. This section of the summer session by-laws (Retiring Faculty Members) is automatically rescinded if the retirement plan is changed so that the department's allocation of summer positions does not impact on retirement benefits. For example, if the retirement plan is changed so that benefits are based on academic rather than annual salary, this section of the by-laws is rescinded requiring no further action on part of the department.
- C. Sabbatical leaves, faculty development leaves, and released time for research**
- 1. It is the policy of the Department of Finance to encourage participation by department members seeking sabbatical and faculty development leaves and research funding.
 - 2. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to seek nondepartmental funding for support of sabbaticals, faculty development leaves and research projects.

3. After exhausting external sources of support for his/her sabbatical, development leave or research project, the individual faculty member may approach the department for assistance.
4. Departmental assistance may consist of (but is not limited to) the following:
 - a. Released time for research approved by the department.
 - b. Supplies and graduate/undergraduate and secretarial assistance for research approved by the department.
 - c. Absorbing the work load of a faculty member on approved sabbatical/faculty development leave by one semester.
 - d. Absorbing the work load of a faculty member not on approved sabbatical or faculty development leave in order to provide a one-semester development leave program approved by the department.
5. A vote of the Finance Department will recommend faculty for development and sabbatical leaves.

D. Periodic Review

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

1. Student evaluation of instruction with a department-approved instrument shall be administered each semester in a manner consistent with University policy. The evaluation item shall be the "critical item summary for questions 2 - 6".
2. The department chairperson shall confer privately with each faculty member as soon as possible following each semester to discuss teaching related incidents that have been called to the attention of the chairperson, the summary result of items 2 - 6, and other evaluation or improvement of instruction instruments used by the faculty member.

Appendix A 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 B
Annual Faculty Review and Evaluation Report

Merit Evaluations Form - Adopted 9/1/88

ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEW AND EVALUATION REPORT

Department of Finance

University of Wisconsin - La Crosse

Name: _____ Calendar Year: ____

Highest Degree Completed: Ph.D. _____ ABD _____ MBA _____

Rank: _____

INSTRUCTIONS: Check and complete the items which apply to your accomplishments during the last calendar year. List each activity only once and include it under the section you consider appropriate.

I. Teaching

A. SEI Scores

Spring _____ Fall _____ Summer _____(optional)

B. List courses taught each semester, including summer.

Identify with an asterisk (*) those courses which are new preparations.

Fall
Course SEI

Spring
Course SEI

Summer (optional)
Course SEI

C. Teaching

Characterize your instructional approach. Feel free to attach copies of materials which would help clarify the approach. These materials could include exams, handouts, assignments, projects and syllabi. Describe any methods you have used to evaluate your teaching effectiveness other than SEI ratings.

(End of page)

D. Teaching Development

List attendance at institutes or seminars, coursework completed, and other educational developmental activities that have improved your teaching.

- ____ 1. Attendance at professional meetings, conventions.
(Give name of organization and dates of meetings.)
- ____ 2. Attendance at institutes and/or seminars. (Give dates, length, location and topics or titles.)
- ____ 3. Course work completed institutions, course titles, credits and dates.
- ____ 4. Other educational development activities.

(End of page)

II. RESEARCH AND RELATED SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

A. Research

Describe your research activities including publications, submissions, presentations, working papers and other work. Please submit copies of completed papers as well as descriptions of work in progress.

- ____ 1. Research or scholarly activities conducted as part of formal release time or non-teaching position assignment.
- ____ 2. Research, etc. conducted with University summer stipend.
- ____ 3. Research, etc. conducted without University administered support funds.
- ____ 4. Presentation of paper.
- ____ 5. Served as critic, discussant, or evaluator.
- ____ 6. Chaired session.
- ____ 7. Other.

B. Grants

List and provide a copy of each proposal submitted for funding. If funded, indicate amount of funding and time period of support.

(End of page)

III. UNIVERSITY SERVICE

A. Department

Describe your contributions to the Department.

B. College

Describe your contributions to the College.

C. University

Describe your contributions to the University. Elaborate on the level of activity; for example, frequency of meetings, subcommittee assignments.

(End of page)

IV. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Describe services provided in a professional capacity. Include such activities as lectures, consulting, in-service training, workshops, membership on advisory boards.

- ___ 1. Lectures - give title, place and date) Provide name of
- ___ 2. Consultant) organization or
- ___ 3. Inservice training) agency, dates of
- ___ 4. Workshops) service, etc.
- ___ 5. Committees, advisory groups and boards)
- ___ 6. Other)

(End of page)

V. If you were on release time during the year, indicate the purpose of the release time.

VI. Additional material you consider significant and/or meaningful.

Appendix C Examples of Merit Fund Distribution

The examples below will aid in explaining the procedure. In each example, X represents that faculty member's base salary for the prior academic year:

Example 1.

Five faculty A through E.

UW System designates a 3% increase with 66.7% for solid performance.

	NOT SOLID PERF.	SOLID PERF.	MERIT PERF.	EXCEPT. MERIT PERF. (teach) (research) (service)
Faculty A		X		
Faculty B		X		
Faculty C		X		
Faculty D		X		X
Faculty E		X	X	

If we assume that the total salary of the department will be about \$360,000, then a 3% raise provides \$10,800 to be distributed. Two-thirds of this amount, \$7200 or 2% of the total, would be distributed to all five faculty who were awarded the strong performer evaluation. Since only one Exceptional Meritorious award was given, this award totals only \$200 leaving \$3,400 to be distributed to the one faculty who received the overall meritorious award.

Without further adjustment, this faculty member would receive an increase equal to 2% of her or his pay plus \$3400. The meritorious allocation, however, cannot exceed the amount received for strong performance. If \$3400 is greater than that amount, it will be adjusted to equal the strong performance allocation with the balance being reallocated as additional strong performance compensation to all five faculty.

Faculty A	X(2%)		+ Additional Reallocation (AR)	
Faculty B	X(2%)		+ same (AR)	
Faculty C	X(2%)		+ same (AR)	
Faculty D	X(2%)		+ same (AR)	+ (\$200)
Faculty E	X(2%)	+ X(2%)	+ same (AR)	

Note - The additional reallocation is an equal percentage times the base salary; the actual dollar amounts will vary depending on the faculty based salary.

Example 2.

Five faculty A through E.

UW System designates a 3% increase with 66.7% for solid performance.

	NOT SOLID PERF.	SOLID PERF.	MERIT PERF.	EXCEPT. MERIT PERF. (teach) (research) (service)
Faculty A		X	X	X
Faculty B		X	X	
Faculty C		X		
Faculty D		X	X	X
Faculty E		X	X	

If we assume that the total salary of the department will be about \$360,000, then a 3% raise provides \$10,800 to be distributed. Two-thirds of this amount, \$7204 or 2% of the total, would be distributed to all five faculty who were awarded the strong performer evaluation. Since only two Exceptional Meritorious awards were given, these awards total only \$400 leaving \$3,396 to be distributed to the four faculty receiving the overall meritorious awards. The percentage (%) factor applied to each of the four salaries would be calculated by dividing the residual amount (\$3,396) by the sum of the salaries of the four faculty receiving the meritorious award. For example, if the sum of the four salaries was \$300,000, the percentage factor would be $\$3,396/\$300,000 = 1.13\%$

The final computation would look like the following:

Faculty A	$X(2\%) + X(1.13\%) + (\$200)$
Faculty B	$X(2\%) + X(1.13\%)$
Faculty C	$X(2\%)$
Faculty D	$X(2\%) + X(1.13\%) + (\$200)$
Faculty E	$X(2\%) + X(1.13\%)$
Faculty A	receives a 3.13% raise plus an additional \$200 raise
Faculty B	receives a 3.13% raise
Faculty C	receives a 2.00% raise
Faculty D	receives a 3.13% raise plus an additional \$200 raise
Faculty E	receives a 3.13% raise

Example 3

This is an unlikely case designed to demonstrate the need to carryover an "IOU" to the Exceptionally Meritorious.

	NOT SOLID PERF.	SOLID PERF.	MERIT PERF.	EXCEPT. MERIT PERF. (teach) (research) (service)		
Faculty A		X	X	X	X	X
Faculty B		X	X			
Faculty C		X	X	X	X	
Faculty D		X	X			X
Faculty E		X	X	X		

If we assume that the total salary of the department will be about \$360,000, then a 3% raise provides \$10,800 to be distributed. Two-thirds of this amount, \$7204 or 2% of the total, would be distributed to all five faculty who were awarded the strong performer evaluation. Since seven Exceptional Meritorious awards were earned, these awards total \$1400 and would leave only leaving \$2,196 or .61% to be distributed to the five faculty receiving meritorious awards. Awarding 2.61% to the faculty is less than 90% of 3% or 2.7%. As a result, 2.7% or 90% of the entire allocation would be distributed and the exceptional meritorious amount would be reduced to 10% of the money available or \$1,080. Each award would amount to \$154.28. The following year, if there were less exceptional meritorious awards, the balance of \$45.72 would be distributed to the four faculty who were owed the balance.

The final computation would look like the following: IOU's

Faculty A	$X(2\%) + X(.70\%) + 3(200)$	or	\$462.86	&	\$137.14
Faculty B	$X(2\%) + X(.70\%)$				
Faculty C	$X(2\%) + X(.70\%) + 2(200)$	or	\$308.57	&	\$ 91.43
Faculty D	$X(2\%) + X(.70\%) + 1(200)$	or	\$154.29	&	\$ 45.71
Faculty E	$X(2\%) + X(.70\%) + 1(200)$	or	\$154.29	&	\$ 45.71

Faculty A receives 2.7% plus \$463 plus an IOU for \$137
 Faculty B receives 2.7%
 Faculty C receives 2.7% plus \$308 plus an IOU for \$ 91
 Faculty D receives 2.7% plus \$154 plus an IOU for \$ 45
 Faculty E receives 2.7% plus \$154 plus an IOU for \$ 45

Appendix D
UW-L Personnel Rules, Chapter 3.6-3.8
October 1, 2008

UWS 3.06 Renewal of appointments and granting of tenure.

(1)(a) General. Appointments may be granted only upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate academic department, or its functional equivalent, and the chancellor of an institution. When specified by the board, the institutional recommendation shall be transmitted by the president of the system with a recommendation to the board for action. Tenure appointments may be granted to any ranked faculty member who holds or will hold a half-time appointment or more. The proportion of time provided for in the appointment may not be diminished or increased without the mutual consent of the faculty member and the institution, unless the faculty member is dismissed for just cause, pursuant to s. 36.13 (5), Stats., or is terminated or laid off pursuant to s. 36.21, Stats.

(b) Criteria. Decisions relating to renewal of appointments or recommending of tenure shall be made in accordance with institutional rules and procedures which shall require an evaluation of teaching, research, and professional and public service and contribution to the institution. The relative importance of these functions in the evaluation process shall be decided by departmental, school, college, and institutional faculties in accordance with the mission and needs of the particular institution and its component parts. Written criteria for these decisions shall be developed by the appropriate institutional faculty bodies. Written criteria shall provide that if any faculty member has been in probationary status for more than 7 years because of one or more of the reasons set forth in s. UWS 3.04 (2) or (3), the faculty member shall be evaluated as if he or she had been in probationary status for 7 years.

(c) Procedures. The faculty and chancellor of each institution, after consultation with appropriate students, shall establish rules governing the procedures for renewal or probationary appointments and for recommending tenure. These rules shall provide for written notice of the departmental review to the faculty member at least 20 days prior to the date of the departmental review, and an opportunity to present information on the faculty member's behalf. The probationary faculty member shall be notified in writing within 20 days after each decision at each reviewing level. In the event that a decision is made resulting in non-renewal, the procedures specified in s. UWS 3.07 shall be followed.

History: Cr. Register, January, 1975, No. 229, eff. 2-1-75; am. (1) (b), Register, February, 1994, No. 458, eff. 3-1-94; correction in (1) (a) made under s. 13.93 (2m) (b) 5, Stats., Register, February, 1994, No. 458.

UWL 3.06 Renewal of appointments and granting of tenure.

(1) Renewal of appointments and granting of tenure require probationary faculty to be reviewed at three levels in the following order: 1) department; 2) college dean; and 3) chancellor. The process advances as the department's decision and the dean's recommendations are forwarded, in writing, to the chancellor. The timing of the reviews is determined by the university's Personnel Schedule Deadlines.

(2) The probationary faculty member shall be notified in writing within seven days after each decision or recommendation at each reviewing level.

(3) When a negative renewal/tenure decision or recommendation is made at any reviewing level, the provisions of UWS 3.07/UWL 3.07 on reconsideration and UWS 3.08/UWL 3.08 on appeal shall apply.

(4) The initial review of probationary faculty shall be conducted by the tenured faculty of the appropriate department in a manner determined by the tenured members. If there are no tenured members in the department, the appropriate supervisor who is tenured shall make the determination. Department procedures for review, criteria for retention and tenure, and the weighting of criteria shall be documented and on file in the appropriate dean's office. Any changes to department procedures, criteria, and their weighting during the six month period preceding the review shall not be applicable to the review.

(5) The department chair shall give written notice of the department review to the probationary faculty member at least 20 days prior to the date of the review. The probationary faculty member may present written and oral support for renewal. The requirements of sub chapter IV of Chapter 19, Wisconsin Statutes concerning open meeting of governmental bodies shall apply.

(6) An affirmative decision by the department or a successful reconsideration by the department that reverses an earlier non-renewal decision is required for renewal and tenure.

(7) The department shall forward the decision and the vote results to the appropriate dean (or other administrative officer). The dean shall submit to the chancellor a written recommendation either affirming or not affirming the department decision. The dean's criteria for renewal and tenure shall be consistent with department criteria. Further, the dean shall take the magnitude of the faculty vote into account when making the recommendation.

(8) Following a non-renewal decision at the department level, and reconsideration and appeal that do not reverse the decision, the department's decision and the vote results shall be forwarded to the appropriate dean (or other administrative officer). The dean shall submit to the chancellor a recommendation either affirming or not affirming the department decision. The dean's criteria for renewal and tenure shall be consistent with department criteria. Further, the dean shall take the magnitude of the faculty vote into account when making the recommendation.

(9) Following an affirmative decision at the department level, but a non-renewal recommendation at the dean level and reconsideration and appeal that do not reverse the recommendation, the process advances to the chancellor.

(10) If the department's decision and the dean's recommendations are both positive the chancellor's decision should be positive unless there are compelling reasons for a negative decision. A faculty member who is denied renewal/tenure at this stage may request the reasons in writing within 10 days. Written reasons shall be provided to the faculty member within 10 days of the receipt of the request. The reasons then become part of the official file of the faculty member.

UWL 3.06 was revised and approved by the Faculty Senate, approved by Chancellor Kuipers on April 15, 1998 and approved by the Board Of Regents on June 5, 1998.

[Previous policy]

UWS 3.07 Non-renewal of probationary appointments.

(1) (a) Rules and procedures. The faculty and chancellor of each institution, after consultation with appropriate students, shall establish rules and procedures for dealing with instances in which

probationary faculty appointments are not renewed. These rules and procedures shall provide that, upon the timely written request of the faculty member concerned, the department or administrative officer making the decision shall, within a reasonable time, give him or her written reasons for non-renewal. Such reasons shall become a part of the personnel file of the individual. Further, the rules and procedures shall provide for reconsideration of the initial non-renewal decision upon timely written request.

(b) Reconsideration. The purpose of reconsideration of a non-renewal decision shall be to provide an opportunity to a fair and full reconsideration of the non-renewal decision, and to insure that all relevant material is considered.

1. Such reconsideration shall be undertaken by the individual or body making the non-renewal decision and shall include, but not be limited to, adequate notice of the time of reconsideration of the decision, an opportunity to respond to the written reasons and to present any written or oral evidence or arguments relevant to the decision, and written notification of the decision resulting from the reconsideration.
2. Reconsideration is not a hearing or an appeal, and shall be non-adversary in nature.
3. In the event that a reconsideration affirms the non-renewal decision, the procedures specified in s. UWS 3.08 shall be followed.

History: Cr. Register, January, 1975, No. 229, eff. 2-1-75.

UWL 3.07 Non-renewal of probationary faculty member's appointment.

(1) In making a decision of non-renewal, the authorized official (or body) shall inform the appointee early enough to allow time for possible reconsideration and appeal and adequate notice of non-renewal.

(2) The Right to Reconsideration at the lowest level where a non-renewal recommendation or decision is made: An authorized official (or body) who makes a recommendation of non-renewal shall formulate and retain written reasons for the decision. If the faculty member wishes reasons he/she shall request them in writing within 10 days. Written reasons shall be provided the faculty member within 10 days of the receipt of the written request. The reasons then become part of the official personnel file of the faculty member.

(3) If the faculty member wishes a reconsideration of the initial non-renewal recommendation, he/she shall request a reconsideration meeting in writing within two weeks of the receipt of the copy of the reasons.

(4) The meeting for reconsideration with the authorized official or body shall be held within two weeks of the receipt of the request. The faculty member shall be notified a minimum of seven days prior to the meeting. At the reconsideration meeting the authorized official (or body) and the faculty member shall be present. Each 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 authorized official and the faculty member. In later appeals such third parties may be called as witnesses. The faculty member may make a personal presentation at the reconsideration meeting. The meeting shall be held in accordance with sub chapter IV of Chapter 19, Wisconsin Statutes.

(5) At the meeting for reconsideration the faculty member is entitled to present documentary evidence. The reconsideration is not a hearing nor an appeal and shall be non-adversary in nature. Its purpose is to allow the faculty member an opportunity to persuade the authorized official or group to change the recommendation of non-renewal by challenging the stated reasons and/or by offering additional evidence. The burden of proof is on the faculty member requesting the reconsideration. This reconsideration proceeding shall occur at the lowest level where a non-renewal recommendation was made.

(6) Following the reconsideration, the authorized official or group shall forward a recommendation (with written reasons) to the next immediate supervisor. A copy of the recommendation and the reasons shall also be sent to the probationary faculty member within seven days of the reconsideration.

UWS 3.08 Appeal of a non-renewal decision.

(1) The faculty and chancellor of each institution, after consultation with appropriate students, shall establish rules and procedures for the appeal of a non-renewal decision. Such rules and procedures shall provide for the review of a non-renewal decision by an appropriate standing faculty committee upon written appeal by the faculty member concerned within 20 days of notice that the reconsideration has affirmed the non-renewal decision (25 days if notice is by first class mail and publication). Such review shall be held not later than 20 days after the request, except that this time limit may be enlarged by mutual consent of the parties, or by order of the review committee. The faculty member shall be given at least 10 days notice of such review. The burden of proof in such an appeal shall be on the faculty member, and the scope of the review shall be limited to the question of whether the decision was based in any significant degree upon one or more of the following factors, with material prejudice to the individual:

- (a) Conduct, expressions, or beliefs which are constitutionally protected, or protected by the principles of academic freedom, or
- (b) Factors proscribed by applicable state or federal law regarding fair employment practices, or
- (c) Improper consideration of qualifications for reappointment or renewal. For purposes of this section, "improper consideration" shall be deemed to have been given to the qualifications of a faculty member in question if material prejudice resulted because of any of the following:

1. The procedures required by rules of the faculty or board were not followed, or
2. Available data bearing materially on the quality of performance were not considered, or
3. Unfounded, arbitrary or irrelevant assumptions of fact were made about work or conduct.

(2) The appeals committee shall report on the validity of the appeal to the body or official making the non-renewal decision and to the appropriate dean and the chancellor.

(3) Such a report may include remedies which may, without limitation because of enumeration, take the form of a reconsideration by the decision maker, a reconsideration by the decision maker under instructions from the committee, or a recommendation to the next higher appointing level. Cases shall be remanded for reconsideration by the decision maker in all instances unless the appeals committee specifically finds that such a remand would serve no useful purpose. The appeals committee shall retain jurisdiction while reconsiderations are pending. The decision of the chancellor will be final on such matters.

History: Cr. Register, January, 1975, No. 229, eff. 2-1-75.

UWL 3.08 Appeal of a non-renewal decision.

(1) The standing committee to hear appeals of a non-renewal decision shall be the same hearing committee established under UWL 4.03.

(2) The appellant shall send a written request for a review of his/her case to the hearing committee and shall include a statement of the factors alleged to be materially prejudicial (see UWS 3.08 (1) a, b, c) and shall provide evidence to support his/her claim. The Hearing Committee may deny further consideration of the case if these materials are not provided.

(3) The hearing shall be held in conformity with sub chapter IV, Chapter 19, Wisconsin Statutes.

(4) While providing due process, the faculty hearing committee shall not be bound by common law or statutory rules of evidence.

(5) The Hearing Committee shall report its recommendations to the body or the officials involved in the non-renewal decision. The Hearing Committee also shall inform the faculty member of the recommendations if the officials do not do so within two working days.

(6) The recommendation of the committee shall be based on a majority vote of the committee members hearing the case.

(7) If the Hearing Committee finds that impermissible factors, as defined in UWS 3.08 (1)(a),(b) and (c), were involved in reaching a decision not to recommend tenure, and after all required reconsiderations have been completed, the Chancellor shall direct the Provost/Vice Chancellor to appoint an ad hoc committee of no fewer than five (5) tenured faculty members. Committee members may be off campus peers but may not be members of the appellant's department or its functional equivalent. No person may be appointed to the ad hoc committee unless the person is knowledgeable in the appellant's academic field or in a substantially similar field. The Provost/Vice Chancellor shall consult with the appellant's Dean to ensure that persons appointed to the ad hoc committee are so qualified. The ad hoc committee shall conduct a new review of the appellant's record with reference to the department's criteria for tenure. The appellant shall be afforded an opportunity to make an appearance before the committee and answer questions. Upon completion of the review, the ad hoc committee shall vote on whether the appellant should be granted tenure. The ad hoc committee shall submit a report of their findings to the Chancellor and provide a copy to the appellant. The findings of the ad hoc committee shall not be based on impermissible factors, as defined in UWS 3.08 (1)(a), (b) and (c).

If a majority of the ad hoc committee has recommended that tenure may be granted, the Chancellor may then recommend to the Board of Regents that a tenure appointment be granted without the concurrence of the appellant's department or functional equivalent.