

MARKETING DEPARTMENT BYLAWS¹

University of Wisconsin-La Crosse

Note: These bylaws follow the **Spring 2020** University of Wisconsin-La Crosse By-Law Template and include the required language. Prior to making changes in any area of these bylaws, the department should consult the UW-L By-Law Template and the required language by going to: <https://www.uwlax.edu/academic-affairs/resources/#tm-academic-departments---administrative-resources>

The Role of By-Laws for Faculty Personnel Decisions: UW System and UWL policies and procedures govern the primary responsibilities regarding personnel review of faculty. Departmental by-laws serve as a faculty member's guide regarding specific faculty responsibilities of teaching, scholarship and service, merit evaluation, and faculty personnel review as it relates to retention, promotion, and tenure. The UW-L By-Laws Template outlines the key policies and procedures associated with faculty functions under the guidance of UW System and UWL's Faculty Senate. The Human Resources [Employee Handbook](#) reflects components of faculty employment associated with faculty as state and university employees.

The URLs in these by-laws should be reviewed regularly for accuracy.

It is imperative to have clear dates regarding changes to by-laws. UWL policy indicates that personnel policy must be in place 6 months prior to use for decisions (e.g., merit and promotion). However, appeals to **tenure** decisions require the ability for a candidate and a committee to review the tenure criteria that was in place at the time of hire. A faculty member who wishes to be reviewed under tenure criteria that was adopted after his/her hire should formally indicate the decision formally to the chair who should inform both the Dean and HR.

¹Blue text indicates text required by the 2020 UW-L By-Law Template Policy.

Black text indicates text recommended by 2016 CBA By-Law Task Force

Maroon text is provided by the Marketing Department, based on previous by-laws & discussion.

Recommended wording or guidance notes from the UW-L By-Law Template Policy are provided in boxes as shown on the title page.

Table of Contents

I.	Title with name of department and date of last by-law adoption	1
II.	Organization and Operation	1
	A. Preamble	1
	B. Meeting Guidelines	1
	C. Definitions of Department Membership and Voting Procedures	1
	D. Definitions of Quorum and Majority	2
	E. Changing Bylaws	2
	F. Conflict of Interest	2
III.	Faculty/Staff Responsibilities	3
	A. Faculty	3
	B. Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations	3
	C. Non Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations	3
	D. Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI)	3
IV.	Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)	4
	A. Evaluation Process & Criteria	4
	1. Faculty	4
	2. Instructional Academic Staff in Permanent Budgeted Instructional Lines (otherwise see VI).	6
	3. Non-Instructional Academic Staff (if included in merit processes, otherwise see VII).	6
	4. Department Chair	6
	B. Distribution of Merit Funds	6
	C. Appeal Procedures	7
V.	Faculty Personnel Review	8
	A. Retention (procedure, criteria, and appeal)	9
	1. Procedure	9
	1.1 First Year Faculty Review (Non-Contract Review) Procedure	10
	1.2 Contract Review (Retention/Tenure) Procedure	10
	B. Tenure review and departmental tenure criteria (if applicable)	15
	1. Procedure – Tenure	15
	2. Criteria-Tenure	16
	3. Appeal Process-Tenure	17
	C. Post-Tenure Review	18
	D. Faculty Promotion Procedures (procedure, criteria and appeal)	18
	1. Promotion Procedure	19
	2. Recommendation/Decision	19
	3. Notification of Decision	20
	4. Promotion Criteria	21
	5. Reconsideration and Appeal-Promotion	21

VI.	Instructional Academic Staff Review	21
A.	Annual Review	22
1.	Instructional Academic Staff Review Committee	22
2.	Evaluation Process	22
3.	Evaluation Criteria	23
4.	Transmission Process	24
B.	IAS Promotion Procedures	24
1.	Eligibility	24
2.	Promotion Process	25
3.	Promotion Criteria	25
4.	Reconsideration and Appeal Process	26
C.	Appeal Procedures re: Annual Review	26
VII.	Non-Instructional Academic Staff Review	27
A.	Annual Review	27
VIII.	Governance	27
A.	Department Chair	27
1.	Election of the Department Chair	27
2.	Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair	28
3.	Department Chair Annual Review	28
B.	Standing Department Committees	28
1.	IAS Review Committee	28
2.	Promotion, Retention and Tenure Committee	29
3.	Curriculum Committee	29
4.	Bylaws Committee	29
C.	Department Programmatic Assessment Plan	29
D.	Additional Department Policies	29
1.	Sick Leave and Vacation	30
2.	Salary Equity	29
3.	Summer and Winter Intersession Teaching Assignments	30
4.	Faculty Leaves	30
5.	Emeritus Status	30
6.	Travel Allocation Policy	30
IX.	Search and Screen Procedures	32
A.	Tenure-Track Faculty	32
B.	Instructional Academic Staff	32
C.	Pool Search	32
D.	Academic Staff (if applicable)	32
X.	Student Rights and Obligations	32
A.	Student Course and Faculty-Related Concerns, Complaints, and Grievances	32
1.	Course Grade Appeals	32
2.	Incomplete Grades	34
3.	Non-Grade Appeals	34
4.	Student Complaints to the Chair	34
B.	Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct	34

C.	Advising Policy	35
XI.	Other	35
A.	Work-Life Balance Statement	35
B.	Outside Employment Statement	35
XII.	Appendices	36
A.	Department Statement on Scholarship	36
B.	Department Statement on Service	41
C.	Department Statement on Teaching	43
D.	Department Annual Peer Review of Teaching for Probationary Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff	45
A.	Student Feedback	45
B.	Classroom Observation	45
C.	Summary Analysis of Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEI's)	47
D.	Write-Up and Dissemination	47
E.	Merit Evaluation Form	48
F.	Guide for IAS Annual Review and Merit Tables	56
G.	Guide for Department Chair Review from Faculty	60
H.	MBA Consortium SEI Questions	62
I.	Post-Tenure Review Policy	63
J.	Standing Department and CBA Committees	72

I. UWL Department of Marketing Bylaws, Policies, and Procedures

Approved: April 16, 2021

(Passed changes to ranked faculty merit; updated student rights and grade appeal sections to better align with Faculty Senate wording and CBA policies)

II. Organization and Operation

Department members are governed by six interdependent sets of regulations:

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

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

B. Meeting Guidelines. Department meetings will be run according to the most recent edition of Robert's Rules of Order (<http://www.robertsrules.com/>) and WI state opening meeting laws (<https://www.doj.state.wi.us/sites/default/files/office-open-government/Resources/OML-GUIDE.pdf>) summary at (<https://www.wisconsin.edu/general-counsel/legal-topics/open-meetings-law/>).

Minutes will be recorded by a voting member (see Section II.C. below) of the department and distributed to department members. Copies of the minutes of department and committee meetings shall be kept in a secure location by the department. Minutes from closed meetings will be taken by the department chair (or a designated faculty member) and 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 Department Membership and Voting Procedures. Members of the department are defined as all tenure-track or tenured faculty (ranked faculty), including those on leave or sabbatical who are in attendance, and instructional academic staff (IAS) members with at least a 50% appointment for two or more consecutive semesters.

Those classified as members of the department are eligible to vote on matters requiring a department vote. IAS who are eligible to vote on department matters, are not eligible to vote on merit, retention, promotion, and tenure issues, **unless serving on department IAS Review Committee**.

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

NOTE: Voting - closed session (added 1-12-2017)

Voting in closed session cannot be anonymous or secret. And, any individual (within or outside the department or university) can request the vote and who voted which way (e.g., public record). Documentation is needed regarding the vote; however, "who voted how" need not be reflected in minutes if there is other documentation that exists and can be accessed. Paper or electronic balloting (although not secret) may make votes feel more comfortable at the time of the vote - particularly those who feel vulnerable.

Reminder - per Robert's Rules - abstention is appropriate ONLY under two conditions: insufficient information (should not be the situation in a personnel review given candidate files) or a conflict of interest.

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 Bylaws. Amendments or additions to these bylaws require a simple majority of the current department membership eligible to vote. Any proposed amendment(s) shall be presented and distributed in writing at a department meeting to provide an opportunity for discussion. A second reading and 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 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" (<http://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/>). Departmental expectations are referenced in Appendices A, B and C.

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 (<https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/classification/>) 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. See Faculty Senate Articles, Bylaws & Policies [<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B5oINNrU5bquTmdYZDRmchI5UHM/view>].

C. Non Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations. Not applicable.

D. Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI). The department will follow the UWL SEI policy and procedure available on the Faculty Senate webpage (<https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/#tm-student-evaluation-of-instruction---sei>) Results from the Faculty Senate approved SEI questions are required for retention, tenure, and promotion for ranked faculty and for renewal and promotion of Instructional Academic Staff in the form of (1) the single motivation item and (2) the composite SEI consisting of the 5 common questions. For ranked faculty contract-renewal and both faculty and IAS promotion these numbers will be reported using the Teaching Assignment Information (TAI) form. The department will add both the motivation item and the composite SEI fractional median for each course. In addition, the candidate's overall fractional median for the term on both the single motivation item and the composite SEI are reported. Finally, the department adds the departmental fractional median for both the single motivation item and the composite, and the minimum and maximum composite SEI for the department.

Additional departmental SEI questions are included to provide feedback to support continuous improvement of teaching. SEI scores are not reported for MKT 400, 415, independent study courses, internships or elective Consortium MBA classes (unless part of load). In situations where the UW-L Faculty Senate approved questions are not allowed (MBA Consortium), the department will use the average of all questions evaluative of the instruction in the approved student evaluation instrument. The relevant MBA Consortium questions can be found in Appendix H.

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 Dec. 15 annually. Merit reviews reflect activities during the prior academic year ending May 31. 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.

A. Evaluation Processes and 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. Faculty on approved leave shall be considered for merit and may be considered for extra 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.

Merit Committee. The **PRT** Committee will conduct the evaluation process. The department chair is not eligible to chair the committee.

Annual Activity Reports. 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. **Faculty members should also evaluate themselves using the categorical scales provided in Appendix E.**

Review Criteria. The criteria used to evaluate ranked faculty performance are designed to promote effective teaching, quality scholarship, and meaningful service (**See Appendices A-C**). 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. In order to enhance the evaluation of effective teaching beyond the measure of SEI scores and classroom peer observations, the annual activity report should also include the **syllabus and** 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.

Merit Review Process.

- The **PRT** committee chair will initiate the merit process early in the fall semester by sending written notification to all **tenured faculty**. **The PRT Committee Chair will initiate the merit process early in the fall semester to coincide with the due date for annual review for all tenure-track faculty.** The notification should include merit guidelines and a request for the annual activity report **and self-evaluation form**.
- Upon receipt of all annual activity reports and self-evaluations, the **PRT** committee chair will distribute all documents to committee members (annual activity reports, self-evaluations, SEI scores, and any other supporting documents that will be used in the evaluation).
- **PRT committee members will complete the merit evaluation form (Appendix E) for all faculty members being reviewed. Faculty members do not review themselves.** Committee members will submit the merit evaluation forms to the Merit committee chair for scoring **prior to the Merit committee meeting**.
- The committee will meet **and the committee chair will share the results of the initial tabulation. After discussion, the committee will vote to determine each faculty member's merit designation.**
- Within seven calendar days of completion of the reviews, the **PRT** committee chair shall notify each faculty member, in writing, of the results of his/her annual merit review (not-meritorious, meritorious or extraordinary merit). Those persons not receiving a meritorious designation shall be notified, in writing, of the reasons for this action. **Those persons receiving a meritorious designation below their self-evaluated designation, will be invited to meet with the committee. The results for the ranked faculty will not be publicly reported to the department, but will be available from the PRT chair if requested.**

Merit Rating Definitions. The annual merit evaluation of faculty must differentiate between levels of merit (**not-meritorious, meritorious or extraordinary merit**).

- Not Meritorious. A faculty member not meeting the criteria for meritorious or extra meritorious.
- 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 or maintain CBA Scholarship & Practitioner Productivity Guidelines (Appendix A) and meet department service responsibilities (Appendix B). Faculty, who have been here less than five years, will be evaluated on their progress towards meeting CBA Scholarship & Practitioner Productivity Guidelines (Appendix A). **For faculty not meeting CBA Scholarly guidelines for part of the year, the decision of "meritorious" versus "not meritorious", will be judged subjectively based on the progress toward scholarship and length of lapse.**
- Extra Meritorious. Extra meritorious recognizes the need to differentially reward faculty for levels of performance and individual accomplishments that exceed the expectations of the department. Examples of extra meritorious activities for teaching may include: exemplary teaching accomplishments, new curriculum development, high SEI scores, innovations in curriculum, grants to support teaching improvement, teaching awards. Examples of extra

merit activities for research may include: **high quality** journal publication, paper acceptance and presentation at one of the discipline's top tier conference(s). Examples of extra merit activities for service may include: leadership positions, notable service contributions to UWL, the CBA, the department, the profession, or the public.

Merit Scoring. Based on the merit definitions identified above, each Merit committee member will assign **Not-Meritorious**, **"Meritorious"**, and **"Extra Meritorious."** for each ranked faculty member on teaching, research and service. A sample table is included in Appendix E.

The Merit committee chair will determine each faculty member's overall merit standing using the following process.

Extra Meritorious. "Extra Meritorious" may be assigned to any individual who is meritorious or extra-meritorious in all categories (see criteria for meritorious designation below). To be considered "Extra Meritorious", a vote of "extra meritorious" by 2/3rd or more of reviewers is needed in teaching, research or service and a vote of "extra meritorious" by 50% or more of reviewers is needed in another area.

Meritorious. "Meritorious" may be assigned to any individual who does not qualify for "extra meritorious" and who is "meritorious" in teaching, research and service. To be considered "Meritorious", a vote of "meritorious" or "extra meritorious" by 50% or more of reviewers is needed in teaching, research and service.

For "extra meritorious" and "meritorious", if 50% and 2/3 are equal then the 2/3 vote needs to be at least 1 greater than 50%.

2. Instructional Academic Staff in Permanent Budgeted Instructional Lines (otherwise see VI). For all IAS, the annual merit review may coincide with and include any concurrent retention and/or promotion review. The pool of merit funds for IAS is separate from the ranked faculty pool. IAS merit review will be done in accordance with Section VI.

3. Non-Instructional Academic Staff (if included in merit processes, otherwise see VII). Not applicable in the Marketing Department.

4. Department Chair. The department chair participates in the ranked faculty merit evaluation process in the same manner as all other ranked faculty. **Chair performance evaluation information** is outlined in section VIII (A3).

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.

All faculty members judged to meet their basic responsibilities as “meritorious” 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.

* Refer to the most current bylaw template for updates on the most complete and current language.

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/>

NOTE: UWS 1.0 indicates that “days” refers to calendar days rather than working or business days - with references to how to treat holidays etc.

NOTE: The probationary faculty member shall be notified in writing within seven days after each decision or recommendation at each reviewing level (UWL 3.06). For departments this is seven [*calendar*] days after the retention review meeting and can be limited to the results of the decision (if in accordance with department by-laws) and could take the form of an email. However, the letter from the department to the Dean (included as part of the departmental materials submitted to the Dean on each faculty member under contract review) should include the date of the vote, the numerical outcome, a clear indication of a 1 or 2 year contract recommendation, and departmental review of the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member’s teaching, scholarship and service. Department by-laws can determine the length of time between the departmental retention review and the receipt of the letter; however, the probationary faculty member must receive the departmental materials before or at the deadline for the materials being sent to the Dean along with the individual faculty member’s annual report on activities and retention (or tenure) report since date of hire with narratives and additional evidence as provided.

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

April 16, 2021

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

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.

- i. 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 by-laws.
- ii. Departments will provide the following materials to the dean:
 1. Department letter of recommendation with vote;
 2. Teaching assignment information (TAI) data sheet that summarizes the courses taught, workload data, grade distribution and SEIs by individual course and semester (which are only available after completing a full academic year) and departmental comparison SEI data; and
 3. Merit evaluation data.

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

iv. 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.

NON-CONTRACT REVIEWS - In the years when a probationary faculty member is not being reviewed for a contract renewal (i.e., a “non-contract renewal review”) the review process should follow the department by-laws (which range from chair review based on merit to full retention-type review) forwarding the resulting letter simultaneously to the probationary faculty member, the Dean and HR. The Deans have agreed to the first Friday in **MAY** as the latest deadline for non-contract review letters.

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 is 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 is comprised of all tenured faculty in the department. In the event that there are fewer than three tenured faculty members, the PRT chair will solicit additional tenured UWL faculty members to serve a one-year term (with the possibility of renewal) on the PRT 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 or above the rank the candidate is seeking constitutes a quorum.

1.1 Faculty Review (Non-Contract Review) Procedure

Reports. The candidate provides **two electronic reports (Individual Activity Report (for last academic year) and Individual Personnel Report (from date of hire) saved as a PDF file** 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:

- Evidence of teaching development activities (e.g., syllabi with learning objectives stated, course assessments, peer evaluations);
- Evidence of scholarship (e.g., copies of presentations, publications, creative activities);
- Evidence of service (e.g., letters or projects associated with department, college, university, and/or professional service);
- A retention narrative that describes the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service, modeled after the narrative required for promotion;
- A copy of their pre-UWL vita will be uploaded as an attachment in the electronic portfolio system.

The Department Chair will provide the committee with merit and SEI summary information.

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

Notification of Decision. Within 7 calendar days after the review meeting, a written summary, shall be given to the probationary faculty member and could be in the form of an email. **A letter reviewing the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship and service will be submitted the HR and the Dean. Reviews are to be completed by May 1.** For non-contact reviews no votes are taken.

1.2 Contract Review (Retention/Tenure) Procedure

Reports. The candidate provides **two electronic reports (Individual Activity Report (for last academic year) and Individual Personnel Report (from date of hire) saved as a PDF file** and

emailed to the Department Chair seven calendar days 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 Activity Report and Personnel Report should include hyperlinks to associated evidence such as:

- Evidence of teaching development activities (e.g., syllabi with learning objectives stated, course assessments, peer evaluations);
- Evidence of scholarship (e.g., copies of presentations, publications, creative activities);
- Evidence of service (e.g., letters or projects associated with department, college, university, and/or professional service);
- A retention narrative that describes the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service, modeled after the narrative required for promotion.
- A copy of their pre-UWL vita uploaded as an attachment in the electronic portfolio system.

The Department Chair will provide the committee with merit and SEI 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 7 calendar days after the review meeting, a written summary, including the vote, shall be given to the probationary faculty member and could be in the form of an email. A letter, written by the PRT committee, reviewing the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship and service will be submitted the HR and the Dean. The letter and deliberations provide a record of the probationary period and may be referenced by both the candidate and PRT 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 PRT 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 are 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. (See Appendix A).
 - 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 SEI scores, 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).
 - iv. **Professionalism:** The members of the Department believe we have established a tradition of civility and professionalism among our members and that is essential for all faculty and IAS to recognize and contribute to this tradition. While teaching, research/scholarship, and service contributions are primary indicators of professional success, we also recognize the role of professionalism/civility as a critical part of the review process. Professionalism is defined as the manner and process in which work-related duties are executed in the workplace.
- e. The Department will review the following required materials:
- A report from the candidate that addresses teaching assignment, teaching development, teaching evaluation, and professional goals for teaching.
 - Teaching assignment encompasses a listing of courses taught, unique expertise,

Note: The granting of academic tenure represents a long-term commitment of institutional resources which requires proof of excellence in past performance and a forecast that an individual faculty member's intellectual vitality and future contributions will continue to be of high quality for many years to come. By specifying in writing the usual criteria for advancement - teaching, scholarship, service - a university does not thereby set objective criteria, constricting its traditional discretion or transforming a largely judgmental decisional process into an automatic right to, or property interest in, tenure. For these reasons, non-tenured instructors should not expect an award of tenure solely on the fact that their contracts have been consistently renewed.

approach to grading and evaluation, and duties that are different from classroom teaching.

- 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.
- Teaching evaluation encompasses a narrative outlining the methods used to evaluate teaching, in addition to written evaluation by peers, and SEI scores.
- Peer evaluation and feedback; SEI results, and syllabi. The Department, in consultation the faculty member, will arrange one peer review per year. 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 (if applicable).

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 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.

NOTE: TENURE personnel ONLY

Candidates should be given the option of requesting an open meeting for the deliberative part of the meeting. The committee can still vote to close and close for the actual voting (see below).

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 teaching competency or scholarship. 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 (A-C). 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 are 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 SEI scores, 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 or 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 or exceeds the UWL CBA Scholarship & Practitioner Productivity Guidelines & Faculty Qualifications (Appendix A). See Appendix A for the Department's Statement on Scholarship.

* Refer to the most current bylaw template for updates on the most complete and current language.

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.

d. Professionalism: The members of the Department believe we have established a tradition of civility and professionalism among our members and that is essential for all ranked faculty and IAS to recognize and contribute to this tradition. While teaching, research/scholarship, and service contributions are primary indicators of professional success, we also recognize the role of professionalism/civility as a critical part of the review process. Professionalism is defined as the manner and process in which work-related duties are executed in the workplace.

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 The department follows the UWL procedure and schedule regarding post-tenure review <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/post-tenure-review-policy/>

UWL's policy was approved by the UW System Board of Regents in November 2016.

The post-tenure review policy as of 2-28-18 can be found Appendix I.

D. Faculty Promotion Procedures (procedure, criteria and appeal). 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 is a privilege based upon qualifications exceeding established minimal criteria and is recommended by an informed collective peer judgment.

Promotion Committee Membership. The Department PRT Committee will consist of all faculty of the same or higher academic rank as the promotion rank that the candidate is seeking. The Department PRT Committee will consist of a minimum of three members. Specifically, this means that all Associate and Full Professors are eligible to vote for faculty seeking promotion to Associate Professor and only Full Professors are eligible to vote on promotion recommendations to Full Professor. In the event that there are fewer than three faculty members at 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 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 Unclassified Personnel Rules Chapter 10, academic staff (instructional and non-instructional) will be evaluated annually. <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/faculty-and-staff/performance-appraisals/>

NOTE - A spring recommendation for a reappointment indicates that the individual is eligible for any pay-plan adjustments. The annual review of IAS should be completed by June 30. However, when a departmental process is part of the annual review (such as a merit determination), December 15 is the latest date of review for IAS on the prior year. The review should be signed by the IAS member and the chair and cc'd to the Dean's Office and HR.

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

Annual reviews of Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) will be conducted by the IAS Review Committee. The Committee will include the department chair, **the most senior IAS member in the department and the chair of the PRT committee**. IAS members of the IAS Review Committee will be at a rank **equal to or** higher than that of the person being reviewed. Tenure-track faculty members will be at a rank of Associate Professor or higher. All Committee members will have equal weight in the final evaluation. **The chair of the PRT committee will serve as the chair of the IAS committee and will determine the review process for the committee.**

Due to limitations in size, the composition of the staff within the department, **and/or when evaluating the most senior IAS member**, members of the IAS Review Committee may be from outside the department. **In this event, the remaining committee members nominate additional IAS members. The additional IAS members nominated will be N+1 where N represents the number of outside IAS committee members needed to form a committee of at least three members. The candidate under review will be allowed to review the IAS committee member candidate pool and remove one or zero potential committee members from consideration at their discretion.**

2. Evaluation Process

- At least 20 calendar days prior to the review, the department chair will give written notice of the review.
- Following receipt of notice the department chair and IAS member will mutually agree upon the composition of the IAS Review Committee **if an additional member is needed.**
- **At least 7 calendar days prior to the review**, IAS under review will provide the department chair with an electronic portfolio **(University Approved Software such as *Digital Measures* reports)** containing information on their teaching, professional development/creative activity/scholarship,

and service activities for the prior academic year ending May 31. Hyperlinked syllabi are required and the IAS member should provide additional evidence. For example, in order to enhance the evaluation of effective teaching beyond the measure of SEI scores and classroom peer observations, IAS members 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.

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

3. Evaluation Criteria

The criteria 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 (**Appendix F**). IAS are expected to devote 80% of their time and effort to teaching and 20% 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

Merit Ratings

Instructional Academic Staff in permanent budgeted instructional lines shall be evaluated annually for merit, and the distribution of any merit salary dollars shall be based upon this annual evaluation and on whether the position generates merit dollars. IAS members qualifying for merit will receive the state-allotted meritorious performance funding.

All IAS 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.

The annual merit evaluations of IAS must differentiate between levels of merit. The possible overall merit designations that can be assigned are: not-meritorious, meritorious, and extra meritorious.

- **Meritorious.** A meritorious designation denotes satisfactory performance related to an IAS member's responsibilities and expectations. To receive a meritorious designation, IAS members must perform their teaching responsibilities at a satisfactory level (Appendix C), as determined by students and peers; meet or maintain professional qualifications as outlined by the CBA (Appendix A); and meet department service responsibilities (Appendix B). It is possible to be non-meritorious in the service category (Appendix B) and meritorious in teaching and be considered meritorious/solid performance.
- **Extra Meritorious.** Extra merit recognizes the need to differentially reward IAS for levels of performance and individual accomplishments that exceed the expectations of the department in one or both areas of IAS responsibility (teaching and/or service). **Anyone who is non-meritorious in either category is not eligible for the extra meritorious overall ranking.** Examples

of extra merit activities for teaching may include: exemplary teaching accomplishments, new curriculum development, high SEI scores, innovations in curriculum, grants to support teaching improvement, and teaching awards. Examples of extra merit activities for professional development/creative activity/scholarship, and service may include: a peer-reviewed journal publication, paper acceptance and presentation at a national conference within one's field or in the area of teaching and learning, research grant awards, committee leadership positions, and notable service contributions to UWL, the CBA, the department, the profession, or the public.

Scoring: Based on the merit definitions identified above, each IAS Review Committee member will assign an overall evaluation to each individual using the Department Merit Evaluation Table (Appendix F). The overall merit evaluation score is based on teaching and service expectations of the department. In the overall category, the IAS member will be assigned the highest overall score (not-meritorious, meritorious, or extra-meritorious) given by a simple majority of the IAS Review Committee.

4. Transmission Process

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.

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

To be considered for promotion, IAS must submit their Promotion Portfolio to the department chair at least 7 calendar days prior to the review.

The IAS Review Committee will review the promotion portfolio. If approved, the IAS Review Committee 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

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.

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.

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.

Service activities fall into two categories, university service and professional service. University service is required while professional service is encouraged.

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

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

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

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

4. Reconsideration and Appeal Process

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.

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 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 committee 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 Rules Chapter 10, academic staff (instructional and non-instructional) will be evaluated annually. <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/faculty-and-staff/performance-appraisals/>. Performance reviews 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.

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 **and subject to remove for cause. The term shall start on July 1 of the elected year.** 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. The department will adhere to the selection and duties of the Chair that are delineated in the Faculty Senate Policies (revised 2008) <http://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/> 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 stated indicated in the Employee Handbook <http://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Employee-handbook/>.

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 **and the CBA Dean's office. The departmental feedback should follow the criteria set forth in appendix G and be initiated and complied by the CBA Deans office. The department will follow current protocol for the Dean's office evaluation.** The review shall be conducted by April 1st and the results shared with the dean and all departmental personnel.

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

Ranked Faculty and full-time IAS are expected to serve on Department committees as assigned by the Department Chair, CBA committees as assigned by the Department Chair, and UWL committees as assigned by the Faculty Senate. **A current list of standing departmental and CBA committees can be found in Appendix H.**

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

The Curriculum Committee will develop student learning outcomes for all programs housed within the Department and will review these outcomes every two years. Various direct and indirect assessment tools will be used to measure the achievement of these outcomes. Department student learning outcomes must be approved by the Department faculty.

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 Department Policies

1. Faculty Leave.

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

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

In the event of a planned absence, Faculty and IAS need to notify both the Department Chair and ADA and fill out the departmental campus absence form with details on course coverage and responsibilities. In the event of an unplanned absence, faculty/IAS need to notify the Department Chair and ADA via email and report accordingly on campus leave reports.

The Department encourages its members to seek leaves for sabbaticals, faculty development, scholarship, service, and other leaves that support the Department's mission.

The CBA has established sabbatical application and procedures, which can be found at http://www.uwlax.edu/uploadedFiles/Academics/Colleges_Schools/College_of_Business_Administrati on/CBA%20Sabbatical.pdf. The sabbatical proposal should be submitted to the Department chair 30 days prior to the CBA sabbatical deadline. The Department Chair will distribute to the department for comment. The PRT committee will review and vote on the proposal, using attributes noted in the CBA criteria. The departmental feedback and PRT vote will inform the required letter of support from the Department Chair.

Professional leave requests (not covered under a sabbatical) requires a proposal similar to the CBA sabbatical one year prior to the requested leave. The Department Chair will distribute to the department for comment. The PRT committee will review and vote on the proposal, using attributes noted in the CBA criteria. The departmental feedback and PRT vote will be forwarded on to the Dean's.

2. Salary Equity Policy.

UWL utilizes CUPA peer data to benchmark faculty and staff salaries (or UW System matches if CUPA data does not exist). Faculty and IAS salaries are benchmarked by rank and discipline whenever possible. The Faculty Senate Promotion, Tenure and Salary (PTS) committee reviews trends in data regarding equity, inversion and compression and makes recommendations for the disbursement of salary equity funds and/or pay plan (if available). Departments do not have the ability to make equity adjustments and Deans only have a limited ability when guided by PTS/Faculty Senate procedures. Individuals with job offers from another institution should provide the written offer to their chair and Dean for potential consideration of a salary adjustment if approved by the Provost and Vice Chancellor of Administration and Finance.

Note: A department may wish to include standard university policies that affect its members (e.g., graduate faculty membership). In addition a department may wish to include policies regarding leave, office hours, work-life policies, online teaching, etc.

3.

Summer and Winter Intersession Teaching Assignments. Summer and Winter Intersession

teaching is subject to funding, student needs, and faculty interest. The Department Chair will make teaching assignments **based on academic strengths, such as degree and rank; seniority; and teaching quality, experience and preferences of the involved faculty.** Additional considerations include contractual requirements, scholarly productivity, and retirement circumstances. An attempt should be made to rotate faculty assignment during intersessions based on qualified faculty interest.

Compensation for Summer Intersession follows UWL compensation policy. Compensation for Winter Intersession follows CBA compensation policy. Classes may be canceled if there is insufficient enrollment.

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 (Approved March 30, 2016). The Marketing Department strongly encourages and supports faculty and staff travel to conferences, seminars, and/or other venues for professional enrichment. The department's goal is to fully fund each department member for at least one professional event. The allocation of travel funds shall be left to the discretion of the chair, based on the priorities outlined below. In general, scholarship and benefit shall determine support.

Priorities for the chair to consider in typical order of importance ^[1]:

- Papers accepted for presentation
- Benefit and alignment with current teaching, scholarship and service responsibilities.

Additional considerations may include:

- Amount of time since last travel grant, with those who have not had a professional development event supported for a longer period of time given preference.
- Magnitude of the expense and alignment with current costs for similar professional development opportunities.
- Appearance on the conference program as chair or organizer or discussant.
- Untenured ranked faculty.
- Recent history of success with converting presentations into publications.

Procedures & Eligibility - Each academic year *Anticipated Travel* forms should be filled out in hard copy and submitted to the ADA for each conference the department member would like to attend. The requesting department member is responsible for complete and accurate anticipated expense figures, and should seek the most reasonable rates available. Should a department member wish to travel to more than one conference, s/he should rank order their requests. The department chair will then use the anticipated travel budget and he outlined priorities to budget travel for the year. The chair will then communicate to the department members the requests that can be funded. Travel requests will be reviewed three times during the academic year, depending on fund availability. Requests should be submitted on or before: September 15th; December 15th; March 30th.

Travel Expectations:

- Tenured and tenure-track faculty are encouraged to pursue development opportunities to present peer-reviewed research papers.

- Instructional academic staff are encouraged to pursue local and regional development opportunities.
- Department members should apply for funds from outside sources when appropriate.

International Travel - International development opportunities will typically be supported by the department up to an amount comparable to domestic opportunities. Other avenues, such as International Scholarship Grants; start-up funds; or personal funds can be used to cover all or additional expenses related to international development. Department members should not expect to receive funding for international travel without having applied for an international travel grant.

Travel Requirements

- The university Electronic Travel Preauthorization will be completed and approved before making travel arrangements (e.g., paying conference registration fees or booking transportation).
- A hard copy of the Department Absence Form should be filled out two weeks prior to departure and submitted to the ADA to ensure classes and other responsibilities are covered and the department chair and ADA are aware of the arrangements.
- If travel plans change, faculty should inform the chair immediately so that the travel funds may be reallocated to unfunded travel proposals using the guidelines below.
- A Travel Expense Report (TER) should be filled out promptly upon return from travel and must be completed within 90 days.

Notes:

1. Travel for administrative purposes or duties, other than professional development (e.g., search and screen, AACSB affiliated, assurance of learning, AMA collegiate conferences, or sales conferences), will not usurp the department's intent to fund at least one professional development opportunity for each department member.
2. While the goal is to fully fund professional development opportunities, the chair is allowed to partially fund development opportunities when there are a high number of requests; requests have lower priority; or the magnitude of the request exceeds typical costs associated with similar development opportunities.

[1] Exceptions to the prioritization order may be made when warranted by the given situation.

IX. Search and Screen Procedures

The department will follow recruitment and hiring procedures prescribed by the University's Office of Human Resources (HR) in conjunction with AAO, UW System and WI state regulations. The [UWL Search and Screen Policy and Procedures](#) are to be followed for all faculty and staff recruitments at UWL. 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 <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/recruitment/#tab-recruitment-processes>

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 <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/recruitment/#tab-recruitment-processes> (same for IAS & NIAS)

C. Pool Search. Hiring policy and procedures are found at <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/recruitment/#tab-recruitment-processes>

D. Academic Staff (if applicable) (same for instructional and non-instructional)
Hiring policy and procedures are found at <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/recruitment/#tab-recruitment-processes>

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.

The chair may offer the following options if the concern warrants further action:

- i. Facilitate a meeting with the faculty member and student with a third person in the room
 - ii. Raise the concern on the student's behalf to the faculty member and/or
 - iii. Provide additional guidance on the formal process or additional campus resources".
- c. If the student is uncomfortable speaking with the department chair, or the chair is the faculty member in question, or they are unsatisfied with the solution, 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 Campus Climate office and/or submit a hate/bias incident report.
- Complaints/concerns/grievances related to sexual misconduct may begin with the process outlined above, but will need to also involve the Equity & Affirmative Action 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.

3. Grade Appeal Policy

The material shown in 1 and 2 is highly recommended but optional according to Faculty Senate. Departments can elect to use the wording above or similar language that should align with the required language on the Syllabus Template, approved by Faculty Senate on October 10th, 2019: For 3 - all departments need to have a policy detailing the procedure by which a student could appeal a grade within the department. If a department does not incorporate 1 and 2 – the grade appeal policy should be A.

Per the CBA Student Grade Appeal Procedure (2018), all appeals for a final grade change must be initiated in writing through the department by the seventh week after the reporting of grades during the semester immediately following the semester in which the grade was earned.

The basis of the appeal should be that the student can demonstrate that the grading was arbitrary or capricious. The appeal process is as follows:

1. The student must first meet with his/her instructor to attempt to resolve the matter.
2. If after completing the first step and the matter is not resolved from the student perspective, the student can appeal in writing to the department chair. The chair will schedule a meeting with the student, instructor, and chair to resolve the matter. If the meeting still fails to resolve the situation from the student's perspective, the student can proceed to file an appeal to the dean's office.
3. In appealing to the dean's office, the student must submit the original written grade appeal and addendums outlining the outcomes of each meeting providing as much detail as possible. The dean's office will send an acknowledgement of receipt of the appeal letter to the student.
4. CBA Dean or Associate Dean in consultation with the College Academic Services Director will review the updated letter and make a decision. The Dean or Associate Dean may consult with students, instructor, or chair prior to making the decision. The Dean or Associate Dean will notify the student within three weeks of receipt of the appeal letter to the dean's office. If the decision of the dean's office is to change the grade, the College Academic Services Director will execute the change of grade and notify the Office of Records and Registration. The decision of the dean's office is final.

Incomplete Grades. As a matter of University policy, grades of "Incomplete" are issued to students strictly on the basis of illness or other unusual causes beyond the student's control, which have rendered the student unable to take the course final exam or to complete some limited amount of coursework. Incompletes are not to be granted to students who have failed to complete at least some substantial portion of the required coursework regardless of the reasons. Furthermore, conflicting student work obligations outside the University do not constitute acceptable grounds for granting grades of incomplete.

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 Office 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/>

Academic dishonesty, sometimes known as "cheating", is subject to appropriate punishment as a matter of UW System policy. This is not something to be taken lightly or ignored as such action works to demean the integrity of the hard-earned grades of all students, the vast majority of whom never cheat. To ignore

“cheating” is to foster it and thereby constitutes a dereliction of professional obligation. The Department follows the UW System policy on “academic misconduct” as it specifically applied to this campus.

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. 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. **Faculty are expected to be available to help with mass advising events, as scheduled.**

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, **personal situations** will be considered when setting class schedules if requested of 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.

XII. Appendices

Appendix A. Department Statement on Scholarship

The Department supports a broad view of scholarship that emphasizes currency 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 as well as for meritorious performance evaluations, have a record of ongoing scholarly activity that meets or exceeds CBA Scholarship & Practitioner Productivity Guidelines & Faculty Qualifications.

Expectations for Faculty with less than 5 years at UW-L:

- Scholarship activity meeting or exceeding CBA scholarly productivity guidelines (See Appendix A). Scholarly productivity guidelines are subject to change when revised by the College of Business Administration. (Expected by 4 year review; required for tenure)
- Reasonable progress should be made toward meeting CBA productivity guidelines as evidenced by having a minimum of one accepted manuscript by the end of 3 years at UW-L.
- Reasonable progress should be being made toward meeting CBA productivity guidelines as evidenced by research grant activity, conference presentations, or paper submissions (Expected by 2 year review).

*Probationary tenure-track faculty may be granted a reduced course load up to 5 years to facilitate research productivity. This is not equivalent to meeting retention guidelines.

The Department expects that successful candidates for tenure and promotion to have a record of ongoing scholarly activity that EXCEEDS the CBA Scholarship & Practitioner Productivity Guidelines & Faculty Qualifications (stated below).

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.

CBA Guidelines for Maintaining Scholarly and Professional Qualifications

Approved September 3, 2020

The UWL College of Business Administration (CBA) is accredited by the Association to Advance Colleges and Schools of Business (AACSB) which sets high standards for excellence for business education. The accreditation is an internationally recognized signal of high quality which is an asset to UWL and the CBA. Meeting the standards requires that the faculty and staff engage in scholarly and professional activities that lead to innovation and impact in business practice and academic disciplines.

Standard 15 of the 2013 AACSB Standards for Business Education and Standard 3 of the 2020 standards set expectations for faculty at an AACSB accredited institution to maintain scholarly or professional engagement in order to maintain currency in their fields of teaching and which lead to high-quality outcomes that support the school's mission. This document operationalizes this expectation for UWL CBA faculty.

AACSB recognizes four categories for qualification based on initial academic preparation and professional experience and sustained engagement activities. These categories are summarized in the following table.

		Sustained engagement activities	
		Academic (Research/Scholarly)	Applied/Practice
Initial academic preparation and professional experience	Terminal degree	Academics (SA)	Practice Academics (PA)
	Master's degree and professional experience	Scholarly Practitioners (SP)	Instructional Practitioners (IP)

The CBA expects most or all faculty to fit in one of these four qualification categories. This document outlines the CBA's expectations for sustained engagement activities for each of the four qualification categories.

The expectations that follow set *minimum* standards for maintaining AACSB qualifications. It is expected that department-specific expectations for merit, retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review exceed these minimums.

Scholarly Academic Qualification

Academic preparation: Normally, faculty members in this category have a terminal degree related to the field of teaching responsibilities. Alternatively, a faculty member may have a terminal degree in a field outside of teaching with other significant academic preparation in the field faculty member will be teaching, possibly including but not limited to AACSB Post-Doctoral Bridge Program, completion of a post-doctorate program, or record of peer-reviewed publications.

Early career qualification: Faculty are considered to have the scholarly academic qualification for the five years following the completion of the above academic preparation

Qualification maintenance: After the five-year period following academic preparation, to maintain the scholarly academic qualification, faculty must maintain currency in their fields of teaching with regular engagement in scholarly activities.

The scholarly academic qualification will be determined on the *first day of classes for each Fall and Spring semester* and be based on academic preparation and scholarly activities that took place in the five-year period leading to that date.

To maintain the scholarly academic qualification, within the five-year period the faculty member at a minimum must achieve one of the following:

- Have at least two activities from Group 1 and have at least three additional activities from Group 1 and/or Group 2 or...
- Have at least two activities from Group 1, where one of the peer-reviewed publications is in a medium-impact journal (defined below) or better, and have at least two additional activities from Group 1 and/or Group 2 or...
- Have at least two activities from Group 1, where two of the peer-reviewed publications are in a medium-impact journal (defined below) or better, and have at least one additional activity from Group 1 and/or Group 2

Scholarly activities counting in this qualification category must be related to the faculty member's field of teaching.

Instructional workload: Tenured and tenure-track faculty will usually have employment contracts specifying a 9-credit per semester teaching load to support maintenance of the scholarly academic qualification. Tenured and tenure-track faculty not meeting the scholarly academic qualification will have a 12-credit per semester teaching load. In rare instances, Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) may have the academic preparation and scholarly engagement activities to support the scholarly academic qualification. Unless different arrangements are approved by the CBA dean, usually IAS employment contracts require a 12-credit per semester teaching load.

Practicing Academic Qualification

Academic preparation: Normally, faculty members in this category have a terminal degree related to the field of teaching responsibilities. Alternatively, a faculty member may have a terminal degree in a field outside of teaching with other significant academic preparation in the field of teaching, possibly including but not limited to AACSB Post-Doctoral Bridge Program, completion of a post-doctorate program, or record of peer-reviewed publications.

Qualification maintenance: To maintain the practicing academic qualification, faculty must maintain currency with professional experience or continued engagement in profession(s) related to their field of teaching.

The practicing academic qualification will be determined on the first day of classes for each Fall semester and be based on academic preparation and scholarly activities that took place in the five-year period leading to that date.

To maintain the practicing academic qualification, within the five-year period the faculty member must have at least three activities from Group 3 and have at least three additional activities from Groups 1, 2, 3 and/or Group 4. Professional and academic engagement activities counting in this qualification category must be related to the faculty member's field of teaching.

Instructional workload: Faculty meeting the practicing academic qualification will usually have a 12-credit per semester teaching load.

Former administrators: Tenured faculty members who have recently served at least one year in a full-time leadership role in college/university administration as non-instructional academic staff and who are not meeting expectations for scholarly academic status may use their administrative experience to automatically qualify as a practicing academic. The practicing academic qualification begins on the date of return to faculty status and continues for the number of years of service in full time administration, up to five years. Eg: A faculty member who served in administration for five or more years can count as a practicing academic for five years. A faculty member who served two years in administration can count as practicing academic for two years. Former administrators in this category have a normal teaching load of 9-credit hours per semester to allow time to engage in scholarship and eventually move to a scholarly academic qualification status. After the post-administration period of qualification has ended, a faculty member will only maintain a 9-credit per semester teaching load if maintaining a scholarly academic status, and will otherwise revert to a usual 12-credit per semester teaching load.

Scholarly Practitioner Qualification

Academic preparation: Normally, faculty members in this category have a master's degree related to the field of teaching responsibilities.

Qualification maintenance: To maintain the scholarly practitioner qualification, faculty must maintain currency in their fields of teaching with regular engagement in scholarly activities.

The scholarly academic qualification will be determined on the first day of classes for each Fall semester and be based on academic preparation and scholarly activities that took place in the five-year period leading to that date.

To maintain the scholarly academic qualification, within the five-year period the faculty member must have one activity from Group 1 and have at least three additional activities from Group 1 and/or Group 2. Scholarly activities counting in this qualification category must be related to the faculty member's field of teaching.

Instructional workload: Faculty meeting the scholarly practitioner qualification will usually have a 12-credit per semester teaching load.

Instructional Practitioner Qualification

Academic preparation: Normally, faculty members in this category have a master's degree related to the field of teaching responsibilities.

Qualification maintenance: To maintain the instructional practitioner qualification, faculty must maintain currency with professional experience or continued engagement in profession(s) related to their field of teaching.

The instructional practitioner qualification will be determined on the first day of classes for each Fall semester and be based on academic preparation and scholarly activities that took place in the five-year period leading to that date.

To maintain the instructional practitioner qualification, within the five-year period the faculty member must have at least two activities from Group 3 and have at least two additional activities from Groups 1, 2, 3 and/or Group 4. Professional and academic engagement activities counting in this qualification category must be related to the faculty member's field of teaching.

Instructional workload: Faculty meeting the instructional practitioner qualification will usually have a 12-credit per semester teaching load.

Selecting and Switching Qualification Categories

Faculty have an obligation to work with their department chair to determine their appropriate qualification category (or what qualification category they will work toward if not currently fitting in anycategory). Department chairs will share this determination with the CBA dean's office along with evidence that faculty members are meeting the minimum expectations for the categories.

AACSB defines in its standards minimum ratios for the proportion of faculty within each discipline that may fall into each qualification category.¹ Furthermore, AACSB expects that the mix of faculty across the four qualification categories is the result of intentional and strategic decisions to advance the college's mission. Faculty members may propose to switch from one qualification category to another and must do so with these considerations in mind and in consultation and with the support of their department chair and the CBA dean. A proposal to switch must include a description of recent activities and planned future activities to assure there is no disruption in meeting the expectations of at least one qualification category as a result of the switch. The decision to approve switching categories is contingent upon the likelihood the faculty member will have no disruption in qualification, the likelihood that switching still results in a mix of faculty that achieve the school's mission, and the likelihood that switching results in qualification ratios within the faculty member's discipline that exceed AACSB minimum standards.

¹ The 2013 AACSB standards state that each discipline has at least 40% of faculty resources be SA qualified, at least 60% be SA or PA or SP, and at least 90% be SA or PA or SP or IP. The proposed 2020 AACSB standards state that each discipline has at least 40% of faculty resources be SA qualified and at least 90% be SA or PA or SP or IP.

Scholarly Engagement Activities

Group 1: Peer Reviewed Intellectual Contributions

(Faculty can repeat items for credit)

Publication in a *peer-reviewed* academic journal
of low-impact or better

- Conference proceedings that are *peer-reviewed* include a complete manuscript that is published, circulated, and publicly available
- Publication of a *first-edition* scholarly book or textbook by a regionally, nationally, or internationally recognized publisher
- Awarded a significant, competitive, external grant for scholarly work^{2,3}

Group 2: Other Intellectual Contributions

(Faculty can repeat items for credit)

- Publication of a second-edition or later scholarly book or textbook by a regionally, nationally, or internationally recognized publisher
- Self-publication of a first-edition scholarly book or textbook, or publication of a first-edition scholarly book or textbook by a publisher not recognized in Group 1
- Presentation of scholarly work at a regional, national, or international academic or practitioner conference (repeatable only for different scholarly works)
- Invited seminar presentation of scholarly work at an academic or research institution (if same scholarly work not presented and counted above and repeatable only for different scholarly works)
- Publication of a book chapter, book review, or study guide
- Publication of a non-refereed journal article
- Awarded a small external grant for scholarly work³
- Awarded a competitive UWL grant for scholarly work^{3,4}
- Editorial responsibilities for a scholarly book or academic journal
- Delivering scholarly symposium or workshop
- Service on a dissertation committee
- Three or more of any of the following: peer-reviews in academic journals, chair or discussant at an academic conference, serving on a panel at a academic conference, reviewing applications for external grants, presentation of scholarly work at local or campus events
- Other significant research projects that have been publicly disseminated and have documented impact

² “Significant” is determined by the department in collaboration with the CBA dean and depends on both the dollar value of the award, the contribution of the faculty and the potential impact of the project to advance scholarship in the field.

Subcontractor amounts may be helpful in this determination. “External” may include UW-System grants.

“Competitive” implies a peer-review process where awards depend on an evaluation of expected scholarly impact.

³ The stated purpose of the grant program must be to support scholarship. Awards from grant programs with different stated purposes that may have resulted in creation of scholarly work do not count in this category.

⁴ “UWL grant” implies grants that are eligible to faculty from all colleges and departments. It does not include CBA-specific grants or department-specific grants.

Scholarly impact: Group 1 activities are distinguished from Group 2 activities in that they are higher impact and involve peer-review. To assure Scholarly Academics and Scholarly Practitioners are engaged in impactful activities, these qualification categories define a minimum number of activities in Group 1, and beyond this minimum, additional activities may come from Groups 1 or 2. While higher-impact activities usually involve larger time commitments or greater workload, workload or time commitment themselves do not serve as a basis for whether an activity is counted in Group 1 or 2.

Low-impact journal: Journal must have a documented and verifiable peer-review process and with public circulation. Journals listed in the Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC) list at 'C' level are considered low-impact unless other external ratings or metrics make the case the journal has a higher impact than typical C-level journals on the list. This category also includes journals not listed on ABDC but have external ratings or metrics similar to C-level journals. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide such documentation⁵. Publications in predatory journals do not count as a low-impact journal publication.

Medium-impact journal: Journal must have a documented and verifiable peer-review process and with public circulation and publications in the journal on average make a measurable impact on the discipline. Journals listed in the Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC) list at 'B' level are considered medium-impact unless other external ratings or metrics make the case the journal has a different level of impact than typical B-level journals on the list. This category also includes journals not listed on ABDC but have external ratings or metrics similar to B-level journals. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide such documentation. Publications in predatory journals do not count as a medium-impact journal publication.

High-impact journal: Journal must have a documented and verifiable peer-review process and with public circulation and publications in the journal on average make a significant impact on the discipline. Journals listed in the Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC) list at 'A' or 'A*' level are considered high-impact unless other external ratings or metrics make the case the journal has a lower level of impact than typical B-level journals on the list. This category also includes journals not listed on ABDC but have external ratings or metrics similar to or exceeding A-level journals. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide such documentation. Publications in predatory journals do not count as a high-impact journal publication.

Peer-review: A peer-review process implies that one or more reviewers with practical or academic expertise critique and evaluate the manuscript for correctness, uniqueness, and added-value to the scholarly literature. As peers, the reviewers are likely similarly qualified as the faculty member, being academics or professionals with similar academic preparation and have a record of making scholarly contributions to the field. The CBA's definition of peer-review also includes law journals recognized by third parties, such as the Australian Business Deans Council or the Washington and Lee School of Law Journal Rankings, as having an impact on the practice of law or on the scholarly literature in the field of law.

⁵ Acceptable documentation might include but is not limited to the h-index for the journal, or membership on another list that can be crosswalked with the ABDC journal list

Predatory journals: Predatory journals and publishers prioritize self-interest and profits at the expense of advancing scholarship. They typically deviate from best-practices for peer-review, editorial review, and publication, and/or lack transparency in these processes. They typically accept articles quickly, without thorough review, and impose fees on the author to publish the work. Sometimes the fee is under the guise of “open access.” Publication fees and open-access are not on their own evidence of predatory practices, but those practices may warrant closer investigation. Multiple lists exist identifying potential predatory journals and publishers, including Beall’s list (<https://beallist.net>) and Cabell’s Journal Blacklist (<https://www2.cabells.com/about-predatory>). Inclusion or omission from these lists are not alone sufficient evidence to make a conclusion of predatory practices, as there are journals determined legitimate in one list and predatory in another (see, for example, *Nature* 2019, 576, 210-212 and Teixeira da Silva and Tsigaris, *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 2018, 44, 781-792) and there may exist predatory journals not yet identified as such by the profession. Still, the lists may serve as a starting point for investigation. Paper acceptances for CBA faculty from journals with publication fees, that lack evidence of impact, and that did not supply thorough peer-reviews should be investigated by the faculty member in collaboration with the department to determine a journal is not a predatory journal. Publications in journals determined to be predatory do not count toward a faculty member’s scholarly qualifications.

AACSB classification of intellectual contributions: AACSB identifies the following categories of intellectual contributions.

Definitions from the 2013 standards - 2018 update:

- Basic or discovery scholarship: Contributions that generate and communicate new knowledge and understanding and/or develop new methods. These contributions are normally intended to impact the theory or knowledge of business.
- Applied or integration/application scholarship: Contributions that synthesize new understandings or interpretations of knowledge or technology develop new technologies, processes, tools, or uses; and/or refines, develops, or advances new methods based on existing knowledge. These contributions are normally intended to contribute to and impact the practice of business.
- Teaching and learning scholarship: Contributions that develop and advance new understandings, insights, and teaching content and methods that impact learning behavior. These contributions are normally intended to impact the teaching and/or pedagogy of business.

Definitions from the 2020 standards:

- Basic or discovery scholarship: Contributions are directed toward increasing the knowledge base and the development of theory.
- Applied or integration/application scholarship: Contributions draw from basic research and use accumulated theories, knowledge, methods, and techniques to solve real-world problems and/or issues associated with practice.
- Teaching and learning scholarship: Contributions explore the theory and methods of teaching and advance new understandings, insights, content, and methods that impact learning behavior.

The CBA has an undergraduate-only student body and a student-focused mission. The CBA recognizes that applied scholarship and pedagogical scholarship advance this mission, in addition to contributions to basic/discovery scholarship that sustain currency in teaching fields. The CBA values contributions of any these types of scholarship from its faculty and expects a college-wide portfolio of its intellectual contributions will include a mix of all of them.

Professional Engagement Activities

Group 3: Professional Engagement Activities with Significant Impact

(Faculty can repeat items for credit)

- Publication of an academic or practitioner-oriented book (first or subsequent editions)
- Publication in an academic, professional, or trade journal of scholarship related to business practice (there should be documented evidence for quality, reputation, and/or impact of journal)
- Presentation at a regional, national, or international practitioner conference (repeatable for each unique contribution, but not for multiple presentations of the same contribution)
- Awarded a significant, competitive, external grant⁶
- Authoring of publicly disseminated business reports
- Editorial position at a professional or trade journal
- Development and presentation of executive education curriculum
- Teaching in company education or training programs
- Leadership role in professional or academic associations, professional standard making bodies, or professional policy-making bodies
- Faculty internships/externships that embeds faculty member in an organization's activities in a manner significant in time and substance
- Membership and active participation on a board of directors for a 12-month period (repeatable for each board membership or for the same membership for each 12-month period the position is held)
- Membership and active participation on a board of advisors for a 12-month period (repeatable for each board membership or for the same membership for each 12-month period the position is held)
- Part-time or full-time work in industry (at least 0.5 FTE over 12-month period or 1.0 FTE over 6-month period, repeatable for each 12-month period)
- Consulting work significant in time and substance (repeatable for each 12-month period)
- Attaining or maintaining an industry-recognized professional certification commonly required for areas of practice in the field (eg: CPA; must have current and valid certification at first day of contract for the academic year to count; repeatable for multiple certifications; not repeatable for the same certification over multiple years)

⁶ "Significant" is determined by the department in collaboration with the CBA dean and depends on both the dollar value of the award and the potential impact of the project on practices in industry. "External" may include UW-System grants.

"Competitive" implies a review process where awards depend on an evaluation of the expected impact.

Group 4: Other Professional Engagement Activities that Enhance Currency in the Field(Faculty can repeat items for credit)

- Attendance at an academic, professional, or trade conference
- Attendance at a professional or academic workshop or seminar
- Administering or reviewing for grant programs outside of UWL
- Creation, revision, or coordination of courses, programs, or events that require significant interaction with external constituents
- Awarded a small external grant
- Awarded a competitive UWL grant⁷
- Serve as an investigator in an externally-grant-funded project (if same grant not already counted)
- Providing expert witness testimony
- Author articles or op-ed pieces for media outlets
- Completion of a graduate course
- Completion of a professional training program
- Completion of a continuing education course or training program
- Acquiring professional certification (if not counted in Group 3 as industry-recognized and/or commonly required to practice in the field; the award of the certificate is not to double-count with completing a training or education program that was required for the certificate)

Professional impact: Group 3 activities are distinguished from Group 4 activities in that they have a higher impact on the CBA's mission. To assure Practicing Academics and Instructional Practitioners are engaged in impactful activities, these qualification categories define a minimum number of activities in Group 3, and beyond this minimum, additional activities may come from any of Groups 1, 2, 3, or 4.

While higher-impact activities usually involve larger time commitments or greater workload, workload or time commitment themselves do not serve as a basis for whether an activity is counted in Group 3 or Group 4.

⁷ "UWL grant" implies grants that are eligible to faculty from all colleges and departments. It does not include CBA-specific grants or department-specific grants

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).”

Behavioral Guidelines:

Faculty are expected to be actively engaged in service as evidenced by regular attendance and participation on committees and/or positions of leadership. While there are a variety of service opportunities available to faculty, it is expected that in most years faculty members will advise an appropriate share of marketing advisees; represent the department on a standing CBA committee and/or serve on departmental committees if asked or eligible; and play an active role on at least one university committee when selected.

Evaluation Criteria:

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

Behavioral Guidelines:

Faculty members are expected to comply with the following behavioral expectations:

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

Evaluation Criteria:

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 it is recognized that different individuals have different talents and objectives within the classroom, faculty should strive to articulate and achieve student learning outcomes. Furthermore, this process is ongoing and faculty are expected 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 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: (It is recommended that a colleague 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 detailed 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, faculty are expected 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 feedback on student perceptions and an observation in at least one class each academic year 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. Student Feedback. A colleague visits one class around the 5th - 6th week in the semester (prior to 7th week but after students have received some form of graded assessment) at a time arranged with the instructor. Students complete a written response (this could be in electronic or paper format) to three items: 1. What does the instructor do that you think facilitates or improves your learning in the class? 2. What, if anything, does the instructor do that you think makes learning more difficult in this class? 3. What would make the course a more effective learning experience for you during the remainder of the semester? The observer writes up a summary of this visit within seven calendar days, provides the probationary faculty member with the summary, and discuss any potential course changes the faculty member might employ.

B. 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 A-D). 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?

C. Summary Analysis of Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEI's):

- Discuss the SEI numerical score received for all/some of the instructor's courses for the year, including the course for which you conducted a classroom observation
- Review the SEI written comments for all/some of the instructor's courses, including the course for which you conducted a classroom observation
- Provide a concise summary (1 paragraph) of the instructor's strengths and areas for improvement based on an objective consideration of the SEI numerical scores and written comments.

D. 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.
- 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. Ranked Faculty Merit Evaluation Form

Complete the following for each eligible faculty member, except yourself. Attach comments to the form if the room provided is insufficient. Please check the appropriate rating and submit your evaluations to the Merit Committee chair, who will tabulate and report the results.

Meritorious Evaluation

Table for Department Records

Category	Name	Vote		
		No Merit	Meritorious	Extra Meritorious
Teaching				
Research				
Service				

Dean's Office Merit Report

Name	Result with Category Designation

Merit Rating Definitions. The annual merit evaluation of faculty must differentiate between levels of merit (**not-meritorious, meritorious or extraordinary merit**).

- Not Meritorious. A faculty member not meeting the criteria for meritorious or extra meritorious.
- 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 or maintain CBA Scholarship & Practitioner Productivity Guidelines (Appendix A) and meet department service responsibilities (Appendix B). Faculty, who have been here less than five years, will be evaluated on their progress towards meeting CBA Scholarship & Practitioner Productivity Guidelines (Appendix A). **For faculty not meeting CBA Scholarly guidelines for part of the year, the decision of "meritorious" versus "not meritorious", will be judged subjectively based on the progress toward scholarship and length of lapse.**
- Extra Meritorious. Extra meritorious recognizes the need to differentially reward faculty for levels of performance and individual accomplishments that exceed the expectations of the department. Examples of extra meritorious activities for teaching may include: exemplary teaching accomplishments, new curriculum development, high SEI scores, innovations in curriculum, grants to support teaching improvement, teaching awards. Examples of extra merit activities for research may include: **high quality** journal publication, paper acceptance and presentation at one of the discipline's top tier conference(s). Examples of extra merit activities for service may include: leadership positions, notable service contributions to UWL, the CBA, the department, the profession, or the public.

Merit Scoring. Based on the merit definitions identified above, each Merit committee member will assign **Not-Meritorious,** "Meritorious", and "Extra Meritorious." **for each ranked faculty member on teaching, research and service.** A sample table is included in Appendix E.

The Merit committee chair will determine each faculty member's overall merit standing using the following process.

- Extra Meritorious. "Extra Meritorious" may be assigned to any individual who is meritorious or extra-meritorious in all categories (see criteria for meritorious designation below). To be considered "Extra Meritorious", a vote of "extra meritorious" by 2/3rd or more of reviewers is needed in teaching, research or service and a vote of "extra meritorious" by 50% or more of reviewers is needed in another area.
- Meritorious. "Meritorious" may be assigned to any individual who does not qualify for "extra meritorious" and who is "meritorious" in teaching, research and service. To be considered "Meritorious", a vote of "meritorious" or "extra meritorious" by 50% or more of reviewers is needed in teaching, research and service.
- For "extra meritorious" and "meritorious", if 50% and 2/3 are equal then the 2/3 vote needs to be at least 1 greater than 50%.

Appendix F. IAS Annual Review Guide and Merit Tables

(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

	Documentation			Performance			
	N/Ap	Evidence	No Evidence	Solid	Emerging	Needs Improvement	Comments
% Teaching							
IAS Self- reflection/teaching philosophy							
SEI scores and comments							
Syllabi and inclusion of learning outcomes							
Grade distribution aligns with department							
Peer evaluation							
Teaching related professional development activities							
Demonstrates use of current and relevant course materials							
Direct measures of student learning including sample work by students							
Indirect measures of student learning							
Participation in departmental or college required course-based assessment (if relevant)							

	Documentation			Performance			
	N/Ap	Evidence	No Evidence	Solid	Emerging	Needs Improvement	Comments
% Service/Professional Development/Scholarship							
Student advisement							
Department service							
College service							
University service							
Mentoring							

Practitioner Engagement and Leadership: Activities are required to maintain Instructional Practitioner Status. The activities below may qualify. Peer reviewed publications are required for Scholarly Practitioner status.	Documentation			Performance			
% Teaching	N/Ap	Evidence	No Evidence	Solid	Emerging	Needs Improvement	Comments
Grants to support teaching improvement							
Leadership/Presentations in teaching workshops, conferences, AOL							
Directed student research							
Teaching awards							
Membership in professional organizations							
Professional service							
Discipline-related community service							
Leadership roles							
Continuing professional education							
Conference/workshop attendance							
Publications/Work in progress							
Grants							
Other:							

% Reassigned time (if applicable) _____
 Description:

IAS Merit Table for Department Records

Category	Name	Vote			Result
		No Merit	Meritorious	Extra Meritorious	
Teaching					
Service					

Table for the Dean's Office

Name	Result with Category Designation

Appendix G. Guide for Department Chair Review from Faculty

(Currently being revised by CBA Dean's Office)

DEPARTMENT CHAIR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Name of person being evaluated:

Assess the department chair's administrative performance using the following scale.

	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
	5	4	3	2	1	0
_____ 1.	Leadership skill as displayed by ability to motivate faculty members to perform effectively.					
_____ 2.	Ability to establish and maintain effective working relationships with faculty members.					
_____ 3.	Willingness to provide assistance when consulted.					
_____ 4.	Makes clear to those affected on what basis decisions are made.					
_____ 5.	Is respected by colleagues.					
_____ 6.	Receptivity to new ideas.					
_____ 7.	Ability to plan college resources so as to achieve the most effective use of resources.					
_____ 8.	Credibility, as perceived by the faculty.					
_____ 9.	Integrity.					
_____ 10.	Trustworthiness.					
_____ 11.	Assumption of responsibility for one's actions.					
_____ 12.	Effectiveness in following through with commitments.					
_____ 13.	Treating the faculty members fairly in personnel matters.					
_____ 14.	Objectivity in decision-making.					
_____ 15.	Ability to make tough decisions and stand by them.					
_____ 16.	Effectiveness in making decisions that are in the best interest of the whole department.					
_____ 17.	Ability to make decisions on the basis of the best information available.					
_____ 18.	Clear communication of ideas.					
_____ 19.	Clear communication of policies.					
_____ 20.	Openness to change, when necessary.					
_____ 21.	Being approachable on most topics and willing to hear them out.					
_____ 22.	Effectiveness in carrying out departmental responsibilities.					
_____ 23.	Commitment to doing the best job possible.					
_____ 24.	Ability to communicate questions, complaints, etc. from students, faculty members and superiors to affected faculty members.					
_____ 25.	Overall evaluation					

WRITTEN COMMENTS ON CHAIR'S ADMINISTRATIVE PERFORMANCE

Name of person being evaluated

1. Chair's Strengths

2. Chair's Weaknesses

3. Suggestions for Improvement

----- (YES or NO) Do you want your comments given to the Chair? (Note: If your answer is yes, these comments would be given to the Chair after merit decisions are transmitted to the Dean).

Appendix H. MBA Consortium SEI Questions

Suggested questions are 2, 7,8,9,10,11,13,14,15,16,17

Item	Item Text
1	From a course design perspective, active participation and discussion in course is
2	Feedback on assignments identified areas for improvement in my learning
3	The tests reflect course objectives
4	The tests and graded exercises cover the course content
5	Graded assignments reflect course objectives
6	The procedure for determining final course grades was appropriate
7	Instructor contributed to my learning in this course
8	Instructor showed interest in the course content
9	Instructor's use of examples & illustrations were
10	Instructor showed interest in student learning
11	Instructor appeared knowledgeable in the subject matter
12	Course activities and content (assignments, discussions, etc.) contributed to my learning
13	Instructor provided timely responses to questions
14	My instructor provided timely feedback on graded assignments
15	Instructor's grading procedure is fair
16	My instructor's overall teaching effectiveness was
17	The instructor has made no attempt to manipulate or bias the student responses on this evaluation

Appendix I. Post-Tenure Review Policy

(Approved by the UW System Board of Regents 11-10-2016)

I. POLICY PHILOSOPHY & DEFINITIONS

A. UW System Statement Regarding Post-Tenure Review

UWL's Post Tenure Review Policy is based on the Regent Policy Document 20-9 entitled "Periodic Post-Tenure Review in Support of Tenured Faculty Development." UW System policy states that tenure is an essential part of the guarantee of academic freedom that is necessary for university-based intellectual life to flourish. The grant of indeterminate tenure to faculty members represents an enormous investment of university and societal resources, and those who receive this investment do so only after rigorous review which established that their scholarship, research, teaching, and service met the highest standards and are congruent with the needs of the university. It is the policy of the Board of Regents that a periodic, post-tenure review of tenured faculty members is essential to promoting faculty development, including recognizing innovation and creativity; enhancing the educational environment for students; and identifying and redressing deficiencies in overall performance of duties through a supportive and developmental remediation process. Nothing in this policy shall be interpreted to alter or to infringe upon existing tenure rights, as set forth in UW System Board of Regents or UW System policies, nor shall this policy diminish the important guarantees of academic freedom. Specifically, this policy does not supersede administrative rules providing for termination for cause set forth in Chapter UWS 4 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code.

B. Deadlines, Due Dates and Definitions

Post-tenure reviews will be completed by departments and forwarded to Deans no later than December 15. The department may conduct the review in the Spring prior to December; however, the faculty member must concur and the December date sets the 5-year clock. However, since HR notification occurs during the summer, official notification of the post-tenure review might not be issued at the time of the Spring review. When specific dates are provided as deadlines (e.g., March 1), if the date falls on a weekend or holiday, the deadline may automatically be assumed to be the next business day. Academic Unit (AU) = Unit that houses ranked faculty department(s) = College of Liberal Studies, College of Business Administration, College of Science and Health, School of Education and Murphy Library. HR = Human Resources. When the review pertains to faculty in Murphy Library, all references to Deans should be interpreted as the Library Director.

C. The Five Year Cycle*

The 5-year cycle at UWL refers to the amount of time between the formal department review associated with tenure or post-tenure review and the next formal department review associated with post-tenure review. Post-tenure review is in addition to the standard annual review of faculty conducted by departments. The start of the post-tenure review timeline for a faculty member is five years from the Fall of the calendar year associated with the formal UW Regent approval of the individual's tenure. Furthermore, for tenured faculty with a post-tenure review officially on file with the Dean's Office or Human Resources (HR) at the time that this policy goes into effect, their next post-tenure review will be in the Fall five years from the calendar year on the department letter on file (even if the resulting review ends up being slightly longer or shorter than 5 years). HR is the final repository and record keeper for personnel documentation.

**UW System Board policy UW SYSTEM requires a post tenure review at least once every five years of each tenured faculty member's activities and performance.*

D. Post-tenure Review Exceptions & Eligibility

The 5-year cycle is not affected by a faculty member's paid or unpaid leave. If a faculty member is on full-time leave from the university in the Fall of his/her 5-year review (paid or unpaid), the faculty member should still be reviewed following the university's policy because the process can be completed electronically and without the faculty member physically present. The review may be deferred only with the approval of the Provost (by request from the faculty member,

supported by the Chair, and the Dean). In such cases, the Provost will specify the new review cycle that applies to the faculty member.

Faculty members with a tenured position and a salary line within an academic department who have appointments outside of the department during the post-tenure review period (e.g., such as serving in the Dean's Office) will undergo post-tenure review as scheduled. For the post tenure review, the outside unit's supervisor will provide a brief overview of the duties and a review of the faculty member's work making sure to clearly indicate whether the individual met or did not meet expectations in the role. The department will review work associated with department-related teaching, scholarship, and service. The department is responsible for requesting and including the review of the work external to the department to include in the post-tenure review materials; however, the department's determination of "meeting or not meeting expectation" is based on department-related activities.

E. Record Keeping and Notification

The initial documentation regarding the known post-tenure review cycles and outcomes at UWL will be established by each AU with Human Resources. For this initial record keeping, each AU must provide an electronic version of the most recent post-tenure review letter from the department and/or Dean to 1) establish the 5-year cycle and 2) have the letter on file with HR. Starting in the summer of 2017, HR will notify academic departments which faculty members need to receive their post-tenure review at or about the same time as departments are notified of which faculty are promotion eligible but no later than 3 months prior to the review. In addition, each faculty member who will be up for review will be notified at the same time as the academic department.

II. POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURE

A. Relationship to Annual Review and other Personnel Review

The post-tenure review may coincide or overlap with other forms of department-level personnel review. However, a separate letter regarding post-tenure review using the structure indicated below must be provided to the Dean (Provost/HR) and the procedure for post-tenure review as described below must be followed.

B. The Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee & Notification

The departmental post-tenure review committee shall be comprised of all tenured faculty members, with a minimum of 3 tenured faculty members. The Department Chair serves as a committee member and chair of the committee unless the department chair holds tenure in another department, or is being reviewed. In either of these two cases, the committee shall elect a chair to complete the administrative components of the process. In the event that there are not three tenured department members, the Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean and the faculty member, shall meet to select outside members. If there is not a mutual agreement, the Dean shall have the final say in the selection of the outside members.

The post-tenure review committee will meet to review the faculty member's materials and determine whether the faculty member 1) meets expectations or 2) does not meet expectations. The faculty member must receive at least 21 calendar days notification of the time/date of the meeting and the deadline (7 days prior to the meeting) for which the materials will be due. Electronic notification through official UWL email is appropriate. The faculty member is not expected to be present for deliberations and the committee will move into closed session following WI open meeting laws.

C. Material for Consideration by the Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee

Seven calendar days prior to the committee meeting, the faculty member under consideration for post-tenure review needs to provide to the committee via its chair, at minimum an electronic report from the electronic faculty activity portfolio system (e.g., annual activity report with hyperlinks) drawn from the last date of tenure (use January 1 of the tenure year if first post-tenure review) or last post-tenure review to the date of the committee review, and the faculty member must ensure that the report is up-to-date on 5 years of activities and includes the following materials:

- hyperlinks to at least one syllabus for each course (not each section of each course, or each term of each course) taught in the past five years
- hyperlinks to evidence of scholarly activities associated with the specific entry (e.g., publication, grant, exhibition, presentation)
- hyperlinks for service are not required

Seven calendar days prior to the committee meeting, the Department Chair must provide to the committee faculty composite SEI scores for each semester being evaluated.

If the faculty member is a School of Education (SoE) affiliated faculty member, the SoE Dean should receive a copy of these materials at the same time as the departmental post-tenure review committee.

D. Post-Tenure Review Categorization

After moving to close the meeting following the proper state statute WI Statute 19.85(1)(c) for personnel review, the departmental post-tenure review committee will consider a motion regarding the faculty member under post-tenure review meeting or not meeting expectations. A majority vote (as defined by departmental by-laws) is needed for the motion to pass. The motion and the numerical results of the vote should be indicated in the minutes and the letter to the Dean. Depending on the result of the department vote, the faculty member will be considered to be in one of the following two categories:

- a. Meets expectations. This category is awarded to those tenured faculty members whose performance reflects the expected level of accomplishment based on departmental by-laws.
- b. Does not meet expectations. This category is assigned to those tenured faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment below the expected departmental level and which requires correction. All reviews resulting in “does not meet expectations,” unless overturned upon further review, will result in a remediation plan as described below.

E. Evidence for Consideration

Although the departmental committee provides an overall categorization of “meets expectations” or “does not meet expectations,” the committee must also consider and report on the faculty member’s performance in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Departmental by-laws, particularly with regard to scholarship appropriate to the discipline, shall be used as the criteria for review. In addition, the department may also draw on foundational expectations in terms of professional ethics such as those articulated in the AAUP’s statement on professional ethics <https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-professional-ethics>.

The Dean of the School of Education shall provide input to the departmental post-tenure review committee for SoE faculty in the form of an evaluative letter. The letter will address teaching, scholarship, service and professional development as they pertain to DPI standards, content standards, and expectations for teacher education.

F. Procedure when Faculty Member “Meets Expectations”

The departmental post-tenure review committee chair provides a letter to the Dean and the faculty member within 14 calendar days of the personnel meeting (no later than December 15) with the following information:

- The date and the numerical result of the vote indicating the overall categorization of “meets expectations” for the faculty member. The letter should include the names of all of the tenured faculty who voted and the committee chair’s signature.
- A brief description of the consensus points of the committee regarding the faculty member’s strengths in teaching, scholarship, and/or service that formed the basis for the committee’s “meets expectations” decision. The faculty member can request a meeting with the committee chair to discuss the evaluation further, if the faculty member wishes.

A copy of the department’s letter, along with the faculty member’s electronic post-tenure review documents are retained by the department in accordance with UWL’s records retention guidelines.

The Dean forwards the letter to HR and the Provost (Chancellor's designee) no later than February 1. If the faculty member is an SoE-affiliated faculty member, the SoE Dean should receive a copy of the letter at the same time as the content Dean.

If a department determines that a faculty member "meets expectations," but the Dean (or SoE Dean) disagrees with the department and has concerns about the faculty member falling below expectations, the Dean forwards the faculty member's file, the department's recommendation and includes his/her own written appraisal of the faculty member's work in the context of the department's by-laws (copied to the faculty member and the post-tenure review committee chair). In the case where a Dean(s) disagrees with the department, the Provost (as the Chancellor's designee) makes the final designation regarding "meets expectations" or "does not meet expectations" after allowing for the faculty's written response (see below). If the Provost indicates that the faculty member "does not meet expectations," the process for a remediation plan as described in the next section is enacted. The Provost's decision must be provided in writing with justification and conveyed to the faculty member, department post-tenure committee chair, the Dean, (and SoE Dean, if applicable) and HR no later than March 1.

If the faculty member wishes to provide written commentary on the post-tenure review committee letter from the department or the Dean he/she must provide the letter to the committee chair, the Dean, and the Provost within 7 calendar days of the receipt of the post-tenure review letter at either the department or Dean review level.

G. Procedure when Faculty Member "Does Not Meet Expectations"

The departmental post-tenure review committee chair provides a letter to the Dean, the SoE Dean (if applicable), and the faculty member within 14 calendar days of the personnel meeting (no later than December 15) with the following information:

- The date and the numerical result of the vote indicating the overall categorization of "does not meet expectations" for the faculty member. The letter should include the names of all of the tenured faculty who voted, the committee chair's signature, as well as a statement indicating that the committee recommends the development of a remediation plan.
- A description of the consensus points of the committee regarding the faculty member's work in teaching, scholarship, and/or service with a clear identification of any deficiencies that formed the basis for the committee's "does not meet expectations" decision.
- The department will also forward the faculty composite SEI scores for each semester being evaluated. (In contrast to promotion, department merit and SEI rankings need not be provided.)

The Dean reviews the file and submits a letter to the Provost (Chancellor's designee) and the faculty member (with a cc: to the Department Chair and HR) by February 1 of the same academic year of the departmental post-tenure review. If the faculty member is an SoE-affiliated faculty member, the SoE Dean should provide written commentary and recommendations to be included in the content Dean's letter.

The Dean's letter must clearly indicate whether or not the Dean concurs with the department's categorization of the faculty member as "does not meet expectations." The Dean's (or the SoE Dean's, if applicable) review is a recommendation to the Provost (Chancellor's designee).

The Provost's letter (as the Chancellor's designee) must be submitted by March 1 and must clearly indicate whether or not the Provost concurs with the department's categorization of the faculty member as "does not meet expectations."

- If the Provost (as the Chancellor's designee) concurs with the department decision, the letter will outline the process and timeline of a remediation plan (below).
- If the Provost does not concur with the department, the Provost sends a letter to the faculty member clearly indicating the department concerns but that the Provost is not requiring a remediation plan. The letter is provided to the committee/department chair, Dean(s), HR, and the faculty member. No formal action is required of the faculty member until the next post-tenure review.

If the faculty member wishes to provide written commentary on the post-tenure review committee letter at any step of the process, s/he must provide the letter within 7 calendar days after the receipt of the post-tenure review decision letter at the department, Dean, and/or Provost level. The letter should be addressed to the most recent review level and to the upcoming review level.

If a remediation plan is required, the following steps will take place:

1. The Provost's letter to the faculty member indicates that a remediation plan is needed and has been recommended by the department (and the Dean and/or the Provost, as applicable).
2. The Provost's letter indicates that the Dean will initiate a face-to-face meeting with the faculty member and the departmental post-tenure review committee chair within 21 calendar days of the date of the Provost's letter. If the faculty member rejects the opportunity for a face-to-face meeting or is unable to schedule such a meeting, the Dean will complete the process without consultation with the faculty member.
3. Prior to the meeting with the Dean, the departmental post-tenure review committee chair and the faculty member shall develop a written plan for mentoring and professional development to address the issue(s) leading to the "does not meet expectations" decision. The remediation plan should clearly indicate the links between the deficiency or deficiencies indicated and the specific operationalized goals and outcomes for the faculty member.
4. The faculty member may choose one other tenured faculty member from the university to attend the meeting as a liaison (if desired). The Dean may also elect to have one other tenured faculty member or administrator from the university attend the meeting as a liaison (if desired) if the departmental post-tenure review committee chair cannot be in attendance.

The final remediation plan:

- shall be the product of mutual discussion between the faculty member, the departmental post-tenure review committee chair, and the Dean, shall respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and shall be flexible enough to allow for subsequent alteration.
- is referred to as developmental as its purpose is to help the faculty member reach appropriate improvement goals in line with the area(s) of deficiency identified. A good developmental remediation plan should reflect the mission/goals/objectives of the department/college/university and the faculty member's professional development needs and objectives.
- shall list resources for appropriate support from the department, Dean, and/or other campus resources as applicable (e.g., Center for the Advancing of Teaching and Learning). Specific financial resources, including supplies and equipment, reassignment time, etc. for supporting a scholarly agenda should also be identified and agreed upon, if needed.
- shall clearly indicate a deadline (not to exceed three academic semesters starting the Fall subsequent to the development of remediation plan) by which time all elements of the plan must be satisfied. The faculty person can request an earlier deadline if s/he wishes.
- shall indicate that 1) a progress meeting will be scheduled with the Dean, the departmental post-tenure review committee chair, and the faculty member approximately one semester into the plan to help determine progress and identify additional improvement resources that may aid the faculty member, and 2) that a final remediation follow-up meeting will occur between the Dean, the departmental post-tenure review committee chair, and the faculty member after the deadline, but before the start of the subsequent academic semester, and not to exceed 21 calendar days past the deadline (e.g., if three semesters are provided, within 21 calendar days of the close of the 3rd semester to allow for student evaluations to be accessed, etc.).
- shall indicate the specific consequence(s) of not meeting the operationalized goals of the remediation plan by the deadline. Consequences can range from informal sanctions such as workload assignments, to discipline short of dismissal for cause (such as suspension

without pay), or in extreme instances, dismissal for cause, under UWS Chapter 4. Within 7 days of the meeting, the departmental post-tenure review committee chair will provide the finalized remediation plan to the Dean, who will forward the plan to the Provost and HR. The final remediation plan will be on official UWL letterhead and will be signed by the faculty member named in the remediation plan, the departmental PTR committee chair, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Provost. All signatories will receive a final signed electronic copy of this plan from HR within 14 days of the meeting.

At least 7 days prior to the final remediation follow-up meeting, the departmental post-tenure review committee will write a letter to the Dean indicating whether the faculty member has either met or not met the goals of the remediation plan, including evidence for the decision. At the meeting, the Dean will consult with the departmental post-tenure review committee chair and the faculty member about the evidence indicating that the faculty member has met or not met the obligations of the remediation plan.

The remediation follow-up meeting will result in a letter from the Dean to the faculty member and the Provost/Chancellor (copy to department Chair and HR) indicating that the faculty member has either

- Met the conditions of the remediation plan, with a statement regarding when the next formal post-tenure review by the department will occur (either sooner or 5 years from the date of the review that triggered the remediation plan). OR
- Not met the conditions of the remediation plan. If the remediation plan has not been met, the letter will include information regarding the sanctions, discipline, or dismissal procedures. Procedures in UWS4 or UWS 6 will be followed. The Chancellor (or Chancellor's Designee) will make the final determination in cases where the conditions of the remediation plan were deemed not to have been met by either the departmental post-tenure review committee or the Dean.

Tenured faculty members who are completing a remediation plan, or have been found to have not met the conditions of a remediation plan, are not eligible for equity adjustments based on merit. If/when the remediation plan is successfully completed, the faculty member is once again eligible, but retroactive pay cannot be awarded.

In those few remediation plans related to a performance shortfall in research where more than three academic semesters may be necessary to correct identified deficiencies, an extension of one academic semester shall be permitted only with the approval of the Chancellor, which shall trigger a notification of that extension to the UW System Administration Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs.

H. Appeals and Grievances

A faculty member cannot appeal a negative post-tenure review decision at the departmental level. Furthermore, the reviews conducted and remediation plans developed in accordance with this policy are not subject to the grievance process set forth in Chapter UWS 6.02, Wis. Admin. Code.

I. Post-tenure Review Opportunities

A faculty member who has been determined to have met expectations by the department will be considered eligible for additional compensation subject to the availability of resources.

J. Information, Documentation and Reporting

Information and documentation relating to post-tenure review shall be maintained by the appropriate department, college or school, or university personnel or bodies, and disclosed otherwise only at the discretion, or with the explicit consent, of the faculty member, unless required by business necessity or by law. The Provost's Office, working in conjunction with HR, will provide the summary report to the Chancellor on the completion of post-tenure reviews by the departments as provided to the Deans, the Provost's Office, and HR.

Appendix J. Standing Department and CBA Committees

Departmental Committees

1. IAS Review Committee. See Section VI.A.1.

2. Promotion, Retention and Tenure Committee. See the Department Review Committees in Section IV.

3. Curriculum/Assurance of Learning Committee.**** Responsible for review of all curriculum proposals and the eventual forwarding of recommendations to the Department for approval. The committee is also responsible for all aspects of departmental program assessment and general education assessment.

4. Bylaws Committee. Responsible for maintenance and refinement of these Bylaws, as needed, and incorporation of any UWL or CBA policies that may impact these Bylaws and the procedures and policies herein.

5. Ranked Faculty Merit Committee. Responsible for scoring and reporting of annual merit to the Dean's office.

CBA College Committee

1. Assurance of Learning Task Force
2. Graduate Committee
3. International Business Advisory Committee
4. Scholarship Committee
5. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

CBA Committee assignments can be found at: <https://www.uwlax.edu/cba/resources-for-faculty-and-staff/#tm-cba-committee-assignments>