

Department of Information Systems

Bylaws, Policy Statements and Guidelines

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-LA CROSSE

Revised August 29, 2008

Adopted: October 17, 2008

I. INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEPARTMENT MEMBERSHIP, MEETINGS, AND VOTING RIGHTS

A. Membership

Tenured and probationary faculty are voting members of the Department. Voting academic staff (as defined in Section II: Information Systems Academic Staff) are also voting members of the department; they have the same rights and privileges of faculty in the area of department governance, with noted exceptions (See section II).

B. Meetings and Quorum

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

A quorum for department meetings will be a majority of the voting members of the Department. Proxy votes do not count in determining whether or not a quorum exists.

C. Voting

All voting members may exercise their voting rights (as defined in these Information Systems Bylaws) on matters requiring departmental approval including committee votes. Unless otherwise specified, approval requires a simple majority vote of those present. In case of tie votes, the motion fails.

D. Proxy Voting

Written proxy voting is permitted on all voting matters brought before the Department or any committee. Proxy votes must be submitted to the Department Chair or committee chair before the meeting where the vote is scheduled.

E. The Robert's Rules of Order are in force whenever a meeting or voting procedure is needed but not specified by these Information Systems Bylaws.

II. INFORMATION SYSTEMS ACADEMIC STAFF

A. Introduction

The following bylaws have been adopted to establish the rights and privileges of academic staff in the Information Systems Department (the Department hereafter).

B. Voting Academic Staff

Voting academic staff in the Department are Academic Staff with Faculty Status who have held appointments in the Department for at least 75 % time two consecutive semesters, or 50% time for two consecutive years. Other academic staff are classified as non-voting academic staff. Voting academic staff in the Department have the same rights and privileges of faculty as they relate to department governance, with noted exceptions. Voting academic staff are entitled to vote on matters requiring departmental approval and to serve as voting members on departmental committees. Voting academic staff are not eligible to serve on either the merit committee or the Promotion, Retention, and Tenure (PRT) Committee (UWL Senate Bylaws IX.C).

C. Non-Voting Academic Staff

Non-voting academic staff are not eligible to take part in department governance. They are not entitled to vote on matters requiring a department vote, or to serve as voting members on department committees.

D. Evaluation of Academic Staff

Academic staff whose salaries contribute toward the departmental merit pool will be evaluated by the Merit Committee for salary purposes. All academic staff will be evaluated by the Department, using criteria established by the Department. The written evaluations will be sent to the department chair for forwarding to the dean. The academic staff member will receive a copy of his/her evaluation.

III. PROMOTION, RETENTION, AND TENURE

The following policy statements were adopted by the Department of Information Systems in accordance with the University of Wisconsin System and University of Wisconsin– La Crosse Faculty and Academic Staff Personnel Rules. The policy statements establish the Promotion, Retention and Tenure Committee (hereafter PRT).

A. PRT Committee

1. The personnel review duties of the PRT committee shall include:
 - a) renewal of appointments and recommendation of tenure for probationary faculty
 - b) initial promotion review for faculty.
2. To be a member of the Information Systems department PRT Committee, one must be a tenured member of the department and have at least a 50% assignment in the department
3. If there are less than three faculty that meet the criteria of policy statement #2, in consultation with the tenured and probationary faculty of the Information Systems department, a pool of committee members (of size N+1, where N represents the number of committee members needed outside the Information Systems Department) will be drawn from tenured faculty members in the College of Business Administration and/or Deans office. Committee members from outside the department shall serve a one-year, renewable term on the committee. The candidate will be allowed to review the committee member candidate pool and remove one or zero potential committee members from consideration at his or her discretion.
4. The PRT Committee bylaws are written and approved by members of the PRT committee, subject to the following exception. If there are less than three faculty that meet the criteria specified in policy statement #2, the PRT bylaws are written and approved by tenured and probationary faculty of the Information Systems department.
5. The PRT chair will be elected by a simple majority of the committee members voting. The term of office will be one year. The PRT chair will be the official and sole spokesperson for the committee.

No member of the committee who is eligible for promotion shall take part in his or her promotion decision.

B. Review Procedures for Retention and Tenure

1. The PRT chair will circulate a schedule of PRT activities to all dept. members before the end of the third week of the fall semester.
2. At least 20 days prior to the review, the department chair shall give written notice of review to the probationary faculty member.

3. At least 7 days prior to the review the probationary faculty member will provide the PRT chair with the following information:
 - a. A completed copy of the Annual Evaluation Form (Check on Digital Measures), which summarizes relevant activities for the most recent academic year. For second year faculty contract decisions and for tenure decisions, relevant activities for all years at UW-L will be reported.
 - b. Copies of all articles accepted and/or published, papers presented and other research completed.
 - c. A separate file that includes all of the faculty member's UW-L course syllabi, reading lists and examinations for the relevant time period, with a maximum of the three most recent years, and any other teaching related materials he/she wants PRT to consider.
 - d. Any other material the faculty member requests PRT to consider.
 - e. Any other material requested by the committee.
4. The department chair will provide the PRT chair with the following information for each candidate:
 - a. Results of the merit evaluation process.
 - b. SEI results for each semester of teaching at UW-L.
 - c. Grade distributions for each semester of teaching at UW-L.
 - d. Any other information requested by the committee that could have a bearing on the potential performance of the retention (tenure) candidate.
5. The committee may invite probationary faculty to an information-sharing meeting prior to their retention review.
6. During the review session and after the presentation of oral support for renewal by the candidate, if the candidate has elected to attend the meeting, and after discussion of the relevant data, the committee will vote by signed ballot on a motion to recommend retention (tenure) of the candidate. Retention (tenure) requires a simple majority.
7. The PRT chair will assign a member of the committee to draft a letter recommending retention (tenure) or non-retention which will include the outcome of the vote. In the event of retention (tenure), the letter will include reasons for retention(tenure). The letter will be sent to the department chair and a copy sent to the candidate.
8. In the event of non-retention, a separate list of reasons will be drafted. The committee will review both the letter draft and list of reasons, make necessary changes, send the let-

ter to the department chair, and send a copy to the candidate. The list of reasons for non-retention is held by the committee and is neither transmitted to the candidate nor added to the candidate's official university personnel file unless the candidate requests reasons for non-retention.

9. In the event of retention, if the members of the committee identify areas where the retention candidate needs improvement, the candidate will be informed of these concerns. A list of recommended improvements will be communicated to the retention candidate through a separate improvements letter and may also be communicated to the dean through the letter recommending retention. Copies of the improvements letters will be retained by the committee to be used for evaluation purposes in subsequent years.
10. Probationary faculty who were hired with a shortened probationary period may be asked to request an extension of their probationary period if the committee believes that it is in the interest of the department.

C. Evaluation Criteria for Retention and Tenure

1. The retention (tenure) decisions by the committee are peer judgments of future performance. Consequently, in making a retention (tenure) decision, the committee will consider all matters bearing on the potential of the candidate
2. In evaluating a faculty member's performance, the committee will consider teaching, research, and professional, public, and university service.
3. The committee has established minimum performance levels applying to a faculty member's record at UW-L prior to the tenure recommendation. These levels serve to identify a floor below which a favorable tenure recommendation is highly unlikely.

a. Teaching:

Evidence of a systematic and on going program focused on assessing student learning at the course level. This program should include specification of student learning objectives, measurement of student outcomes related to those objectives, and analysis of such measurement results.

Evidence of the establishment and maintenance of high academic standards expected of students.

b. Research:

Meet College of Business Administration Scholarly Productivity Guidelines.

c. Service:

Professional and Public Service - at least six from among the following: attendance at professional meetings (workshops, seminars, etc.), discussion of papers at professional meetings, and/or public service activities in a professional capacity (e.g., presentations or assignments with the BDC, Reviewers for peer reviewed journals, Reviewers for professional conferences, conference session chair.

University Service - membership on at least six committees from among the following: standing committees, significant ad hoc committees, and/or Faculty Senate.

4. Satisfactorily meeting the minimum performance levels does not guarantee a favorable tenure recommendation. In evaluating a probationary faculty member's performance in excess of the minimum levels, the committee will weight the three areas as follows:

Teaching 45%,
Research 35%, and
Service 20%.

This weighting scheme constitutes a statement of values adopted by the PRT committee.

5. Except for the use of SEI results in evaluating teaching effectiveness, evaluation will be performed by peers. The areas and activities to be considered under each of the three categories include, but are not limited to:

- a. Teaching:

SEI results
Curriculum and course development
Innovative approaches to instruction
Quality of syllabi, exams, and assignments
Maintenance of academic standards and integrity
Teaching workload and course variety
Supervision of student research and internships
Attendance at workshops and seminars on teaching effectiveness
Improvement of instruction grant application and funding
Preparation of materials employing various media for instructional use
Student advising and counseling

- b. Research: (See Dept. of I-S definition of Scholarship)

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
Working papers and research in progress
Maintenance of academic standards and integrity

Development activities that contribute to a faculty member's subject matter competence in the rapidly changing environment of Information Technology.

c. Service:

Public and Professional Service

Participation as discussant or chair at professional conferences

Offices held in community organizations

Speeches and workshops conducted

Consulting

Attendance at professional conferences

Attendance at institutes and seminars

Participation in University Outreach programs

Membership in professional organizations and community organizations in a professional capacity

Honors and awards

University Service

Faculty Senate

University committees

Department committees

College committees

Advisor to campus groups

Developing library resources

Other services to university programs

D. PRT and Merit Evaluations

Since merit evaluations are only one of several criteria used by PRT in the retention (tenure) evaluation, a candidate's merit evaluation and retention (tenure) evaluation may differ. Differences in evaluations may result from, but are not limited to, the following reasons:

1. The evaluations are conducted by different committees.
2. The merit committee bases its decisions on performance over one year, while PRT considers all relevant past activities.
3. The merit committee evaluates only past performance while PRT also considers potential performance.
4. Merit committee evaluations are based primarily on quantitative measures while PRT also considers qualitative aspects of the candidate's performance.

E. Review Procedures for Promotion

1. The department chair shall follow UW-System and UW-L guidelines to notify eligible promotion candidates and obtain a [written or oral response](#) indicating their intention to seek promotion that academic year.
2. At least 7 days prior to the review the probationary faculty member will provide the PRT chair with the following information:
 - a. [A completed copy of the UW-L Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report \(excluding any portion of the Report to be completed by the department chair or PRT committee\).](#)
 - b. A curriculum vitae.
 - c. Copies of all articles accepted and/or published, papers presented and other research completed.
 - d. Any other material the faculty member requests PRT to consider.
 - e. Any other material requested by the committee.
4. The department chair will provide the PRT chair with the following information for each candidate:
 - a. Results of the merit evaluation process.
 - b. SEI results for the last six semesters of teaching at UW-L.
 - c. Grade distributions for each semester of teaching at UW-L.
 - d. Course syllabi from the Department Course Syllabi File.
 - e. [The portion of the UW-L Promotion Candidate Evaluation Form that is to be completed by the department chair.](#)
 - f. Any other information requested by the committee that could have a bearing on the potential performance of the promotion candidate.
5. The committee may invite candidates to an information-sharing meeting prior to their promotion review.
6. During the review session and after the presentation of oral support for promotion by the candidate, if the candidate has elected to attend the meeting, and after discussion of the relevant data, the committee will vote by signed ballot on a motion to recommend promotion of the candidate. Promotion requires a simple majority.
7. The PRT chair will assign a member of the committee to draft a letter recommending promotion or non-promotion which will include the outcome of the vote. In the event of

promotion, the letter will include reasons for promotion. The letter will be sent to the department chair and a copy sent to the candidate.

8. In the event of non-promotion, a separate list of reasons will be drafted. The committee will review both the letter draft and list of reasons, make necessary changes, send the letter to the department chair, and send a copy to the candidate. [The list of reasons for non-promotion will be transmitted to the candidate for the purpose of suggesting future directions for improvements. However this list will not be added to the candidate's official university personnel file.](#)

F. Evaluation Criteria for Promotion

1. In evaluating a faculty member's performance, the committee will consider teaching, research, and professional, public, and university service.
2. The committee has established minimum performance levels applying to a faculty member's record at UW-L prior to the promotion recommendation. The minimum levels for promotion from **Assistant Professor to Associate Professor** are as follows:

a. Teaching:

[SEI scores equal to or above the overall fractional median of the Department for items 4-17 on the old SEI instrument or 4-9 on the new SEI instrument for at least 1/3 of the semesters proceeding the promotion review semester.](#)

Evidence of a systematic and on going program focused on assessing student learning at the course level

c. Research:

Meet College of Business Administration Scholarly Productivity Guidelines.

[Four refereed journal articles \(in total with the last two at UW-L\).](#)

c. Service:

Professional and Public Service - at least [five](#) from among the following: attendance at professional meetings (workshops, seminars, etc.), discussion of papers at professional meetings, [reviewing articles for academic journals](#), and/or public service activities in a professional capacity (e.g., presentations or assignments with the BDC.)

[College](#) and University Service - membership for a total of at least 75% of the semesters they have been in service at UW-L from among the following: standing committees, significant ad hoc committees, and/or Faculty Senate.

3. The minimum levels for promotion from **Associate Professor to Full Professor** are as follows:

a. Teaching:

SEI scores equal to or above the overall fractional median of the Department for items 4-17 on the old SEI instrument or 4-9 on the new SEI instrument for at least 1/3 of the semesters proceeding the promotion review semester.

b. Research:

Meet College of Business Administration Scholarly Productivity Guidelines.

Six refereed journal articles (in total with the last three at UW-L).

c. Service:

Professional and Public Service - at least **eight** from among the following: attendance at professional meetings (workshops, seminars, etc.), discussion of papers at professional meetings, **reviewing articles for academic journals**, and/or public service activities in a professional capacity (e.g., presentations or assignments with the BDC.)

College and University Service - membership for a total of at least 75% of the semesters they have been in service at UW-L from among the following: standing committees, significant ad hoc committees, and/or Faculty Senate.

4. Satisfactorily meeting the minimum performance levels does not guarantee a favorable promotion recommendation. In evaluating a faculty member's performance in excess of the minimum levels, the committee will weight the three areas as follows:

Teaching **40%**,
Research **40%**, and
Service **20%**.

Note that this weighting scheme places a heavier weight on research than that used for tenure and retention reviews stipulated in IIC.4.

5. Except for the use of SEI results in evaluating teaching effectiveness, evaluation will be performed by peers. The areas and activities to be considered under each of the three categories include, but are not limited to:

a. Teaching:

SEI results
Curriculum and course development
Innovative approaches to instruction

- Quality of syllabi, exams, and assignments
- Maintenance of academic standards and integrity
- Teaching workload and course variety
- Supervision of student research and internships
- Attendance at workshops and seminars on teaching effectiveness
- Improvement of instruction grant application and funding
- Preparation of materials employing various media for instructional use
- Student advising and counseling

b. Research: (See Dept. of I-S definition of Scholarship)

- 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
- Working papers and research in progress
- Maintenance of academic standards and integrity
- Development activities that contribute to a faculty member's subject matter competence in the rapidly changing environment of Information Technology.

c. Service:

Public and Professional Service

- Participation as discussant or chair at professional conferences
- Offices held in community organizations
- Speeches and workshops conducted
- Consulting
- Attendance at professional conferences
- Attendance at institutes and seminars
- Participation in University Outreach programs
- Membership in professional organizations and community organizations in a professional capacity
- Honors and awards

University Service

- Faculty Senate
- University committees
- Department committees
- College committees
- Advisor to campus groups
- Developing library resources
- Other services to university programs

IV. INTERSESSION SCHEDULING AND STAFFING

Intersession scheduling and staffing refers to the following: J term and Summer sessions.

A. Eligibility

Only full-time, tenure track, faculty are eligible for intersession teaching positions.

B. Remuneration

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.

C. Allocating Teaching Positions

1. The method of allocating teaching positions among eligible faculty is a rotation list.
2. The department chair maintains the rotation list.
3. The initial rotation list is based on a random process.
4. A newly hired faculty member who possesses the terminal degree is added to the top of the list at the start of his/her first academic term on campus. A newly hired faculty member without the terminal degree is added to the bottom of the list at the start of his/her first term. In the event that more than one new faculty are hired with the same terminal degree status and starting in the same academic term, their respective places on the list are governed by date of hire. Upon completion of the terminal degree, an eligible faculty member is moved to the top of the list prior to assignment of teaching positions for the subsequent intersession (e.g. Completion of the degree during the 2008/2009 academic year – June 1, 2009 through May 31, 2010 -- allows movement to the top of the list prior to assignment of teaching positions for the May and Summer sessions of 2011).
5. The department chair determines the number of classes, their type, and their schedule, that are likely to meet minimum College of Business enrollment requirements.
6. Eligible faculty members, in sequential list order, will be offered an opportunity to select a course from the schedule until the schedule for the session in question is staffed.
7. When a faculty member accepts an intersession position, his/her name is removed from its current position and placed at the bottom of the list. However, if subsequently the class is cancelled, that faculty member maintains his/her original position on the list

8. A faculty member who, when offered, declines to select a position, maintains his/her current position on the list.
9. If a first pass through the list does not meet staffing needs, a second pass may be made. If the second pass does not meet staffing needs, the department chair may seek other instructors to teach needed classes.
- 10.

(Voted and passed x-y-z on 10/17/08)

V. MERIT EVALUATION

A. Introduction

The following bylaws are used for the determination of merit pay for tenure-track faculty. The merit evaluation process employs a single merit score in the range of 0 to 1,000 points for each candidate. The IS Merits Evaluation Committee computes this score according to the criteria specified in the Evaluation Categories and Weights and Evaluation Criteria sections herein, and submits all candidates' scores to the Chair of the department. The Chair then compiles the departmental distribution list and submits it to the Dean of the CBA. The "Information Systems Department Annual Evaluation Form" is the main document for merit reporting. Because the merit review covers a different time period than the annual review, candidates should modify their annual reports to reflect their service records pertaining to the correct review period, which is from June 1 to May 31.

B. Eligibility for Merit Consideration

To be eligible for merit consideration, department members must prepare and submit the annual department evaluation form and all the SEI scores from each course taught during the preceding two semesters, by the date specified in the University's personnel schedule.

C. Evaluation Committee

The evaluation process will be conducted by a committee consisting of all tenure-track faculty members in the department. The Merit Committee chair will be elected each year by the committee. All Merit Committee members will vote during all evaluations except their own.

D. Evaluation Categories and Weights

1. Full Time Faculty

In evaluating a full-time teaching (FTT) faculty member's performance, the Merit Committee will weight the three areas as follows: Teaching, 45%, Research, 35%, and University and Professional Community Service, 20%. Research output for new faculty members occurring after the date of their contract, but before the beginning of the reporting year, will be considered. However, first-year new faculty are not allowed to compete in teaching and service.

In evaluating department members with administrative duties, teaching load reductions, or teaching overloads, the Merit Committee will adjust its procedure to recognize these activities.

2. Department Chair

In evaluating the department chair's performance, the Merit Committee will assess the following three categories: Teaching, Research, and Administration/University /Community (hereafter A/U/C) Service. The Merit Committee will rate the department chair by computing the sum of the weighted value of each aspect of the department chair's performance according to the following equation: (.3) Teaching + (.35) Research + (.35) A/U/C Service. Teaching and research performance will be evaluated using the same standard as for FTT faculty members. Evaluation of A/U/C services will require consideration of, but is not limited to:

- a. activities reported by the chair on the department evaluation form related to his/her chair assignment,
- b. a letter from the dean of CBA assessing the level of service outside the department, and
- c. a census of department members for assessment of the chair's administrative activity performance.

3. Faculty on Leave

- a. Department members who take one-year or longer leaves of absence for any reason will receive a merit score during their absence of at least 400 if a completed merit form is submitted.
- b. The merit committee shall have discretion to deviate from normal evaluation procedures in assessing the performance of department members on one year or longer leaves of absence. For example, a department member on leave who is developing significant skills that will contribute to departmental objectives may be rewarded for those activities with a merit score in excess of 400.
- c. Merit scores for department members on one-year or longer leaves of absence will not be reported outside the department. The report will simply indicate an on leave status.
- d. Department members who take one-semester leaves of absence for any reason will receive a merit score for the academic year based on a normal evaluation of their performance during the active semester. In addition, their SEI scores and committee service will be annualized and any research conducted or published during the leave will be counted.

E. Evaluation Criteria

The following criteria shall serve as the guideline for evaluating each merit case.

a. Teaching (450 points maximum)

1. SEI (150 points)

For purposes of assigning merit points, the annual average of the composite fractional median of items 4 through 17 from the Department of Information Systems Student Evaluation Form will be used.

<u>SEI Average:</u>	<u>Merit Points</u>
2.00 and below	No points
2.01 to 4.5	Round [60 x (Average - 2.00)]
4.51 and above	150 points

2. SEI Adjustment (50 points)

This evaluation component directly addresses the impact of student grade average on the SEI score. The following formula is used to compute the SEI adjustment for candidate i :

$$\text{SEI Adjustment} = 50 \times (AS_i / AS^*),$$

Where $AS_i = SEI_i / GPA_i$, and $AS^* = \max AS$ of all candidates. The GPA_i used in this formula is computed from the pooled GPA distribution of all courses taught by candidate i during the review period.

3. Peer Evaluation (200 points)

This is a subjective measure of teaching performance, which must be carried out with extreme care. Merit Committee members are required to consider the following inputs in performing peer evaluation; it is the goal of the department to increase emphasis on outcome assessment as an ingredient of teaching evaluation.

- Course portfolio
- Outcome assessment
- Academic standards
- Faculty development related to IT knowledge and skills acquisition

4. Supervision of Independent Study and Internship (50 points maximum)

IS faculty are encouraged to supervise independent studies and internships. Supervision of each quality independent study or internship for credit course that is well documented will receive 20-point and 10-points scores, respectively, up to a maximum of 50 points for all cases.

b. Research (350 points maximum)

1. Academic Journal Articles

Category A: 200 to 350 points per article

Category B: 150 to 250 points per article

Category A consists of internationally renowned journals that are business related, whereas Category B consists of other academically rigorous journals. The identification and recognition of referred journals is a duty of the Merit Committee.

2. Referred Conference Proceedings

National /International: 50 to 100 points per regular article

Regional: 30 to 60 points per regular article

Examples of National/International Conferences are AMCIS, DSI, HICSS and ICIS.

3. Book Chapters, Monographs, and Technical Reports

50 to 100 points per item

4. Conference Presentations Without Proceedings Papers and Invited Research Presentations

National/International: 20 points per incidence

Regional/Local: 10 points per incidence

5. Funded Research Grants

External to the University: 30 to 50 points per grant

Internal to the University: 20 to 30 points per grant

6. Research in Progress (Informational: no points assigned)

The determination of the publication date of any research output pertaining to Items 1, 2, and 3 above is at the discretion of the reviewed candidate. Either and only one of the dates can be used: the acceptance date or the actually publication date.

c. Service (200 points maximum)

Service performance will be evaluated based on four categories:

1. Departmental (120 points maximum)

Service performance will be classified into four levels and assigned the corresponding scores.

- Outstanding: 120 points
- Solid: 90 points
- Acceptable: 70 points
- Unacceptable: 0 points

2. College and University (50 points maximum)**3. Local Community and Academic Community (30 points maximum)****F. Evaluation Process**

The committee will establish an activities schedule before the end of the spring semester and notify all eligible candidates for merit distribution of the annual merit process timetable. The committee's work will be completed within the first four weeks of the fall semester and the merit ratings will be submitted to the Dean of CBA for determination of annual faculty salary adjustments.

Each voting member will evaluate the merit forms and submit to the committee chair category scores within the specified range for each performance category, for each candidate. The chair will compile the category scores, and calculate a trial overall score for each candidate. Each voting member's category scores will contribute equally to the overall score.

After these scores have been computed, the chair will distribute the results to the committee members and reconvene the committee to discuss category scores. Committee members will abstain from discussions about themselves. After the discussions, committee members may revise their category scores and resubmit them to the committee chair. The chair will recalculate the revised category scores to obtain the final overall scores.

G. Transmission Process

Within five working days of the committee's final ratings, the committee chair will send to each department member an evaluation report, which includes his/her final overall merit score and category scores, and the distribution of all merit scores and category scores in the department. A copy of each report and all other documentation regarding the merit process will be forwarded to the department chair for retention in department files.

H. Merit Pools and Distributions

Merit pay adjustments are allocated on the basis of performance and on current salary according to the University's percentage distribution scheme for these two components. In order to receive the portion on the basis of current salary, a faculty member must exhibit solid performance. Solid performance is a determination by the Merit Committee. If a department member does not exhibit solid performance then that portion of the available merit dollars will be added to the performance pool. Merit candidates who do not exhibit solid performance as judged by the IS Merit Committee will be provided a due process for appeal. The appeal process must be concluded before merit recommendations are due in CBA dean's office.

The merit pools for teaching academic staff and faculty are separate. In each case, performance will be measured by adding each individual's scores from the appropriate categories.

The ratio of each individual's score divided by the total of all individuals' scores will be multiplied by total performance merit dollars to get an individual's performance merit dollars. The current salary portion is an equal percentage increase for each faculty member.

(Voted upon and passed 3-1-0 on 4/20/01.)

VI. DEFINITION OF SCHOLARSHIP

University of Wisconsin–La Crosse is defined to be any effort that contributes to the *Research and scholarly activity* within the Information Systems Department at the common body of knowledge in the theory, development, and application of information systems. In particular, these activities shall include

- Writing and publishing scholarly papers in **referred** journals of information systems, or closely-related disciplines;
- Presentation of scholarly work at **or publish in proceedings of** recognized information systems–related meetings or conferences;
- Authoring of texts, or other copyrighted or patented work, contributing to the information systems profession
- Editing or refereeing publications or presentations for a recognized information systems-related journal, textbook, conference, symposium, or workshop;
- Proposing, receiving, and administering grants for the support of information systems at UW-L;
- Participating in information systems-related consulting;
- Developing software or software tools of significant contribution to the information systems discipline;
- Supervising student research or serving on graduate student thesis or research project committee;
- Collaborating on interdisciplinary projects and/or scholarly activity involving the use of information systems;
- Contributing to the offering of information systems-related institutes, short courses, seminars, or workshops;
- Actively participating in professional organizations of information systems discipline; and
- Refreshing and renewing personal knowledge of the discipline of information systems through self-study, or attendance at appropriate institutes, short courses, seminars, or workshops.