

BY-LAWS, GUIDELINES, OBJECTIVES AND POLICY STATEMENTS

Department of Finance

University of Wisconsin-La Crosse

This copy printed December, 2005

Special Notes

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.

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:

- I. Academic Staff
- II. Class Scheduling
- V. 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 were revised.

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Academic Staff	3
II. Class Scheduling	4
III. Merit Evaluation	5
A. The Merit Committee	6
B. Areas of Evaluation	6
C. Criteria for Evaluating	6
D. Scoring	7
E. Weights	7
F. Categories	8
G. Dollar Allocation	8
H. Examples	9 - 11
Appeal Procedure	12
Mechanics	13
Merit Evaluation for Academic Staff (NA)	
Annual Faculty Review and Evaluation Report	14 - 18
IV. Objectives	18
V. Promotion, Renewal and Tenure By-Laws	19
Policy Statement on the PRT Committee	19
PRT Committee By-Laws	20
3.05 Periodic Review	23
Rules for Promotion	24
VI. Post Tenure Review	25
VII. Summer Session Appointments	28
VIII. Sabbatical Leaves, Faculty Development Leaves and Released Time for Research	31

I. ACADEMIC STAFF

The following policy statement has been adopted to officially establish the rights and privileges of academic staff within the Department of Finance.

Department Full-Time Continuing Academic Staff Policy Statement

Academic staff in the Department of Finance shall have the same rights and privileges of ranked faculty as they relate to department governance. Therefore, academic staff shall be entitled to vote on matters, both procedural and substantive, requiring a department-wide committee.*

*Academic Staff, as well as other non-tenured members of the department, are not eligible to serve on the Promotion, Renewal and Tenure Committee.

This policy statement was revised by the Department of Finance on November 25, 1986.

II. 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.

Revised by the Department of Finance on November 26, 1986.

SALARY BY-LAWS

I. Introduction

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.

II. Salary/Merit Evaluation

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:

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

A. Merit Committee

The Merit Committee will conduct the evaluation process. The Merit Committee will be composed of all tenure-track 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 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.

B. Areas of Evaluation

1. **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.

2. **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 CBA Scholarly Productivity guidelines.]

3. **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.

C. 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 criteria,” “strong performer” or “meritorious performer.”

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.

D. Compensation Percentage Allocation Model

All 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. No 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 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**).

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

III. Appeals Procedure

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:

- a. Conduct expressions, or beliefs that 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 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:
 1. The department merit by-laws 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.
- d. Written notice of the decision of the department evaluation committee shall be transmitted to the individual within seven days of the decision.

IV. MECHANICS

Confidentiality

In order to assure confidentiality, after the Program Assistant has compiled the comments,

- a. Faculty will receive back their copy of comments regarding other faculty members. Faculty will retain and safeguard their own evaluations of the other department members
- b. 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.
- c. 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.
- d. 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. A copy will be kept on file for potential retention, promotion, and post-tenure review purposes.
- e. 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.
- f. All electronic copies of the comments will be deleted by the Program Assistant. This will end the merit process.

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.

<u>Fall</u>		<u>Spring</u>		<u>Summer</u>	(optional)
Course	SEI	Course	SEI	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.

IV. OBJECTIVES

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.

V. PROMOTION, RENEWAL AND TENURE

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

Department Policy Statement on the PRT Committee

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-quarter-time teaching position in the Department.

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.

This policy statement was approved by the Department of Economics and Finance on September 12, 1977.

Fin PRT Committee By-Laws

UW-L FIN 3.06 Renewal of appointments and granting tenure

- (1) 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.
- (2) 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.

- (3) Evaluation criteria for renewal of appointment and granting of tenure In accordance with UW-L 3.05(1), 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(A).

(4) Methods of evaluation

1. 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 Personnel Rules, 3.05(2)(a)(b) and in the UW-La Crosse Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, 3.05(B).

Revised by the Department of Finance, November 25, 1986.

2. 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.

(5) Review Procedures for Renewal of Appointment and Granting of Tenure

1. The department chairperson shall give written notice of the department review at least 30 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, either the following information:
 - a. A completed copy of the Fin PRT Activity Summary Form which summarizes relevant activities for the most recent calendar year. (Exception: For tenure, the activity form shall include all relevant activities in previous years at UW-L). Copies of the Form will be supplied by the department chairperson.
 - 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 .
2. The department chairperson shall provide the chairperson of the PRT Committee with the following information for each renewal (tenure) candidate:
 - a. Student evaluation analysis computer printout for each semester during the year. (Exception: for tenure, all available printouts form previous years will be provided).
 - b. Course syllabi from the department Course Syllabi File.
 - c. Any other information requested by the committee which could have a bearing on the potential performance of the renewal (tenure) candidate.

(6) Academic Staff Appointment and Education Preparation

It is recognized that academic staff may differ with respect to appointments and educational preparation. Academic staff may receive regular appointments (contracts which do not exceed one (1) academic year) and multiple year contracts (contracts which exceed one (1) academic year). In addition, academic staff may or may not have completed the terminal degree. Likewise, those who have not completed the degree may or may not be enrolled in an academic program leading to a terminal degree. It is the purpose of the following by-laws to encourage and promote the same educational preparation (Prep Code 1) for academic staff as for faculty.

1. Academic staff with the terminal degree shall be eligible for recommendation to a multiple year contract during the second annual appointment, provided funds for such a position are assured.
2. Academic staff without the terminal degree, but who are officially enrolled in a graduate program leading to a terminal degree, shall be eligible for a multiple year contract as in Section 1 of their by-laws. However, given this status, the total number of appointment years is limited to five.
3. Academic staff without the terminal degree and not officially enrolled in an academic program leading to a terminal degree shall be eligible for a maximum of one (1) regular appointment renewal. Such an individual may, however, qualify for eligibility under Section 2 of these by-laws by presenting to the chairperson of the PRT Committee evidence that he/she is officially accepted** in an academic program no later than February 13 of the individual's renewal year. The years of employment under this section shall be counted towards the five (5) possible appointment years in Section 2.

* Evidence of official enrollment can include fee payment, grade transcripts, and acceptance of a dissertation proposal.

** Such evidence of official acceptance is defined as (A) a letter of intent containing a plan of graduate study specifying the time frame for such study and (B) a letter of acceptance from the academic institution in question.

NOTE: These by-laws appear to be compatible with Fin. PRT Committee By-Laws UW-L Fin. 3.05 Renewal of Appointments and Granting of Tenure and have been written as an extension of such by-laws.

Fin. Department 3.05 Periodic Review

- (1) 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 12".
 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 results of "item 12", and other evaluation or improvement of instruction instruments used by the faculty member.

Revised by the Department of Finance, November 25, 1986.

UW-L Fin. Department Rules for Promotion

- (1) The initial review of 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.
- (2) 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) 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.

VI. Post Tenure Review (PTR) - (approved Spring 1995)

Purpose

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.

Timing of Reviews

For 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.

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 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 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-T-R Committee will prepare a working draft. In the draft, the P-T-R 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-T-R 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-T-R 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-T-R Committee feels that a development plan is necessary, the final report will indicate such.

Development Plan and Subsequent Review

If a development plan is requested, the P-T-R 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-T-R Committee. Once the plan is completed, a subsequent meeting with the P-T-R 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-T-R 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-T-R Committee feels that sufficient progress does not appear to be forthcoming, it may request an updated development plan.

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.

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.

VII. SUMMER SESSION APPOINTMENTS

Finance Department Summer School Scheduling Guidelines

1. Eligibility: Only full-time faculty with a terminal degree and full-time academic staff with three or more years of continuous full-time service are eligible to share in the summer session allocation. An eligibility exception can be made for first-year faculty members who are still ABD when the summer session assignments are due to the dean's office.

2. Allocations: Each eligible department member will receive a proportionate share of the summer school pool allocated to the department. The shares will be computed using the January salaries (of the same year as the summer session) of the department members, and an adjusted salary for the chairperson. For the purpose of this calculation, the Chair's salary will be multiplied by 4/3. Algebraically, the calculations are:

$$x_i = \frac{\text{(January salary of } i\text{th non-chair department member)}}{\text{(Sum of January salaries of all eligible members)} + \frac{4}{3} \text{(January salary of Department Chair)}}$$

Each eligible department member to receive:

$$\frac{x_i}{\text{Sum}(x_i)} \text{ times pool}$$

The chairperson's summer stipend is a compensation provided for the chairperson's responsibilities during summer. It is expected that the chairperson will be willing and available during summer to assume these responsibilities. If the chairperson receives a stipend for summer responsibilities from the CBA Dean, (s)he will not receive an extra allocation from summer school funds. The chairperson will receive compensation for summer teaching assignments consistent with the departmental allocation model.

3. 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.
4. Assurance that needed classes are taught: If no reasonable arrangement can voluntarily be worked out so that it is assured that all necessary classes are taught, the chairperson has the authority to assign faculty members to teaching assignments. Non-teaching slots will consist of projects involving faculty commitment equivalent to the commitments associated with teaching slots and must be approved by the department.
5. To provide maximum retirement benefits for all retiring members at the department, the retiring member will be allocated a full-time summer appointment (consisting of two-ninths of his/her academic salary) 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 (Section 5) 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.

These guidelines were last amended at the 2/24/86 meeting of Finance Department members.

**VIII. FINANCE DEPARTMENT POLICY STATEMENT ON
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.