DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS

BYLAWS, POLICY STATEMENTS AND GUIDELINES

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - LA CROSSE

Revised October 13, 2025

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

Approved:	April 3rd, 2017
Last Amended:	October 14, 2024

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

These Bylaws were adopted by the members of the Department of Information Systems in accordance with the UW-System and UWL *Faculty and Academic Staff Personnel Rules.*

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

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

B. Meeting Guidelines

Meetings of the Department and its Committees will be conducted in accordance with the most recent edition of *Robert's Rules of Order* and WI state open meeting laws.

Minutes will be recorded by the ADA or a voting member (see Section II.C. below) of the Department and distributed within two weeks to Department members. Copies of the minutes of Department and Committee meetings shall be kept in a secure location by the Department. Minutes from closed meetings will be taken by the Department Chair, ADA (or a designated faculty member) and written within one week of the proceedings. They will be available upon request.

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

C. Definitions of Membership & Voting Procedures

1. All ranked faculty and instructional academic staff in the Information Systems shall constitute the Information Systems faculty.
2. Ranked faculty
    a. In accordance with UW-L Articles of Faculty Organization, all persons with the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor with tenure or probationary appointments shall constitute the ranked faculty.
    b. Ranked faculty holding a 50% or greater appointment will have full rights and privileges in the Information Systems Department as described herein.
3. Academic staff
    a. Academic staff appointments may be fixed term, probationary, or indefinite.
    b. Full time academic staff having a 100% position appointment for at least two consecutive semesters whereas part time academic staff have less than 100% position appointment for two consecutive semesters.
    c. Academic staff may be instructional academic staff (IAS) (primary core function is instruction and assessment of students), non-instructional academic staff (none of their appointment involves instruction), or a combination.
4. Academic Staff Voting Procedures
    a. Full time instructional academic staff and part time instructional academic staff with at least 50% of their appointment in the Information Systems Department for two consecutive semesters have the same rights and privileges of ranked faculty as they relate to department governance, with noted exceptions.
    b. Full time instructional academic staff and part time instructional academic staff with at least 50% of their appointment in the Information Systems Department for two consecutive semesters are entitled:
        1. to vote on matters requiring departmental approval; and
        2. to serve as voting members on department committees.

c. Full time instructional academic staff and part time instructional academic staff with at least 50% of their appointment in the Information Systems Department for two consecutive semesters are not eligible:
    1. to vote on personnel matters regarding appointments and leaves; and
    2. to serve on the department merit committee, unless they have been in the department full time for at least one year and their salaries contribute toward the department merit pool.
d. Part time academic staff with less than 50% position contract or not contracted for one full academic year are:
    1. not eligible to take part in department governance;
    2. not entitled to vote on matters requiring a department vote; or
    3. not entitled to serve as voting members on department committees.

Those classified as members of the Department are eligible to vote on matters requiring a Department vote. IAS below the rank of Distinguished and/or Senior Lecturers who are eligible to vote on Department matters, are not eligible to vote on merit, retention, promotion, and tenure issues.

Proxy votes are not permitted in meetings of the Department and its Committees.

D. Definitions of Quorum and Majority

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

E. Changing By-laws

Amendments or additions to these bylaws require a simple majority of the current Department membership eligible to vote. Any proposed amendment(s) shall be presented and distributed in writing at a Department meeting to provide an opportunity for a second reading and discussion. A vote will be taken at the next subsequent meeting. A second reading may be waived (by majority approval) for bylaw changes that do not pertain to personnel decisions.

F. Conflict of Interest.

Department faculty members understand and accept the potential that exists for a real and/or perceived conflict of interest between related faculty members. A Department member or the Department Chair must be recused from voting when there is an actual conflict of interest, such as voting on any matter that directly affects a spouse, ex-spouse, relative, or domestic partner. The recusal shall be construed in a neutral manner, neither a vote for, nor a vote against the spouse, ex-spouse, relative, or domestic partner. Any faculty member may also make a written request to the CBA Dean (Dean) at least five calendar days prior to a Department or Committee

vote, requesting a determination of whether a Department member must be recused for an actual or apparent conflict of interest. The Dean may act in the capacity of Department Chair, if necessary, when the Department Chair is recused.

III. Faculty/Staff Responsibilities

A. Faculty

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

Regular Teaching Loads

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

Faculty in the College of Business Administration whose teaching performance is deemed satisfactory by the department and whose scholarly activities meet the guidelines usually will be assigned a nine-credit teaching load per semester. A nine-credit load usually will consist of two preparations. The department chair may assign newly appointed faculty a nine-credit load to stimulate scholarly activities. Faculty whose scholarly output is below the College productivity guidelines normally will be assigned a twelve-credit teaching load until they make satisfactory progress toward meeting the guidelines.

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

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

B. Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations

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

C. Non Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations

Not applicable

D. Student Feedback on Instruction

The department will follow the UWL student feedback on instruction policy and procedure available on the Faculty Senate webpage.

Results from student feedback of instruction surveys are required for retention, tenure, post-tenure review, and promotion of tenure-track/tenured faculty and for renewal and promotion of Instructional Academic Staff. Student feedback of instruction summary reports must be included in promotion, retention, and tenure files.

IV. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)

The results of merit reviews for all ranked faculty who have completed at least one academic year at UWL are due to the Dean's Office on Oct. 1 annually. IAS with 50% or greater and redbooked must also have a merit review completed. 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 portfolio system on activities from the prior year June 1st – May 31st.

The areas of review shall include Teaching, Scholarship/Professional Development, and Service activities. For all IAS, the annual merit review may coincide with and include any concurrent retention and/or promotion review. For all non-tenured, Ranked Faculty members, the annual merit review may coincide with and include any concurrent mid- contract, retention, promotion, and/or tenure review. For all tenured, Ranked Faculty members, the annual merit review may coincide with and include any concurrent promotion and/or post-tenure review. IAS merit review will be done in accordance with Section VI. The criteria and procedures for faculty merit shall be as follows:

A. Merit Committee. 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 Merit Committee will elect a chair to manage the evaluation process. The chair will remain in the position for at least one year or until a new vote is requested by any member of the Merit Committee. The Department Chair is not eligible to chair the committee.

B. Annual Activity Reports. Each year during the first week of May, the Department Chair will remind all faculty to update their electronic portfolio. The annual activity report shall serve as a vehicle for self-evaluation, which, along with other external evidence of Teaching, Scholarship/Professional Development, and Service activities, will form the basis for the annual review. The results of these annual reviews for all faculty who have

completed at least one academic year at UWL are due to the Dean's Office on Oct. 1 annually.

C. Review Criteria. The criteria used by the Committee to evaluate a Ranked Faculty member's annual performance are designed to promote effective Teaching, quality Scholarship, and meaningful Service. Ranked Faculty are expected to devote 50% of their time and effort to Teaching, 30% to Scholarship, and 20% to Service, and review of Ranked Faculty in each of these areas will be weighed accordingly. For all ranked faculty members, effective Teaching, Scholarship/Professional Development, and Service will be measured by comparing the evidence and artifacts reported in the annual activity report. In order to enhance the evaluation of effective teaching beyond the measure of student feedback on instruction results and classroom peer observations, the annual activity report should also include the pedagogical devices that were used to measure course, Department, and/or CBA learning outcomes. These devices can include assignments, quizzes, exams, or projects in whole or in part, and should be accompanied by assessment evidence, samples of student work, and/or reflective commentary to aid the Committee.

D. Evaluation Processes & Criteria

1. Faculty. Faculty members shall be evaluated annually for merit, and the distribution of any merit salary dollars shall be based upon this annual evaluation and on whether the position generates merit dollars. The evaluation shall consider all of the criteria listed above in Appendix E. In addition, the annual merit evaluation of faculty must differentiate between levels of merit. Merit reviews reflect activities during the prior academic year ending June 1.

a. Merit Review Procedures. Early in the fall semester, the Merit Committee Chair will initiate the merit process. This includes sending out a written notification to all eligible faculty who should be considered eligible for merit. The notification should include Merit Guidelines and a request for the Annual Activity Report. Once all Annual Activity Reports are received, the Merit Committee Chair will send out the Merit Evaluation Form (Appendix E) and all documents to the Committee members (Annual Activity Reports, student feedback on instruction results, and any other supporting documents that will be used in evaluation). The Merit Committee Chair will also send the Dean the department chair materials for evaluation. Each ranked faculty member will be responsible for preparing and submitting the documents used for Merit Evaluation to the Merit Committee Chair. The committee member will submit the Merit Evaluation Form back to the Merit Committee Chair for scoring. The committee will meet to discuss the scores assigned by the other committee members. Each member of the committee will then have the opportunity to modify merit scores assigned for each faculty

b. Scoring. Based on the merit definitions identified below, each Merit Committee member will assign an overall evaluation to each individual using the Merit Evaluation Form. The overall merit evaluation score is based on the teaching, research and service expectations of the department. The possible overall evaluations that can be assigned are: "Not-Meritorious," "Meritorious", and "Extra Meritorious".

In the overall category, the faculty member will be assigned the highest overall score (Not-Meritorious, Meritorious, or Extra Meritorious) given by one half or more (simple majority) of his or her colleagues. Extra Meritorious will be assigned to any individual who receives an "extra merit" rating by at least two-thirds of his or her colleagues in two of the three categories.

Within seven calendar days of completion of the reviews, the Merit Committee Chair shall notify each faculty member, in writing, of the results of overall annual merit ratings (not-meritorious, meritorious or extraordinary merit).

Faculty members who are on professional leave are expected to submit a completed annual activity report by June 1 describing their leave and other professional activities.

c. Merit Ratings

Meritorious. A meritorious designation denotes satisfactory performance related to a faculty member's responsibilities and expectations. To receive a meritorious designation, faculty members must perform their Teaching responsibilities at a satisfactory level (Appendix C), as determined by students and peers, meet, maintain, or demonstrating progress towards CBA Scholarship & Practitioner Productivity Guidelines (Appendix A) and meet Department Service responsibilities (Appendix B). All faculty members shall be notified of their meritorious designation. Those persons not receiving a meritorious designation shall be notified, in writing, of the reasons for this action.

Faculty members qualifying for merit will receive the state-allotted meritorious performance funding. Faculty on approved leave shall be considered for merit and may be considered for extra merit.

Extra Merit. Extra merit recognizes the need to differentially reward faculty for levels of performance and individual accomplishments that exceed the expectations of the department. Extra Meritorious will be assigned to any individual who receives

an "extra merit" rating by at least two-thirds of his or her colleagues in two of the three categories. Examples of Extra Merit activities for Teaching may include: exemplary teaching accomplishments, new curriculum development, high student feedback on instruction results, innovations in curriculum, grants to support teaching improvement, teaching awards. Examples of Extra Merit activities for Research may include: Tier 1 journal publication, paper acceptance and presentation at one of the department discipline's top tier conference(s). Examples of Extra Merit activities for Service may include: service leadership positions, notable service contributions to UWL, the CBA, the department, the profession, or the public. All faculty members shall be notified of their assigned extra merit ratings, along with the numbers of Department members in each merit category.

2. Department Chair. The department chair participates in the ranked faculty merit evaluation process in the same manner as all other ranked faculty.

3. IAS will participate in the IAS Merit process (Appendix G) as described under section VI.

B. Distribution of Merit Funds. Annually, the Department may be allocated merit monies as determined by the action of the state legislature, the Board of Regents, and/or the UW-System Administration as a percentage of the Department total salary package. These monies shall be distributed to Department members based on the merit ratings assigned through the annual merit review process described above. The pool of merit funds for IAS is separate from the Ranked Faculty pool.

All faculty members judged to meet their basic responsibilities, as "meritorious" and granted 100% shall receive the state-allotted meritorious performance raise. If the state fails to designate a specific percentage for meritorious, the department will assume the meritorious allocation will be 2/3 of the total percentage allocated. All faculty who receive an overall evaluation of "meritorious performer" will receive an equal share of the remaining merit pool.

Note that when a whole-department merit designation is used for monetary reporting issues, the Ranked Faculty and IAS must be split into two separate merit category distributions because two separate sources fund these two different populations. At the appropriate time, the Department Chair (or Human Resources Office) will communicate the merit adjustment dollars awarded to each faculty member.
Merit pay increases will not be made in years when merit funding is unavailable. The Committee will consider the annual merit ratings retroactive to the previous year and apply the highest evaluation to make the merit pay increase equitable when merit funds are made available.

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

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

Appeals beyond the Department level may be presented to the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals and Academic Freedom (CGAAF) Committee (see Section II.G. of the Faculty Senate Bylaws -- https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/). As in all processes involving the evaluation of personnel, mechanisms for merit evaluation appeals beyond the Department level are established on this campus. Your attention is directed to the UW-System Administrative Code, the local UWL Faculty Rules, and the UWL Faculty Handbook.

V. Faculty Personnel Review

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

Tenure/retention decisions will be guided by the criteria established in the bylaws at the time of hire unless a candidate elects to be considered under newer guidelines. The criteria outlined in Section V. A & V. B. "Faculty Personnel Review" in these bylaws should be applied to faculty with a contract date after date adopted by the department. The department will follow policies guiding part-time appointments for faculty and tenure clock stoppage available on the Human Resources website.

It is the intent of the members of the Department to facilitate the professional development of non-tenured faculty members during their probationary period, while at the same time maintaining the highest possible standards of excellence in teaching, scholarly activity, and service. Departmental policy for reviewing the performance of probationary faculty members emphasizes:

- Collaboration and open communication between non-tenured faculty members and the Department's Promotion, Retention and Tenure (PRT) Committee or designated representatives;
- A constructive and formative process of setting goals, obtaining and utilizing evidence of performance, and identifying strengths and areas needing improvement; and
- Adequate record keeping benefiting all parties.

Faculty Mentoring. During the first academic year of employment in the department, each probationary faculty member in consultation with Departmental colleagues are encouraged to select a mentor within the Department. Each probationary faculty member is also encouraged to obtain a mentor from among faculty members outside the department. The Department Chair will assist in the process of identifying possible mentors if so desired. Mentors are to serve as accurate sources of information and perspective on policies and practices in the Department and university, but are not to be held responsible for the performance of the probationary faculty member(s) with whom they have a mentoring relationship.

Promotion, Retention and Tenure Committee Membership. The PRT Committee reviews all probationary tenure-track faculty in the Department. The PRT Committee of the Department is comprised of all tenured faculty in the department. In the event that there are fewer than three tenured faculty members, the Chair will solicit additional tenured UWL faculty members to serve a one-year term (with the possibility of renewal) on the retention committee so that the committee has a minimum of three tenured UWL faculty members. The number of additional faculty members nominated will be N+1 where N represents the number of outside committee members needed to form a committee of at least three members. The candidate(s) under review will be allowed to review the committee member candidate pool and remove one or zero potential committee members from consideration at their discretion.

Candidacy. Subsequent to the call of the Vice Chancellor/HR, the Department shall establish a review date and inform all probationary faculty with at least 20 calendar days' notice to prepare a set of materials describing performance in the areas of: teaching; scholarly and research activity (see Department statement on Scholarly Activity) and; department, university, community, and professional service. The date, time, and place of the meeting shall be conducted in compliance with the Wisconsin Open Meeting Rule.

PRT Committee Review Process. At least seven calendar days prior to the date of the review, probationary faculty members shall submit to the Department Chair in the appropriate electronic format, the materials listed below relating to each type of review. The probationary faculty under review shall have the opportunity to make a written and/or oral presentation at the meeting prior to the meeting going into closed session. For a retention and/or tenure meeting to take place, attendance by 2/3 of the tenured faculty constitutes a quorum. For a promotion meeting to take place, attendance by 2/3 of the faculty members at the current level or above the rank the candidate is seeking constitutes a quorum.

A. Retention (procedure, criteria and appeal)

All retention decisions, including the ultimate retention through tenure, use past performance to predict future performance. In each retention decision, the Committee must assess the promise as well as the competency of the candidate in meeting the purpose, vision, and mission of the Department.

1. Procedure

a. Faculty under review provide an electronic portfolio related to their

teaching, scholarship, and service activities extracted from their date of hire to the date of departmental review. Hyperlinked syllabi are required and the candidate may choose to provide additional evidence. Additional materials may be required for departmental review and will be indicated in these bylaws.

b. Departments will provide the following materials to the dean:
    i. Department letter of recommendation with vote;
    ii. Teaching assignment information (TAI) datasheet that summarizes the courses taught, workload data, grade distribution and student feedback on instruction results by individual course and semester (which are only available after completing a full academic year) and departmental comparison student feedback on instruction results; and
    iii. Merit evaluation data.
c. The initial review of probationary faculty shall be conducted by the tenured faculty of the appropriate department in the manner outlined below.
d. All first-year tenure-track faculty will be formally reviewed in the spring of their first year. A departmental letter will be filed with the Dean and HR. Formal reviews resulting in contract decisions will minimally occur for tenure-track faculty in their 2nd, 4th and 6th years.

1.1 First Year Faculty Review (Non-contract review) Procedure

a. **Reports**. The candidate provides one electronic "Retention Report-Individual" saved as an HTML report and emailed to the Department Chair one week prior to the Retention committee meeting. The retention report of the candidate's activities will be generated from the electronic portfolio system and represent activities since date-of-hire at UWL as a tenure-track faculty member. The retention report should include hyperlinks to associated evidence such as:
    i. Evidence of teaching development activities (e.g., syllabi with learning objectives stated, course assessments, peer evaluations);
    ii. Evidence of scholarship (e.g., copies of presentations, publications, creative activities);
    iii. Evidence of service (e.g., letters or projects associated with department, college, university, and/or professional service);
    iv. A retention narrative that describes the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service, modeled after the narrative required for promotion;
    v. A copy of their pre-UWL vita will be uploaded as an attachment in the electronic portfolio system.
b. **Recommendation/Decision.** Prior to the beginning of the review of the candidate(s), the meeting will go into closed session according to Section 19.85 in the Wisconsin Statutes. Using the criteria in 1.2 d below, the PRT

shall evaluate the probationary faculty member's performance. The first-year review is a non-contract review, so no votes are taken.

c. **Notification of Decision**. Within 14 calendar days after the review meeting, a written report of the results, reporting on each of the review areas shall be given to the probationary faculty member and HR by May 1st.

1.2 Contract Review (Retention/Tenure) Procedure

a. Reports. The candidate provides two electronic reports – saved as HTML reports and emailed to the Department Chair seven calendar days prior to the Retention Committee meeting.

i. A "retention report" of the candidate's activities (generated from the electronic portfolio system and representing activities since date-of-hire at UWL as a tenure-track faculty member which should include hyperlinks to associated evidence such as:
ii. Evidence of teaching development activities (e.g., syllabi with learning objectives stated, course assessments, peer evaluations);
iii. Evidence of scholarship (e.g., copies of presentations, publications, creative activities);
iv. Evidence of service (e.g., letters or projects associated with department, college, university, and/or professional service);
v. A retention narrative that describes the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service, modeled after the narrative required for promotion.
vi. An "annual report" of the candidate's activities (generated from the electronic portfolio system representing activities since date-of-last review).
vii. A copy of their pre-UWL vita uploaded as an attachment in the electronic portfolio system.
viii. The Department Chair will provide the committee with merit and student feedback on instruction results summary information.

b. **Recommendation/Decision** Prior to the beginning of the review of the candidate(s), the meeting will go into closed session according to Section 19.85 in the Wisconsin Statutes. Using the criteria d below, the Promotion, Retention and Tenure Committee shall evaluate the probationary faculty member's performance. During the review meeting, the Chair shall entertain a motion regarding the retention/and or tenure of the candidate(s). Votes shall be cast by a show of hands on a motion to retain/and or tenure the faculty member. Passage of a motion to retain a candidate(s) (and, if appropriate, to recommend tenure) shall require a [2/3][simple] majority of those present and voting.

c. **Notification of Decision** Within two calendar days of the promotion consideration meeting, the Department Chair will orally notify each candidate

of the Department's recommendation. Within 14 calendar days after the review meeting, a written report detailing the Committee's decision, including the actual vote, shall be given to the probationary faculty member and the Dean. In the case of a positive decision, The Department Chair, in consultation with the Promotion, Retention and Tenure Committee, will prepare a written report summarizing the committee's deliberations and including concerns or suggestions for improvement identified by the Committee. The Department Chair will meet with the probationary faculty member to answer any questions, discuss the contents of the letter, and set goals for the next review. The letter and deliberations provide a record of the probationary period and may be referenced by both the candidate and Committee in subsequent reviews. In the case of a nonrenewal recommendation, the Committee shall consult with the Dean prior to notifying the faculty member. The Department Chair, in consultation with the Committee, will prepare a written report (according to UWS 3.07) that includes the numerical vote and the Committee's reasons for the non-renewal decision. Also, see Reconsideration below.

d. **Retention Criteria** In order to obtain a recommendation for reappointment, the faculty member's performance must be judged satisfactory and must show potential for continued professional growth. Performance criteria are stated below and detailed in the related appendices. The members of the Promotion, Retention and Tenure Committee shall use the electronic portfolio and the accompanying narrative to judge each probationary faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Of these areas of responsibility, teaching is most important. After establishing a record of successful teaching, a program of continued scholarship is necessary for retention and, ultimately, a positive tenure recommendation. Service is also an important faculty responsibility. Probationary faculty should demonstrate success in teaching and scholarship before establishing a record of service. First and second year faculty members should focus their attention on teaching and research, and develop as teacher-scholars knowing that a record of service within and outside the department is expected and will increase accordingly, beginning with departmental service. Overall, workload in the three areas of responsibility is weighted- 50% teaching, 30% scholarship, and 20% service. Minimal standards are described below:

i. ***Scholarship*:** Persons recommended for retention will show continuing progress in their agenda for research/scholarship. The Department expects that successful candidates for retention have a record of ongoing scholarly activity that adheres to the Department Statement on Scholarship (Appendix A). Candidates for retention shall provide a report on research/scholarship that should detail the candidate's progress in developing and carrying out a research agenda and state the candidate's professional goals in this arena.

ii. ***Service:*** Candidates for retention shall provide a report on service that should detail the candidate's accomplishments and professional goals in this arena. For retention, the Department expects service to the

Department, including regular attendance at departmental and relevant committee meetings, active participation in departmental program assessment, attendance at a minimum of one UWL graduation ceremony per year, and developing contributions to the university and/or community. The level of service should increase with years of experience and the faculty member's current rank. See Appendix B for the Department's Statement on Service.

iii. ***Teaching:*** For retention, candidates will need to demonstrate strong evidence of quality teaching, professional development as a teacher, and professional competence as a teacher. Establishing a successful record of teaching is the most important priority for probationary faculty members. Teaching criteria reflect the department's commitment to teaching but do not define how a probationary faculty member articulates their prowess in teaching. Teaching effectiveness should be observed and measured by multiple methods. Recognition for teaching includes not only student feedback on instruction results, but also a record of personal teaching assessment, developmental opportunities, and peer evaluations. Probationary faculty members should provide clear, compelling, and outcome-based evidence of their growth and success as a teacher. The Department encourages faculty members to contribute to the existing curriculum as well as develop new courses as appropriate. Innovative assignments, teaching strategies, and improvements will be recognized for retention and tenure. At a minimum, probationary faculty members are expected to meet the criteria outlined in the Department's Statement on Teaching (Appendix C).

e. The Department will review the following required materials:
   i. A report from the candidate that addresses teaching assignment, teaching development, teaching evaluation, and professional goals for teaching.
   ii. Teaching assignment encompasses a listing of courses taught, unique expertise, approach to grading and evaluation, and duties that are different from classroom teaching.
   iii. Teaching development encompasses the development of new courses and units, innovations and improvements in teaching techniques, participation in workshops on teaching, and preparation of curriculum materials.
   iv. Teaching evaluation encompasses a narrative outlining the methods used to evaluate teaching, in addition to written evaluation by peers, and student feedback on instruction results.
   v. Peer evaluation and feedback; student feedback on instruction results, and syllabi. The Department, in consultation the faculty member, will arrange approximately one peer review every two academic years. See Appendix D for the Peer Review of Teaching Process.

f. **Appeal Process-Retention** Anyone wishing to appeal a Department

retention or tenure decision is required to submit a written petition to the Chairperson of the Department carefully detailing the basis on which this appeal is being made. This appeal must be filed with the chairperson within 14 calendar days of the notification of the contested retention/ tenure decision. The Department will then hold a special closed session hearing to review all evidence pertinent to this petition in the presence of the appellant. The faculty member may make a personal presentation at the reconsideration meeting. Both the Committee and the faculty member may choose up to two members of the university community to be present also. These third parties may question either of the other parties and make comments to them. These third parties also shall file a report of the reconsideration meeting with the Committee 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. At the meeting for reconsideration, the faculty member is entitled to present documentary evidence. The reconsideration is neither a hearing nor an appeal and shall be non-adversarial in nature. Its purpose is to allow the faculty member an opportunity to persuade the Committee to change the recommendation of nonrenewal by challenging the stated reasons and/or by offering additional evidence. The burden of proof is on the faculty member requesting the reconsideration. Subsequent to hearing the facts, the Department will dismiss the appellant from the hearing room chambers and will render its final decision on the appeal. (cf. Faculty Personnel Rules UWS 3.06-3.11 and UWL 3.06-3.08; and UWL Employee Handbook). The faculty member may appeal a negative reconsideration decision. Such an appeal must be filed, in writing, with the University Hearing Committee within twenty calendar days of notice that the result of the reconsideration has affirmed the nonrenewal decision.

B. Tenure review and departmental tenure criteria

The basic rules regarding retention and tenure are described in the Faculty Personnel Rules (UWS 3.06 - 3.11 and UWL 3.06 - 3.08).

The granting of academic tenure represents a long-term commitment of institutional resources, which requires proof of excellence in past performance and a forecast that an individual faculty member's intellectual vitality and future contributions will continue to be of high quality for the duration of their employment. Non-tenured instructors should not expect an award of tenure solely on the fact that their contracts have been consistently renewed; however, the procedures for making tenure decisions and recommendations for probationary faculty parallel procedures for retention and are based on the body of work evidenced during the individual's time in rank. Tenure will be granted with a [2/3][simple] majority vote by tenured faculty. In cases where there are fewer than three tenured faculty members, the process listed above under 1.a. Promotion, Retention and Tenure Committee membership shall apply.

1. **Procedure-Tenure**

The process for the tenure review is the same as the retention review listed above. The decision to recommend a faculty member for tenure in the Department is based on an appraisal of the candidate's overall contribution from their date of hire at UWL in a tenure-track position.

2. **Criteria-Tenure** The following stated criteria for tenure are guidelines to establish minimum performance in each category. As these are minimum criteria, the achievement of the minimum in each category will not be considered sufficient for tenure or reappointment. Performance well above the minimum level is expected in one or more of the three categories to be evaluated. In order to obtain a recommendation for granting tenure, the faculty member's performance must be judged satisfactory and must show potential for continued professional growth. Performance criteria are stated below and detailed in the related appendices. The members of the Promotion, Retention and Tenure Committee shall use the UWL electronic portfolio system retention file information and the accompanying narrative to judge each probationary faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Overall, workload in the three areas of responsibility is weighted- 50% teaching, 30% scholarship, and 20% service. Minimal standards for tenure are described below:
    a. Teaching: For tenure, candidates will need to demonstrate strong evidence of a steady pattern of high-quality teaching, professional development as a teacher, and professional competence as a teacher. Teaching effectiveness should be observed and measured by multiple methods. Recognition for teaching includes not only student feedback on instruction results, but also a record of personal teaching assessment, developmental opportunities, and peer evaluations. Probationary faculty members should provide clear, compelling, and outcome-based evidence of their growth and success as a teacher. The Department encourages faculty members to contribute to the existing curriculum as well as develop new courses as appropriate. Innovative assignments, teaching strategies, and improvements will be acknowledged. Faculty members seeking tenure are expected to meet and EXCEED the criteria outlined in the Department's Statement on Teaching (Appendix C).
    b. Scholarship: The Department expects that successful candidates for tenure have a record of ongoing scholarly activity that meets and EXCEEDS the UWL CBA Scholarship & Practitioner Productivity Guidelines & Faculty Qualifications (Appendix A). See Appendix A for the Department's Statement on Scholarship. Candidates for tenure shall provide a report on research/scholarship that should detail the candidate's progress in developing and carrying out a research agenda and state the candidate's professional goals in this arena.
    c. Service: Candidates for tenure shall provide a report on service that should detail the candidate's accomplishments and professional goals in this arena. For tenure, the Department expects service to the Department, including regular attendance at departmental and relevant committee meetings, active participation in departmental program

assessment, attendance at a minimum of one UWL graduation ceremony per year, and on-going contributions to the college, university, and/or community. See Appendix B for the Department's Statement on Service.

3. **Appeal Process-Tenure** Anyone wishing to appeal a Department tenure decision is required to submit a written petition to the Chairperson of the Department carefully detailing the basis on which this appeal is being made. This appeal must be filed with the chairperson within 14 calendar days of the notification of the contested tenure decision. The Department will then hold a special closed session hearing to review all evidence pertinent to this petition in the presence of the appellant. The faculty member may make a personal presentation at the reconsideration meeting. Both the Committee and the faculty member may choose up to two members of the university community to be present also. These third parties may question either of the other parties and make comments to them. These third parties also shall file a report of the reconsideration meeting with the Committee 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. At the meeting for reconsideration, the faculty member is entitled to present documentary evidence. The reconsideration is neither a hearing nor an appeal and shall be non-adversarial in nature. Its purpose is to allow the faculty member an opportunity to persuade the Committee to change the recommendation of nonrenewal by challenging the stated reasons and/or by offering additional evidence. The burden of proof is on the faculty member requesting the reconsideration. Subsequent to hearing the facts, the Department will dismiss the appellant from the hearing room chambers and will render its final decision on the appeal. (cf. Faculty Personnel Rules UWS 3.06-3.11 and UWL 3.06-3.08; and UWL Employee Handbook)

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

   Anyone wishing to appeal a Department tenure decision is required to submit a written petition to the Chairperson of the Department carefully detailing the basis on which this appeal is being made. This appeal must be filed with the chairperson within 14 calendar days of the notification of the contested retention/ tenure decision. The Department will then hold a special closed session hearing to review all evidence pertinent to this petition in the presence of the appellant. Subsequent to hearing the facts, the Department will dismiss the appellant from the hearing room chambers and will render its final decision on the appeal. (cf. Faculty Personnel Rules UWS 3.06-3.11 and UWL 3.06-3.08; and UWL Employee Handbook)

C. Post-tenure Review

In accordance to UW system requirements, tenured faculty will be reviewed according to their five-year cycle. The department recognizes that faculty work post-tenure may be quite different from work done pre-tenure. For example, post-tenure faculty may explore "risky" or emerging directions of scholarship. When reviewing post tenure activities the department and post tenure review committee will recognize these differences. The procedure for post tenure review is located at https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/post-tenure-review-policy/

Retention Criteria. In order to obtain a recommendation for reappointment, the faculty member's performance must be judged to be meeting department expectations for a tenured faculty member. Performance criteria are stated and detailed below. The members of the Post Tenure Review Committee shall use the electronic portfolio to judge each faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Overall, workload in the three areas of responsibility is weighted- 50% teaching, 30% scholarship, and 20% service. Minimal standards are described below:

i. ***Teaching:*** Faculty recommended for post tenure retention will show evidence that they are meeting satisfactory contributions for post tenure teaching. Satisfactory contributions include any of the following: (e.g., evidence of satisfactory teaching such as satisfactory student feedback on instruction results and/or peer evaluations of teaching, keeping up-to-date in the field, holding regular office hours). See appendix C for the Department's Statement on Teaching.

ii. ***Scholarship*:** Faculty recommended for post tenure retention will show evidence that they are meeting satisfactory contributions for post tenure scholarship. Satisfactory contributions include any of the following: (e.g., adhering to CBA Scholarly productivity guidelines, attendance at conferences, making presentations, publications, sustained scholarly progress, mentoring undergraduate/graduate research, submitting grants, etc.…. additional examples can be found in Appendix A.

iii. ***Service:*** Faculty recommended for post tenure retention will show evidence that they are meeting satisfactory contributions for post tenure service. Satisfactory contributions include participation in any of the following service areas: (departmental, college, university, community, professional). See Appendix B for the Department's Statement on Service.

Scoring. Based on the retention criteria, each Post Tenure Review Committee member will assign an overall evaluation to each individual using the Post Tenure Review Evaluation Form (Appendix H). The overall evaluation score is based on the teaching, research and service expectations of the department. The possible overall evaluations that can be assigned are: "Meeting" or "Not-Meeting", department expectations.

The faculty member will be assigned the highest overall score (Meeting or Not-Meeting) given by one half or more (simple majority) by the Post Tenure Review Committee.

All procedures for notification and action plans will follow the UWL PTR policy located at https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/post-tenure-review-policy/

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

Promotion is a privilege based upon qualifications exceeding established minimal criteria and is recommended by an informed collective peer judgment.

The department will follow the guidelines and schedules regarding faculty promotion available at http://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Faculty-Promotion-Resources/. The Department promotion procedures are designed to facilitate the implementation of the guidelines outlined in the UWL Employee Handbook.

Promotion Committee Membership. The Department PRT Committee will consist of a minimum of three members at associate or higher level with at least one member from the IS department. In the event that there are fewer than three IS faculty members at the current level or above the rank that the candidate is seeking, the Department Chair will solicit additional UWL faculty members to serve a one-year term (with the possibility of renewal) on the retention committee at the rank the candidate is seeking, so that the committee has a minimum of three UWL faculty members at the appropriate rank. The number of additional faculty members nominated will be N+1 where N represents the number of outside committee members needed to form a committee of at least three members. The candidate(s) under review will be allowed to review the committee member candidate pool and remove one or zero potential committee members from consideration at their discretion.

Candidacy. Subsequent to the call of the Vice Chancellor/HR, the Department shall establish a review date and inform all probationary faculty with at least 20 calendar days' notice to prepare a set of materials describing performance in the areas of: teaching; scholarly and research activity (see Department Statement on Scholarly Activity) and; department, university, community, and professional service. The date, time, and place of the meeting shall be conducted in compliance with the Wisconsin Open Meeting Rule.

1. **Promotion Procedure**
   a. Before the end of spring semester, a list of faculty who meet the minimum university eligibility requirements for promotion in the coming academic year are distributed by the Human Resources Office to department chairs. The Department Chair will review this list for accuracy. At this time, the Department Chair will notify the faculty members of their eligibility.
   b. Subsequent to the Chair receiving notification from the Vice Chancellor/Human Resources of a candidate's eligibility for promotion in rank, candidates will be informed in writing by the Chair of eligibility at least 20 calendar days prior to the scheduled and publicized promotion review meeting. The date and time for the promotion review meeting is set by the Department with enough time allocated to go through the review

process and any potential appeals prior to the deadline for submitting materials to the Dean.

c. Faculty who are eligible and wish to be considered for promotion must submit a completed Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report as outlined by the Joint Promotion Committee using the electronic portfolio process. The report is submitted to the Department Chair at least seven calendar days prior to the scheduled date of the departmental promotion consideration meeting.

2. **Recommendation/Decision**

a. The Department Chair will make the promotion materials and the candidate's merit and student evaluation information available for review by all faculty eligible to vote on the promotion question at least seven calendar days in advance of the departmental promotion consideration meeting. The promotion candidate may make an oral presentation at the departmental promotion consideration meeting prior to the meeting going into closed session. The requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meeting law shall apply to this meeting.

b. After having a discussion of a candidate's performance with respect to the criteria specified below, votes will be cast on a separate motion to promote each candidate. Voting eligibility in all promotion considerations shall be restricted to faculty of the same or higher academic rank as the promotion rank in which the candidate is seeking. At least a two-thirds majority of eligible voting members present is necessary for a positive promotion recommendation. The results of the vote will be recorded and entered in the appropriate portion of the Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report form.

3. Notification of Decision

a. Within two calendar days of the promotion consideration meeting, the Department Chair will orally notify each candidate of the Department's recommendation. For positive recommendations, the members of the PRT Committee who have volunteered to write the Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report will do so within seven calendar days as required. A draft of the letter will be sent to all voting members of the PRT for review. The Department Chair may also include a separate letter to provide further clarification of candidate materials if they wish to do so. A copy of the promotion letter(s) will be provided to the candidate at least one day prior to the submission of the promotion file to the dean. All candidates should understand clearly that eligibility status, Department, and CBA recommendations do not assure or imply that a positive promotion decision will be made by the Joint Promotion Committee.

b. In cases of a negative decision by the Committee, a written report including the numerical vote and the reasons for the negative decision will be prepared by the Committee and transmitted to the candidate within seven calendar days of the promotion consideration meeting.

c. If approved by the PRT Committee, the Department Chair will transmit the vote and the letter from the PRT committee to the Dean following the most current

JPC guidelines.

d. JPC requires that a faculty member who has had reassigned time to fulfill a position outside the expectations of a standard faculty member (e.g. Department Chair, director of a center or program, etc.) must provide two related documents in their promotion report:
e. One or more letters from their supervisor(s) (e.g. Department Chair, Dean, etc.) that outlines their job description with respect to each reassigned time appointment.
f. Documentation that illustrates their level of success in the role fulfilled by the appointment, such as performance reviews or other data that show how the aims of the appointment are being met. The candidate is responsible for uploading these documents in their promotion report.

4. **Promotion Criteria**

To be considered for promotion to a higher rank, faculty must meet the minimum University criteria as stated in the UWL Staff Handbook.

a. For the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must provide evidence of teaching excellence, the establishment of a program of scholarship, and be engaged in service at the department and college or university levels. Evidence of teaching excellence, scholarship, and service will be consistent with the Department's definitions of scholarship (see Appendix A), service (see Appendix B) and, teaching (see Appendix C).
b. To be promoted to the rank of Professor, a faculty member must be well respected within the department for excellence in teaching and as someone who has taken a leadership role in enhancing the curriculum in the department. The faculty member has a significant and continuing program of peer-reviewed scholarship. The faculty member provides strong leadership in department service and is well respected at the school or college level for university service. In addition, professional and expertise-based community service will be considered positively. Evidence of teaching excellence, scholarship, and service will be consistent with the department's definitions of scholarship (see Appendix A), service (see Appendix B) and, teaching (see Appendix C).

5. **Reconsideration and Appeal-Promotion**

a. After receiving the Chair's notification, the promotion candidate will have 14 calendar days to request reconsideration by the PRT Committee. Written notice of the reconsideration decision will be transmitted to the candidate and the Dean within seven (7) calendar days.
b. Each promotion candidate has the right to appeal the Department's reconsideration decision to the Complaints, Grievance, Appeals, and Academic Freedom (CGAAF) Committee. Rules and procedures for filing a grievance are specified in UW-System 6.02 and UWL 6.02. The CGAAF Committee shall forward its recommendation to the chancellor (see UW-System 6.02).Written notice of the reconsideration decision will be transmitted to the candidate and the Dean within seven (7) calendar days.

VI. Instructional Academic Staff Review

A. Annual Review. In accordance with Faculty Personnel rule UWL 10.06, instructional academic staff will be evaluated annually. https://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Unclassified-Personnel-Rules/

These bylaws establish the Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Review Committee and describe the procedures and criteria used for the annual review of Instructional Academic Staff. This annual review will also serve as a merit evaluation for all IAS.

1. Instructional Academic Staff Review Committee

a. Annual reviews of Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) will be conducted by the IAS Review Committee or department chair at the discretion of the IAS. The Committee will include the department chair, a mutually agreed upon IAS member, and a mutually agreed upon tenure-track faculty member. If another IAS member is not available, a mutually agreed tenure track faculty member will replace the IAS member. All Committee members will have equal weight in the final evaluation.

b. Members of the IAS Review Committee may be from outside of the department due to limitations in the size and/or the composition of the staff within the department.

c. IAS members of the IAS Review Committee will be at a rank higher than that of the person being reviewed and will also have more years of service. Tenure-track faculty members will be at a rank of Associate Professor or higher.

2. Evaluation Process

a. At least 20 calendar days prior to the review, the department chair will give written notice of the review.

b. Following receipt of this notice the department chair and IAS member will mutually agree upon the composition of the IAS Review Committee.

c. Prior to the review, IAS under review will provide the department chair with an electronic portfolio containing information on their teaching, professional development/creative activity/scholarship, and service activities for the prior academic year ending June 1. Hyperlinked syllabi are required and the IAS member may provide additional evidence if they so desire. For example, in order to enhance the evaluation of effective teaching beyond the measure of student feedback on instruction results and classroom peer observations, an IAS member may choose to include in their

electronic portfolio information on the pedagogical devices that were used to measure course, Department, and/or CBA learning outcomes. These devices can include, but are not limited to, assignments, quizzes, exams, or projects in whole or in part, and should be accompanied by assessment evidence, samples of student work, and/or reflective commentary to aid the Committee.

d. All annual reviews of IAS will be completed before October 1 for the prior academic year.

3. Evaluation Criteria

a. The criteria (Appendix F) used by the Committee to evaluate an IAS member's annual performance are designed to promote excellence in teaching and meaningful professional development/creative activity/scholarship and service activities. IAS are expected to devote 75% of their time and effort to teaching and 25% to professional development/creative activity/scholarship and service unless otherwise reallocated in advance by the Department Chair. Review of IAS in each of these areas by the Committee will be weighed accordingly.

In addition, all IAS are expected to meet the standards of professional qualification according to the guidelines set by AACSB and the College of Business Administration. These requirements can be found at: http://www.uwlax.edu/uploadedFiles/Academics/Colleges_Schools/College_of_Business_Administration/UWL%20CBA%20Scholarly%20Productivity%20-%20May%2015,%202014%20-%20Approved-1.pdf

b. Merit Ratings

Merit ratings of Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) will be conducted by the IAS Review Committee or department chair at the discretion of the IAS. The Committee will include the department chair, a mutually agreed upon IAS member, and a mutually agreed upon tenure-track faculty member. If another IAS member is not available, a mutually agreed tenure track faculty member will replace the IAS member. All Committee members will have equal weight in the final evaluation.

Instructional Academic Staff in permanent budgeted instructional lines greater than 50% shall be evaluated annually for merit, and the distribution of any merit salary dollars shall be based upon this annual evaluation and on whether the position generates merit dollars. Merit reviews reflect activities during the prior academic year ending June 1. See Appendix G for evaluation criteria.

a. Merit Review Procedures. Early in the fall semester, the Merit Committee Chair or department chair will initiate the merit process. This includes sending out a written notification to all eligible IAS who should be considered eligible for merit. The notification should include Merit Guidelines and a request for the Annual Activity Report. Once all Annual Activity Reports are received, the Merit Committee Chair or department chair will send out the Merit Evaluation Form (Appendix G) and all documents to the Committee members (Annual Activity Reports, student feedback on instruction results, and any other supporting documents that will be used in evaluation). Each ranked faculty member will be responsible for preparing and submitting the documents used for Merit Evaluation to the Merit Committee Chair. The committee member will submit the Merit Evaluation Form back to the Merit Committee Chair for scoring. The committee will meet to discuss the scores assigned by the other committee members. Each member of the committee will then have the opportunity to modify merit scores assigned for each faculty

b. Scoring. Based on the merit definitions identified below, each Merit Committee member will assign an overall evaluation to each individual using the Merit Evaluation Form. The overall merit evaluation score is based on the teaching, and service expectations of the department. The possible overall evaluations that can be assigned are: "Not-Meritorious," "Meritorious", and "Extra Meritorious".

In the overall category, the faculty member will be assigned the highest overall score (Not-Meritorious, Meritorious, or Extra Meritorious) given by one half or more (simple majority) of his or her colleagues. Extra Meritorious will be assigned to any individual who receives an "extra merit" rating by at least two-thirds of his or her colleagues in two of the three categories.

Within seven calendar days of completion of the reviews, the Merit Committee Chair shall notify each faculty member, in writing, of the results of overall annual merit ratings (not-meritorious, meritorious or extraordinary merit).

Faculty members who are on professional leave are expected to submit a completed annual activity report by June 1 describing their leave and other professional activities.

c. Merit Ratings

Meritorious. A meritorious designation denotes satisfactory performance related to a faculty member's responsibilities and expectations. To receive a meritorious designation, faculty members

must perform their Teaching responsibilities at a satisfactory level (Appendix C), as determined by students and peers, meet, and meet Department Service responsibilities (Appendix B). All faculty members shall be notified of their meritorious designation. Those persons not receiving a meritorious designation shall be notified, in writing, of the reasons for this action.

Faculty members qualifying for merit will receive the state-allotted meritorious performance funding. Faculty on approved leave shall be considered for merit and may be considered for extra merit.

Extra Merit. Extra merit recognizes the need to differentially reward faculty for levels of performance and individual accomplishments that exceed the expectations of the department. Extra Meritorious will be assigned to any individual who receives an "extra merit" rating by at least two-thirds of his or her colleagues in two of the three categories. Examples of Extra Merit activities for Teaching may include: exemplary teaching accomplishments, new curriculum development, high student feedback on instruction results, innovations in curriculum, grants to support teaching improvement, teaching awards. Examples of Extra Merit activities for Service may include: service leadership positions, notable service contributions to UWL, the CBA, the department, the profession, or the public. All faculty members shall be notified of their assigned extra merit ratings, along with the numbers of Department members in each merit category.

4. Transmission Process

a. A letter summarizing the results of this review along with any necessary supporting documentation will be submitted to the Dean's office on or before October 1. This letter will also contain a merit evaluation for the prior academic year.

b. The Dean's Office will forward the results of the annual review to Human Resources.

B. IAS Promotion Procedures. Policies and procedures guiding promotion for IAS are available at http://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/IAS-promotion-resources/

1. Eligibility. Only IAS in Redbook positions are eligible for promotion. This includes individuals in Growth, Quality, and Access lines.

2. Promotion Process

a. To be considered for promotion, IAS must submit their Promotion Portfolio to the department chair on or before October 15th.

b. The IAS Review Committee will review the promotion portfolio. If approved by the Committee, the department chair will provide a letter of support for the promotion candidate to the University IAS Promotion Committee. In cases of a negative decision by the Committee, a written report explaining the reasons for the negative decision will be prepared by the Committee and transmitted to the candidate within seven calendar days of the promotion consideration meeting.

3. Promotion Criteria

a. To be considered and recommended for promotion, a candidate must exhibit excellence in teaching and be engaged in professional development/creative activity/ scholarship, and service.

b. Professional development activities may include, but are not limited to, those activities that can be shown to relate to the IAS teaching or service responsibilities, such as participation in workshops, institutes, seminars, graduate courses, participation in professional organizations, attendance at professional meetings, and professional certification.

c. Creative activities and scholarship include, but are not limited to, articles, books, and book reviews submitted and/or accepted by refereed and/or non-refereed journals, papers presented at professional programs, research grant applications and funding, as well as working papers and research in progress.

d. Service activities fall into two categories, professional service and university service. Professional service activities to be considered include, but are not limited to:

i. Participation as discussant or chair at professional conferences

ii. Offices held in community organizations in a professional capacity

iii. Speeches and workshops conducted

iv. Consulting

v. Participation in University outreach programs

vi. Membership in organizations in a professional capacity

vii. Honors and awards

University service activities to be considered include, but are not limited to:

i. University committees

ii. College committees

iii. Department committees

iv. Advisor to campus groups

v. Developing library resources

vi. Other services to university programs

4. Reconsideration and Appeal Process

a. After receiving the Chair's notification, the promotion candidate will have 14 calendar days to request reconsideration by the IAS Review Committee. Written notice of the reconsideration decision will be transmitted to the candidate and the Dean within seven (7) calendar days.

b. Each promotion candidate has the right to appeal the Committee's reconsideration decision to the Complaints, Grievance, Appeals, and Academic Freedom (CGAAF) Committee. Rules and procedures for filing a grievance are specified in UW-System 6.02 and UWL 6.02.

C. Appeal Procedures re: Annual Review

1. The signature of an IAS member on the annual review evaluation prepared by the department chair indicates that the review has occurred and that the form and/or letter represents the feedback that has been discussed with the IAS member under review.

2. If the IAS member has concerns about the factual veracity of the review he/she should discuss these concerns with the department chair prior to signing the document in the event the disagreement can be resolved.

3. Should the review remain as originally stated an IAS member may provide a written statement regarding concerns about the review to the Dean within 20

calendar days of when the review took place. This written statement will be forwarded to Human Resources with the annual review evaluation.

4. An appeal beyond the department level may also be presented to the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals and Academic Freedom (CGAAF) Committee (see Section II.G. of the Faculty Senate Bylaws). As in all processes involving the evaluation of personnel, mechanisms for annual review or merit evaluation appeals beyond the department level are established on this campus. Your attention is directed to the UW-System Administrative Code, the UWL Unclassified Personnel Rules, and the UWL Faculty Handbook.

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

A. Annual Review. In accordance with Faculty Personnel rule UWL 10.06 academic staff will be evaluated annually.http://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Performance-appraisals/. Performance appraisals of non-instructional academic staff (NIAS) are due to Human Resources from the Dean's office no later than July 31.

VIII. Governance

A. Department Chair

A. Department Chair. The Department will adhere to the selection and duties of the Chair that are delineated in the Faculty Senate Policies (revised 2008) under the heading "IV. Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons," "V. The Selection of Department Chairpersons," and "VI. Remuneration of Department Chairpersons." In addition, references to chair-related duties are indicated in the Employee Handbook

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

In brief, the procedures for electing the Department Chair are as follows: 1) elections shall be held during the month of February; 2) the Dean shall send nominating ballots, containing the names of all members of the Department eligible to serve as chair to each member of the Department eligible to vote; 3) each person receiving a ballot shall nominate one person and return it to the Dean, who shall tabulate the results; 4) the Dean shall determine whether or not the two persons

receiving the highest number of nominations are willing to serve if elected; however, if one person has received nominations from sixty percent, or more, of the eligible voters, that person shall be declared elected; 5) if a Department Chair has not been selected in the nomination balloting, the Dean shall place the names of the two persons receiving the highest number of nominations on a ballot and send it to the eligible voters for an election; 6) each person receiving the ballot shall vote for one person and return it to the Dean; 7) the Dean shall tabulate the results of the election and submit the name of the nominee receiving the most votes as the chair-elect to the provost/vice chancellor for approval, who in turn, shall submit it to the chancellor for approval. If approval is not given, the Dean shall conduct another election under the provisions of this policy.

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

3. **Department Chair Annual Review.** The department chair should be evaluated annually by all departmental personnel using the criteria administered by the CBA Deans Office.

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

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; Promotion, Retention and Tenure Committee; and By-law Committee. Tenured and tenure-track faculty make up the Merit committee. Tenured and tenure-track faculty, along with the most senior full-time IAS member in the department based on years of service, make up the By-law Committee. Tenured faculty make up the Promotion, Retention and Tenure committee. All faculty, including full-time instructional staff in the Information Systems department, make up the Curriculum Committee. Other responsibilities, as assigned by the chair of the department, include search and screen committees, library liaison, Information Systems Student Group advisor, and assessment, to mention only a few.

Standing committees within the College of Business Administration requiring representation by Information Systems faculty or instructional academic staff: CBA Undergraduate Curriculum Committee; International Business Advisory Committee and CBA Scholarship Committee; Assurance of Learning Committee.

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

A senior level faculty member(s) will be responsible for coordinating and reporting programmatic assessment as requested by the department chair. In order to assist the CBA in providing assurance of learning with respect to CBA learning goals, the department will work to assure consistency in CBA core courses that are housed within the department and participate in assurance of learning assessment efforts within these courses. In addition, the department will take part in the CBA's biennial assessment to measure competency in the major using department learning goals. The Curriculum Committee will be responsible for responding to the assessment results and, based on the results, will make recommendations to the department.

D. Additional departmental policies

1. Salary Equity. Faculty who believe they are entitled to an equity adjustment, for example in cases involving (a) recent acquisition of a Ph.D.; (b) gender or racial inequity; and/or (c) "inversion" and "compression," may ask the Department Chair to consider recommending a salary equity adjustment to the Dean. 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 Department Chair shall have the right to appeal the decision of the Department Chair to the tenured members of the faculty. The Department Chair shall supply the tenured faculty data on salaries and will forward their recommendation to the Dean.

2. FMLA, Sick Leave and Vacation. Department members will account for sick leave in adherence to the most current UW-System guidelines. For unclassified staff, twelve-month employees garner vacation time, nine-month employees do not. The department will follow University FMLA policy. Procedures can be found at: https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/benefits/family--medical-leave-act/

3. Faculty Leaves. The Department encourages its members to seek leaves for sabbaticals, faculty development, scholarship, service, and other leaves that support the Department's mission. In addition, faculty members may seek leaves for medical and other reasons. The CBA has established sabbatical application and procedures, which can be found at http://www.uwlax.edu/uploadedFiles/Academics/Colleges_Schools/College_of_Business_Administration/CBA%20Sabbatical.pdf

4. Emeritus Status. The Department may nominate qualified Ranked Faculty and IAS members to the Chancellor for designation as emeriti. Committee members

at the rank or higher of the qualified member, participate in the nomination process. These nominations shall be forwarded to the Dean for endorsement prior to their submission to the Chancellor.

5. Travel Allocation Policy. In support of Department members' pursuit of professional development or enrichment, the Department budget contains funds for expenses incurred during travel to conferences, seminars or other professional activities. The department chair will allocate travel funds in consultation with faculty.

6. Intersession and Overloads Scheduling. Intersession an Overloads scheduling and staffing refers to the following: Spring, Fall, J-Term and Summer sessions. The goal of the Information Systems Department regarding intersession and overload teaching loads is to provide teaching opportunities to all ranked faculty whenever possible and to serve the needs of the students. The intersession and overload class schedule, developed by the Department chair, should be based on the academic strengths and teaching preferences of the involved ranked faculty in conjunction with the historical "drawing power" of each class. The Department Chair will make teaching assignments based on contractual requirements, retirement circumstances, and CBA Scholarly Productivity Guidelines. Compensation received from outside sources of funding shall NOT be included in the consideration of undergraduate course assignments. Remuneration is based on College of Business guidelines that specify a level of compensation in fixed dollar terms based on the number of enrolled students. Summer and Winter Intersession teaching and all overloads is subject to funding and student needs.

1. Eligibility
    a. Only full-time, tenure track faculty (ranked faculty) members with terminal degrees in information systems are eligible to share in the intersession and overload allocations. Any faculty not currently meeting CBA Scholarly Productivity Guidelines or deemed in danger by the chair to not meet CBA Scholarly Productivity Guidelines within the next year will not be eligible for intersession and overload teaching. Newly hired faculty receiving summer startup support are not eligible for intersession teaching.
    b. Ranked faculty members granted a two or more consecutive semester unpaid leave are not eligible for a department intersession and overload allocation in the state fiscal year(s) for which the leave is granted.
2. Class Schedule
    a. The department chair will establish the intersession and overload schedule to meet student demand.
    b. The chair will put out a call for interest in intersession and overload teaching, and any other needed overload courses each year.
    c. If the supply of ranked faculty wishing to teach exceeds the available courses, then the courses shall be allocated to faculty using the following criteria in order:

i) preference will be to comply with any college/university requirements
ii) preference will be given to faculty members in reverse order of length of time since last having taught summer, J term and/or an overload course.
iii) After announcing his/her intended retirement date, a faculty member will be given his/her first choice for a maximum of three courses in Spring, Fall, J-term and or Summer sessions. If the faculty member does not retire by the announced date, s/he will given last preference for 3 years.
iv) preference will be given to the faculty member with seniority.
d. Unfilled Positions
i) If courses remain, the chair may seek other instructors, first inside and then outside of the department, to teach needed classes.

7. Program Revenue Distribution and Funds

Any program revenue funds received by the IS department will be allocated at the discretion of the Department Chair. The Department Chair will make allocation decisions based on growth and development opportunities for the department. The use of program revenue funds is directed by UWL policy. Example uses include: travel, technology or scholarly activities. Priority for funding will be given to full-time, tenure track faculty (ranked faculty) members with terminal degrees in information systems.

8. Cancellation of Class and Notification

Faculty must notify both the department chair and ADA when the faculty member cancels a class. The department chair and ADA should be emailed in advance of any classes being cancelled or at a minimum the day of any class cancellation. Faculty members do not need to notify the department chair or ADA on days where the University is closed.

IX. Search and Screen Procedures

The department will follow hiring procedures prescribed by the University's Office of Human Resources (HR) in conjunction with AAOD and UW System and WI state regulations. It is the search and screen committees' responsibility for reviewing and adhering to university guidelines as reference in the links below.

A. Tenure-track faculty. The approved UWL tenure track faculty recruitment and hiring policy and procedures are found at http://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Recruitment/. Additionally, UWL's spousal/partner hiring policy can be found at http://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Spousal-and-partner-hiring/

B. Instructional Academic Staff. Hiring policy and procedures are found at http://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Recruitment/(same for IAS & NIAS)

C. Pool Search. Hiring policy and procedures are found at http://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Recruitment/

X. Student Rights and Obligations

A. Student Course- and Faculty-Related Concerns, Complaints, and Grievances

1. Informal Complaints

   If a student has a concern or a complaint about a faculty member or course, the general process for making informal complaints is outlined in steps 1-3 below. Students are welcome to bring a friend or a UWL staff member with them during the following steps. Students who report concerns/complaints/grievances, whether informally or formally, will be protected from retaliation and have the right to expect an investigation and the option to have regular updates on the investigation:

   a. The student should speak directly to the instructor.
   b. If the student is uncomfortable speaking with the instructor, or they are unsatisfied with the solution, they should go to the chair of the faculty member's home department.
   c. If the student is uncomfortable speaking with the department chair, or the chair is the faculty member in question the student should speak with their college dean.

   Depending on the specifics of the student's concern, it may be helpful for them to reach out to additional offices:

   - Complaints/concerns/grievances about grades, teaching performance, course requirements, course content, incivility, or professional ethics should follow the process outlined above. Students may also wish to seek support from the Student Life office.
   - Complaints/concerns/grievances related to hate/bias and discrimination may follow the process outlined above, and in addition or instead students may contact the Center for Transformative Justice and/or submit a bias incident report.
   - Complaints/concerns/grievances related to sexual misconduct may begin with the process outlined above but will need to also involve the Office of Title IX and Violence Prevention offices, and/or the Title IX Team. Students should know that faculty members are mandatory reporters of sexual misconduct, but that confidential resources are available to them.

2. Formal Complaints

If the student is unsatisfied with the solution of their informal complaint, they have the right to file a formal institutional complaint with the Student Life office, as described in the Student Handbook.

1. Grade Appeal Policy and Procedure Policy (approved 10/3/2024 by Faculty Senate)
   Enrolled students are afforded an opportunity to seek redress of perceived grievances concerning the assignment of final course grades by instructors. Grievances only will be considered for final course grades and must involve one or more of the following factors. 1. An error was made in grade computation.
   2. The grade was based on factors contrary to those stated in the course syllabus or a reasonable interpretation of it.
   3. The grade includes a penalty for actions involving the freedom of written or spoken classroom expression.
   4. The grade involved a breach of federal or state constitutional protections, laws, Universities of Wisconsin or UW-La Crosse policies.

   Preliminary Procedures
   - The student must attempt an informal resolution of the problem with the instructor no later than the 10th working day of the next regular semester (Fall/Spring). The instructor may require a written request from the student.
   - If the informal process with the instructor does not resolve the problem, the student should communicate, using their UWL email, with the Department Chair within five working days. The Chair may either attempt informal resolution of the problem or inform the student in writing of formal grievance policies within five working days. Communications from this point forward should use all parties' UWL email accounts.

   Formal Procedures
   1. Chair Procedures
      - If the Chair decides an informal resolution is inappropriate or unattainable, they should inform the student within five working days the student may request a formal review of the matter by the Department Grade Appeals Committee. This request must be received by the Chair within five working days of the notification of the failure of the attempt at mediation. The student's petition must be in writing and include the nature of the grievance and its basis from the four factors listed in the "Policy" section above, a brief description of the attempt at informal resolution, the desired outcome the student wishes, and all supporting evidence. The Chair will, within five working days, arrange for the engagement of the committee to hear the student's appeal.
      - At the same time, the Chair will acknowledge the student's petition and inform the course instructor. If the instructor, upon seeing the petition, wishes to respond, this must be done within five working days.

- Upon receipt of the student's petition and the potential response from the instructor, the Chair will convene the committee within five working days and deliver all written documents concerning the case, including a written account of the Chair's attempt at mediation, if applicable.

2. Grade Appeals Committee

- The Chairperson will then appoint a three-member ad hoc Appeals Committee to review this appeal. The members of this committee will be randomly selected from the Department excluding the instructor[s] teaching the course in which the appeal has been made.
- The committee will review the materials presented, including the student petition and other evidence provided by the instructor or Chair. It may ask for clarifying information from either the student or the instructor via written inquiry and may call for an oral presentation from either. Each person will be given an opportunity to respond if further evidence is presented to the committee.
- Following review and consideration of the evidence, the committee will render a formal recommendation and communicate that recommendation to the Chair and the instructor within ten days of the committee's first meeting. The report will include the committee's findings of fact, its recommendation, and its rationale for the recommendation.
- Unless they are no longer a UWL instructor, the course instructor retains the right to accept or reject the recommendations of the Department Grade Appeals Committee. If the instructor is no longer a UWL instructor, the Chair (or their designee) will assume the instructor's role. The instructor's decision at the end of this process will be considered final with no further appeal possible.

3. Further Action

- Grievances related to course grades cannot be appealed except through the instructor and the department procedures described above. The assignment of final course grades involves the professional judgment of qualified instructors in a particular field of study. Administrative officers at the College or University level are assumed to not have relevant academic expertise and bear no responsibility for the determination of course grades.
- If the student believes the grade appeal process, stated in the by-laws, was not appropriately followed they can pursue a grievance through the Office of Student Life. However, an appeal to the Office of Student Life cannot involve the department or instructor's decision on the grade.

Conditions

- At all review levels the burden of proof is the student's responsibility.
- The term "working days" refers to days when classes are scheduled.
- Grievance petitions must be individually filed.

B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct
Faculty and staff are expected to report academic misconduct per Chapter 14 of the UW System code. The Office of Student Life provides guidance and assistance. Academic and nonacademic misconduct policies are referenced in the student handbook: https://www.uwlax.edu/student-life/student-resources/student-handbook/

C. Advising Policy. Each student majoring in will be assigned a faculty advisor. Student requests for a particular faculty member advisor will generally be honored whenever it is feasible to do so. Students are expected to meet with their faculty advisor at least once each semester to discuss their academic progress, career interests, and course schedule. Faculty are expected to keep their posted office hours throughout the academic semester and are recommended to expand these hours during the times that students are scheduled for course registration.

XI. Other

A. Work-Life Balance Statement. In an attempt to help staff and faculty balance their work and personal lives, the Department will endeavor to schedule all meetings within the hours of 8:30 am and 5:00 P.M. Additionally, childcare and family care duties will be considered when setting class schedules if requested by the instructor.

B. Outside Employment Statement. Outside professional employment for faculty in the Department is acceptable and encouraged when it does not infringe upon the faculty member's primary obligation to the Department and the University. Outside work is defined as any work outside the parameters of the faculty member's job description within the Department. In the Department, outside work is likely to include consulting, paid scholarship, teaching activities and/or professionally unrelated activities. For outside employment to be acceptable it may not:

1. Involve such hours or such jobs that conflict with current position description.

2. Involve the use of Department personnel and/or resources.

3. Infringe on the reputation of the UWL Department. Concerns regarding the above are under the purview of the Department Chair and the Dean. Ongoing outside employment of 10+ hours per week during the academic semesters (within normal business hours) needs to be approved by the Department Chair and Dean.

C. Office Assignment Policy. The department chair's office is designated as 241 Wing Technology Center. Newly elected chairs may choose to either occupy that office or retain his/her current office.

Order of preference for all vacated faculty offices is determined by a set of criteria that is applied in the following order:

- Faculty hire date (as shown in official university records)
- Rank (used if two or more faculty have same hire date)
- Date of Rank (if two or more faculty have same hire date, same rank)
- Academic Staff Service (if two or more faculty have same faculty hire date, same rank, same date of rank, number of full-time equivalent years of service as Academic Staff is used to determine seniority)

D. Reassigned positions other than chair (associate chairs, program directors, etc).

- Any reassigned positions involving course release will be considered by the PRT committee.
    - 3 year terms will be assigned.
    - Interested candidates will self-nominate by submitting a brief CV and a 1-2 page statement of interest and eligibility for the position according to the duties to the department chair.
- Any reassigned positions involving overload compensation are selected by the sponsoring college or program.

C. Approval of Faculty Leaves or Sabbaticals

The departmental chair will in consultation with department faculty is responsible for approving requests for leave or sabbatical and writing a letter of support or lack of support, given that the chair is responsible for aligning resources required to cover a leave. Sabbatical approval by the department may involve increased student enrollment to cover the loss of student seats associated with sabbatical approval. Department faculty should consider classroom impact when approving sabbatical leave. In the event the departmental chair is requesting leave, the request should be discussed with the CBA Dean and choice of designated chair for the leave period made in conjunction with the Dean. Approval and letter of support, or lack thereof, would fall to the designated chair for the leave period.

Appendix A.

Appendix A. Department Statement on Scholarship

The Department supports a broad view of scholarship that emphasizes keeping current in the discipline, acquiring and advancing knowledge, and incorporating new knowledge into teaching on a regular basis. The Department generally accepts the characterization of scholarly activity offered by the AACSB. While faculty may pursue research that leads to publication, there is an expectation that research and scholarship will be embedded in a commitment to translate and integrate new knowledge into effective teaching. Research has shown that such a broad definition is among the factors that characterize colleges where faculty are deeply committed to their work and enthusiastically support their institutions' distinctive missions (Rice & Austin, 1988).

The Department defines scholarship as any creative endeavor that results in significant contributions to the Department discipline within the areas of teaching, research, and professional service. Furthermore, in conjunction with the views of the University's Joint Promotion Committee, scholarly activities are further characterized as those having value to our discipline and, in most cases, having been subjected to external peer review.

Scholarly activity may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Basic and applied research
- New applications of existing knowledge
- Integration of knowledge
- Development and/or analysis of pedagogical methods

Expectations: The Department expects that successful candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion as well as for meritorious performance evaluations have a record of ongoing scholarly activity that EXCEEDS the CBA Scholarship & Practitioner Productivity Guidelines. The department generally categorizes scholarship into three areas.

Primary Areas of Scholarship are those that are highly competitive and subject to rigorous peer review by individuals or organizations external to the University. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- Publication of research manuscripts in scholarly, peer-reviewed journals
- Publication of textbooks or edited collections by recognized academic publishers (and/or chapters in textbooks or edited collections)
- Publication of popular press books on topics germane to the Department discipline (if peer reviewed).
- Publication of manuals, book reviews, technical reports, and laboratory manuals (if peer reviewed).
- Grants from federal, state, or private agencies, UWL or UW System research grants for research, equipment or innovative teaching methodologies.
- Publications regarding the scholarship of teaching and learning in peer-reviewed venues.

Secondary Areas of Scholarship are those that are subject to less rigorous peer review by individuals or organizations external to the University or are subject only to University peer review on campus. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- Invited presentations at professional meetings, conventions, conferences.
- UWL or UW System professional development grants or sabbaticals
- Publication of manuals, book reviews, technical reports, and laboratory manuals.
- Presentation of papers on creative or original work at professional meetings, conventions, or other colleges and universities.
- Original integrations of applied knowledge (non-peer reviewed presentations or publications) to practitioner audiences.
- Published or presented original research by an undergraduate or graduate students for which the faculty member was the primary advisor.

Tertiary Areas of Scholarship are those that are not subject to peer review. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- Participation in institutes, short courses, seminars, workshops, and professional meetings.
- Refereeing and reviewing original manuscripts.
- Aids undergraduate and/or graduate students' independent research projects and/or supervises students' involvement in the faculty member's program of research.
- Obtains recognition regionally, nationally, or internationally for recent, as well as past, contributions to a particular field of study by a variety of means (requests for reprints, invitations to read papers, citations of research, etc.).
- Engaging in self-study or a professional growth plan to enhance professional competence – including licensure.
- Presentations before on-campus or general audiences that require original preparation.
- Conducting a program assessment for an external organization.

Journal Rankings

The Information Systems Department will use the Australian Business Deans Council [ABDC] Journal list as its base list. There are over 177 journals with field of research (FoR) codes for Information Systems [806].

In the case of an article appearing in a peer reviewed journal not on the ABDC list, or not within the FoR codes the author, along with the department chair must agree on the quality and appropriateness of the journal. The additions will be approved semi-annually by the department.

The author is responsible for making the case for inclusion in the department list based on crosswalking the journal with the ABDC list. This could be achieved by using any of the following metrics to crosswalk the data:

Impact Factors

Social Sciences Citation Index
The AIS rank list

Appendix B. Department Statement on Service

The Department upholds the belief that a well-rounded academician is a teacher who also pursues scholastic and service activities. Theorists (such as Boyer, 1994) have argued that service is particularly important in higher education because colleges and universities need to respond to the challenges that confront society. In terms of how service relates to scholarship and teaching, Lynton (1996) suggests that these three components that comprise the triad of academic activity should be seen "as a continuum along which basic and applied research overlap and merge into application and related forms of outreach, which in turn almost inevitably include a formative component that melds into organized instruction (p. 17-18)."

When evaluating the work of faculty, the department particularly values service that can enhance the department and/or university, benefit the community, be incorporated back into the classroom and/or enhance scholarly activities. UWL gives more weight to service that is related to the candidate's professional discipline and the department is likely to weigh service work more heavily if the individual has played a key role on the committee or contributed heavily to an activity. Finally, evidence of the service work's links back to the classroom is particular encouraged (e.g., a practitioner's work serves to enhance class examples and case studies).
In defining service, the department considers the three traditional categories within service:

1. Professional service: involves the use of a faculty member's professional expertise in a service activity that may be internal or external to the University. This may include sharing professional expertise with one's professional organizations.

2. University service: involves work on committees, task forces, and special projects for the University, college and/or department.

3. Community service: involves applying the faculty member's professional expertise in a volunteer, civic or, community related capacity.

Examples of service (in alphabetical order):

- Chairperson, director and/or leadership activities in the Department, College, University or professional associations
- Community education on Department related topics
- Editorial service to professional journals
- Engage in peer review for retention, tenure, and post tenure review processes.
- Evaluating manuscripts for professional publications
- Membership on boards, commissions, task forces, projects and/or special assignments in

the college, university or university system

- Membership on departmental, college, university or professional association committees
- Office holding in professional associations
- Other contributions of clear value to the university, community and/or profession
- Professional consultant or advisor to boards, committees, commissions, task forces, community organizations and governmental agencies, or businesses
- Public speaking related to the faculty member's areas of professional expertise
- Social service to boards, committees, commissions, institutes, task forces, community agencies and organizations related to the faculty members' area(s) of expertise
- Writing guest editorials and granting media interviews in areas related to the faculty members' area(s) of expertise

Appendix C. Department Statement on Teaching

When evaluating the teaching work of faculty, the Department considers examples of teaching activity such as those enumerated below as the fundamental aspect of the work of a faculty member at UWL. While we recognize that different individuals have different talents and objectives within the classroom, we want our faculty to strive to articulate and achieve student learning outcomes. Furthermore, we see this process as ongoing and expect our faculty to continually examine their objectives and teaching strategies in this light.

Research has identified several components that make up effective teaching – five of which tend to be primary, overlapping and interrelated: enthusiasm, preparation & organization, ability to stimulate student thought and interest, clarity, and knowledge and love of the content (Gmelch & Miskin,1995). The Department recognizes that student evaluations of teachers may tap many of the above characteristics. However, student evaluations may or may not tap other important aspects of teaching - namely, student learning. As Weimer (1993) stated "a good teacher entails more than a decision to be enthusiastic, organized, clear, stimulating, and knowledgeable, it involves translating those abstract ingredients into tangible behaviors, polices and practices." (Weimer,1993). Consequently, the Department encourages our faculty to provide a wide portfolio of teaching materials in order to convey as many aspects of their courses as possible. Examples of teaching evidence are listed below:

1. Student evaluations: (with weight given to issues such as department averages, whether the course is required, the rigor of the course requirements, graduate or undergraduate students, grading curves, etc.).

2. Student commentary: (We require a colleague to summarize students' written commentary from a sampling of classes. We expect faculty to monitor persistent themes from these commentaries).

3. Syllabi (most effective when clearly linked to course objectives and goals – syllabi should be detail fully enough such that an outside reader could get good sense of the course content and process).

4. Class materials: examples of class activities, examinations, essays, projects, etc. (Material that might also be included in a teaching portfolio include: Statement of teaching responsibilities, including specific courses, and a brief description of the way each course was taught. A reflective statement by the professor describing personal teaching philosophy, strategies, and objectives. A personal statement by the professor describing teaching goals for the next five years. Self- evaluation by the professor. This would include not only a personal assessment of teaching-related activities but also an explanation of any contradictory or unclear documents or materials in the teaching materials.).

5. Additional descriptions of teaching involvement (e.g., Information about direction/supervision of honors projects, undergraduate research, graduate theses, and

research group activities. Contributing to, or editing, a professional journal on teaching in the professor's discipline.).

6. Description of steps taken to evaluate and improve one's teaching (e.g., changes resulting from self-evaluation, time spent reading journals on improving teaching, participation in seminars, workshops and professional meetings on improving teaching, and obtaining instructional development grants).

7. Description of curricular revisions or new course development (e.g. new course projects, materials, assignments or other activities).

8. Evidence of student learning (e.g., Student scores on professor-made or standardized tests, possibly before and after a course, as evidence of student learning. Student essays, creative work, field-work reports, laboratory workbooks or logs and student publications on course-related work. Information about the effect of the professor's courses on student career choices or help given by the professor to secure student employment. A record of students who succeed in advanced courses of study in the field. Statements by alumni on the quality of instruction. Student publications or conference presentations on course-related work. Examples of graded student essays showing excellent, average, and poor work along with the professor's comments as to why they were so graded.) This evidence is particularly important when clearly linked to stated course goals and objectives.

9. Outside validation (solicited and unsolicited letters of support, classroom visitations, videotape analysis, awards or recognitions, classroom group interviews, senior exit interviews).

10. Finally, as aforementioned, we expect each of our faculty to be active in advising which entails availability to students, knowledge of university policies and curricula and ongoing training in this arena.

*Material culled from Seldin (1991), Braskamp & Ory (1994), Centra (1993), and Boyer (1990).

Appendix D. Department Annual Peer Review of Teaching for Probationary Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff

All IAS at the rank of associate lecturer and probationary faculty in the Department receive peer evaluation and an observation in at least one class approximately every two academic years prior to IAS promotion/ranked-faculty tenure. The reviewee shall schedule a meeting with the reviewer prior to the class so that the goals of the class within the curriculum can be explained. The reviewee should schedule the review to take place at a time when teaching effectiveness can be most appropriately observed and evaluated. The reviewer should observe a class for the entire class period. The reviewer prepares a written evaluation (see below). The reviewer and reviewee meet to share and discuss the evaluation. The reviewer submits the written evaluation in electronic format to the Department Chair and to the reviewee for placement in the candidate's electronic portfolio.

A. Classroom Observation. A colleague visits the classroom. The probationary faculty member is responsible for initiating and setting up the classroom visit. The observer writes up a review that includes:

- A Review of the syllabus and course materials (including reading materials, laboratory materials, assessment etc.). Comment on these as applicable.
- Discuss with the instructor the objective(s) of this course and of the specific class to be observed, and how these will be met.
- Summarize your observations, taking into account, where relevant, the points listed below (items 1-4). Clearly, certain criteria will be more relevant to some classes than others. Address relevant criteria where appropriate. Be sure to include in your observation report: the name of the instructor being observed, the name and number of the course being observed, the date of the observation, and the name of the reviewer.
- Pay particular attention to what the instructor has done to enhance student learning (based on syllabus, discussions, and/or classroom performance).
- Make any specific suggestions for improving the class and/or the instructor's teaching (this is important as it will provide guidance for further growth and improvement in the instructor's teaching development).
- In your discussion of the above points, consider the following:

1. Clarity and Content. Comment on the instructor's knowledge of the material, intellectual challenge to students, explanation of relevant terms and concepts, points covered in relation to class and course objectives.

- Are the instructor's statements accurate according to the standards of the field?
- Does the instructor incorporate current research in the field?
- Does the instructor identify sources, perspectives, and authorities in the field?
- Does the instructor communicate the reasoning behind concepts?
- Does the instructor define new terms or concepts?
- Does the instructor elaborate or repeat complex information?
- Does the instructor use relevant examples to explain content?

- Does the instructor pause during explanation to allow students to ask questions?
- Is the instructor's content culturally sensitive and/or diverse?

2. Organization. Comment on preparedness for class and presentation of material in an understandable way.

- Does the instructor arrive to class on time?
- Does the instructor state the relation of the class to the previous one?
- Does the instructor know how to use the educational technology needed for the class?
- Does the instructor make transitional statements between class segments?
- Does the instructor convey the purpose of each class activity?
- Does the instructor summarize periodically and at the end of class?
- Is the class structured to meet its objectives?

3. Variety and Pace. Comment on the instructor's clarity and audibility of presentation, use of technology, use of active learning activities (such as demonstrations, student presentations, group activities/discussion).

- Does the instructor vary the volume, tone, and pitch of voice for emphasis and interest?
- Does the instructor avoid extended reading from notes or text?
- Does the instructor speak at a pace that allows students to take notes?
- Is more than one form of instruction used?
- Does the instructor pause after asking questions?
- Does the instructor encourage student responses?
- Does the instructor draw non-participating students into the discussion?
- Does the instructor prevent particular students from dominating the discussion?
- Does the instructor help students extend their responses?
- Does the instructor mediate conflict or differences of opinion?
- Does the instructor demonstrate active listening techniques?
- Does the instructor provide explicit directions for active learning tasks?
- Does the instructor allow sufficient time to complete active learning tasks?

4. Rapport with Students: Comment on students' involvement/interaction, opportunities to ask and answer questions, the instructor's openness to students' comments and ideas, and the instructor's recognition of students' failure to understand course materials.

- Does the instructor address students by name?
- Does the instructor address student comprehension or questions?
- Does the instructor provide feedback at given intervals?
- Does the instructor use positive reinforcement?
- Does the instructor incorporate students' ideas within the class?

B. Write-Up and Dissemination

- The written report should provide feedback for the instructor and appropriate contextual analysis that will be useful in retention, tenure, and promotion review.
- Provide a concise summary (1 paragraph) of the instructor's strengths and areas for improvement.
- The report should be shared with the instructor, and an electronic copy should be sent to the Department Chair within one week of completion of the letter (shortly after the results from the Student Evaluations have been compiled at the end of the semester).

Appendix E. Merit Evaluation Form

Complete the following for every merit eligible faculty member except yourself. You may attach comments to this form if the room provided here is insufficient. Please check the appropriate rating and submit your evaluations to the Merit Committee chair that will tabulate the rankings and provide results.

	Overall Merit Evaluation		Extra-Merit Performance Recognition Categories		
	Not-Meritorious	Meritorious	Teaching	Research	Service
Name of Ranked Faculty 1					
Comments:					
Name of Ranked Faculty 2					
Comments:					

Meritorious Evaluation Guidelines

A meritorious designation denotes satisfactory performance related to a faculty member's responsibilities and expectations. To receive a meritorious designation, faculty members must perform their Teaching responsibilities at a satisfactory level (Appendix C), as determined by students and peers, meet or maintain CBA Scholarship & Practitioner Productivity Guidelines (Appendix A) and meet Department Service responsibilities (Appendix B).

Extra-Merit Performance Recognition Guidelines

Extra merit recognizes the need to differentially reward faculty for levels of performance and individual accomplishments that exceed the expectations of the department in one or more of the three areas of responsibility (Appendix A-C). Examples of Extra Merit activities for Teaching may include: exemplary teaching accomplishments, new curriculum development, high student feedback on instruction results, innovations in curriculum, grants to support teaching improvement, teaching awards. Examples of Extra Merit activities for Research may include: Tier 1 journal publication, paper acceptance and presentation at one of the department discipline's top tier conference(s). Examples of Extra Merit activities for Service may include: service leadership positions, notable service contributions to UWL, the CBA, the department, the profession, or the public.

Appendix F.
Guide for IAS Annual Review
(All of the following do not have to be present for a successful review.)

CBA productivity guidelines have been discussed during this review: Yes No

% Teaching _____	**NA**	**Evidence**	**No Evidence**	**Comments**
Direct measures of student learning including sample work by students				
Indirect measures of student learning				
Student feedback on instruction results				
Classroom observations by peers				
Teaching development activities				

Annual Leadership Activities in Instructional Engagement are required to maintain Instructional Practitioner Status. The activities below may qualify.

Development of new teaching materials				
Grants to support teaching improvement				
Innovations in curriculum				
Leadership role in enhancing the curriculum				
Evidence based teaching improvements				
Directed student research				
Teaching awards				
Other:				

% Service/Professional development/Scholarship _____	NA	Evidence	No Evidence	Comments
Student advisement				
Department service				
College service				
University service				
Mentoring				

Practitioner Engagement and Activities are required to maintain Instructional Practitioner Status. The activities below may qualify. Peer reviewed publications are required for Scholarly Practitioner status.

Membership in professional organizations				
Professional service				
Discipline-related community service				
Leadership roles				
Continuing professional education				
Conference/workshop attendance				
Publications				
Presentations				
Works in progress				
Grants				
Other:				

% Reassigned time (if applicable) _____

Description:

Appendix G
IAS Merit Evaluation Criteria

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

- Teaching – 75 percent
- Service - 25 percent

Specific Merit Guidelines

The following form will be completed by the department chair or PRT committee members (as requested by the IAS faculty member). Please check the appropriate rating and submit your evaluations to the chair of the PRT or department chair (depending on the evaluation method selected by the IAS) who will then tabulate the rankings and provide results.

	Overall Merit Evaluation		Extra-Merit Performance Recognition Categories	
	Not-Meritorious	Meritorious	Teaching	Service
Name of IAS Faculty 1				
Comments:				
Name of IAS Faculty 2				
Comments:				

Meritorious Evaluation Guidelines

A meritorious designation denotes satisfactory performance related to a faculty member's responsibilities and expectations. To receive a meritorious designation, faculty members must perform their Teaching responsibilities at a satisfactory level (Appendix C), and meet Department Service responsibilities (Appendix B).

Extra-Merit Performance Recognition Guidelines

Extra merit recognizes the need to differentially reward faculty for levels of performance and individual accomplishments that exceed the expectations of the department in one or more of the three areas of responsibility (Appendix B-C). Examples of Extra Merit activities for Teaching may include: exemplary teaching accomplishments, new curriculum development, student feedback on instruction results, innovations in curriculum, grants to support teaching improvement, teaching awards. Examples of Extra Merit activities for Service may include: service leadership positions, notable service contributions to UWL, the CBA, the department, the profession, or the public.

Appendix H. Post Tenure Review Form

Complete the following form for each post tenure review eligible faculty member. You may attach comments to this form if the room provided here is insufficient. Please check the appropriate rating and submit your evaluations to the PRT chair that will tabulate the results.

	Teaching		Research		Service	
	Meeting Expectations	Not Meeting Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Not Meeting Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Not Meeting Expectations
Name of Ranked Faculty 1						
Comments:						
Name of Ranked Faculty 2						
Comments:						

Post Tenure Review Evaluation Guidelines

A meeting expectations denotes satisfactory performance related to a tenured faculty member's responsibilities and expectations. To receive a meeting expectations designation, faculty members must perform their Teaching responsibilities at a satisfactory level (Appendix C), as determined by students and peers, meet any CBA Scholarship & Practitioner Productivity Guideline (Appendix A) and meet any Department Service responsibilities (Appendix B).