Department of Health Professions

Bylaws

Departmental Approval: May 8, 2009
Portions: October 6, 2016
Portions: March 29, 2017
Portions: September 19, 2017
Portions: September 29, 2017
Portions: October 16, 2017
Portions: November 8, 2017
Portions: April 2, 2018

Approved by Dean:

PLEASE NOTE: The format for these bylaws as well as selected sections and section verbiage are standard across the university consistent with Faculty Senate action taken on April 15,

2008. Sections followed by an * represent required wording and therefore not subject to the amendment process as outlined within these bylaws."

I. Department of Health Professions Bylaws (11/8/17)

II. Organization and Operation

A. Preamble
B. Meeting Guidelines
C. Definitions of Membership and Voting Procedures
D. Quorum
E. Bylaws Amendments

III. Faculty/Staff Responsibilities

A. Faculty - Responsibilities and Expectations
    1. Teaching
    2. Scholarship
    3. Service
    4. Clinical Activities
    5. Outside Activities
B. Instructional Academic Staff - Responsibilities and Expectations
    1. Teaching
    2. Scholarship
    3. Service
    4. Clinical Activities
    5. Outside Activities
C. Non Instructional Academic Staff - Responsibilities and Expectations
D. Student Evaluations of Instruction

IV. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)

A. Evaluation Processes and Criteria
    1. Faculty
B. Distribution of Merit Funds
C. Appeal Procedures (if applicable)
D. Annual Professional Development Plans and Selection of Mentors
    1. Selection of Mentors for Newly Hired Faculty and IAS
    2. Components of the Professional Development Plan
E. Peer Review of Teaching
F. Annual Activity Reports

V. Faculty Personnel Review

A. Retention (procedure, criteria, and appeal)
B. Retention/Tenure Review Committee
C. Review Process
D. Department Retention and Tenure Criteria
E. Reconsideration
F. Tenure Review and Departmental Tenure Criteria (Appendix B)

G. Post-Tenure Review
    1. Criteria
    2. Process
H. Faculty Promotion Procedures (procedures, criteria, and appeal)
    1. Review process
    2. Criteria
    3. Reconsideration
I. Instructional Academic Staff Review
    1. Annual Review
    2. Annual Review Appeal Procedure
    3. Promotion Procedures
    4. Promotion Recommendation Committee
    5. Reconsideration

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

VII. Governance

A. Department Chair
    1. Election of the Departmental Chair
    2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair
B. Program Directors
    1. Selection and Appointments
    2. Responsibilities of Program Directors
C. Evaluation of Program Directors and Department Chair
D. The Health Professions Department
    1. Departmental Committees
        a) Committee Membership
        b) Committee Organization
            (1) Chair and Program Directors Committee
            (2) Merit Evaluation Committee
            (3) Retention and Tenure Committee
            (4) Promotion Recommendation Committee
            (5) Student Recruitment Committee
            (6) Departmental Programmatic Assessment Plan
            (7) Additional Department Policies

VIII. Search and Screen Procedures

A. Tenure-Track Faculty
B. Instructional Academic Staff
C. Contingency Workforce (Pool Search)
D. Academic Staff

IX. Student Rights and Obligations

A. Complaint, Grievance and Appeal Procedures
    1. Grade Appeal
    2. Academic Non-Grade Appeals
    3. Program Policy Appeal
B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct (Students)
C. Advising Policy

1. Advisement of Students in Professional Programs
2. Evaluations of Students in Professional Programs
3. Advisement of Pre-Professional Students

X. Appendices

A. Procedure for Hearing Grade Appeal
B. Definition of Teaching, Service, and Scholarship
C. Policy on Outside Activities
D. Template for Professional Development Plans and Faculty/IAS Evaluations
E. Peer Evaluation Form (Faculty/IAS)

I. Department of Health Professions Bylaws (11/8/17)

A. Vision Statement

The University of Wisconsin-La Crosse Department of Health Professions will be a recognized leader in evidence-based, clinically integrated healthcare education through collaboration among uniquely specialized professionals and institutions, serving diverse student and community populations.

B. Mission Statement

The Department of Health Professions at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, in concert with the Health Science Consortium, is committed to the education of healthcare professionals who are prepared to uphold and advance their respective professions' standards of practice throughout the continuum of health care. The department is committed to serving as a resource for the people, communities, and healthcare systems of our region.

II. Organization and Operation

Department members are governed by six interdependent sets of regulations:

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

A. Preamble

The Health Professions Department was created through a merger of the Physical Therapy Department and the Clinical Science Department following faculty senate approval of the Reorganization of the Collegiate Structure at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse in Spring 2003. The Clinical Science Department housed an array of five independent programs (Medical Laboratory Science, Nuclear Medicine Technology, Occupational Therapy, Physician Assistant, and Radiation Therapy). The Physical Therapy Department was a single unit, not separated into programs. The proposed reorganization was implemented Summer 2003 with Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy, Physician Assistant and Radiation Therapy comprising four independent units in the newly formed Health Professions Department, Nuclear Medicine Technology Program becoming a unit within the Chemistry Department (and in 2010 returned to the Health Professions Department) and Medical Laboratory Science becoming a unit within the Microbiology Department. The Health Professions Department bylaws were first adopted by the members of the department in accordance with the University of Wisconsin System and University of Wisconsin-La Crosse Faculty and Academic Staff Personnel Rules in December 2003. Medical Dosimetry was added as an online degree program in 2003 and later transitioned to a MS degree in 2009. Medical Dosimetry is funded through service based pricing. The Physician Assistant program began awarding the MS degree in 2003, the Occupational Therapy Program began awarding the MS degree in 2004 and the Physical Therapy Program began awarding the DPT in 2005.

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.wisconsin.edu/general-counsel/legal-topics/open-meetings-law/

Minutes will be taken by a departmental academic department associate (ADA) and will be posted electronically for review by department members. Copies of the minutes of department meetings and committee meetings shall be available, retained and will be made publically available on request.

C. Definitions of Membership and Voting Procedures

The Department utilizes both ranked (tenured and tenure-track) faculty and instructional academic staff (hereafter referred to as IAS). The Department values their contributions equally and any differential treatment is related to College and University policies.

Voting members of the department shall include all ranked faculty (including those on leave or sabbatical who are in attendance) and IAS, and non-instructional academic staff who have ≥ 50% FTE departmental appointments and who maintain a campus presence of ≥ 20 hours per week during the academic year. Other faculty and IAS appointed in the department are welcome to participate in department meetings and discussions but are not voting members of the department.

Ranked faculty and IAS have similar voting rights except IAS shall not vote on personnel issues of retention, tenure, or promotion for ranked faculty. IAS who hold the title of senior lecturer or associate clinical professor may vote on IAS career progression matters as appropriate. Voting occurs with a voice, hand or electronic vote.

Proxy votes are not permitted in meetings of the department and its committees. Voting members who join by teleconference/internet and have reviewed the deliberations are eligible to vote.

D. Quorum

For meetings of the department and its committees, a quorum is defined as the simple majority of the entire membership eligible to vote**.** Unless otherwise stated, a majority (and similarly a two-thirds majority) is defined as a majority of those present at meetings of the department and its committees.

E. Bylaws Amendments

Changes to these bylaws may be adopted if supported by two-thirds of the voting members of the department. The vote will occur after two readings of the amendment(s) at two different department meetings unless the requirement of a second reading is waived by two-thirds of the voting members of the department. Both meetings must be announced at least five days in advance of the meetings.

III. Faculty/Staff Responsibilities

A. Faculty

Responsibilities and Expectations

Faculty responsibilities are referenced in section IV of the Faculty Senate bylaws entitled "Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons."

A complete set of the by-laws are available on the Senate webpage under "Senate Articles and By-laws" http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/. https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/committees/faculty-senate/faculty-senate-manual-021417.pdf (This is the direct link, page 38-42)

Faculty in the department are expected to maintain high levels of professional competency in areas of teaching, scholarship and service. Faculty are expected to be contemporary in content areas related to their expertise.

Appendix B will assist faculty in classifying their professional activities in ways that are consistent with departmental and university expectations regarding teaching, scholarship, & service. Sections IV & V will serve to further clarify how faculty contributions will be evaluated.

A-1. Teaching
Faculty members of the department are required to keep current in their subject and profession. Additional information may be found in individual position descriptions. Faculty members are required to work with the department chair and/or program director(s) to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching, evaluate student evaluations, and maintain contemporary expertise for each course they teach.

A-2. Scholarship
Faculty members of the department are required to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship. Scholarship (is) are considered to be well defined activities that use professional expertise to discover, apply or use knowledge. These activities provide value to an academic discipline, often incorporate methods from one or more disciplines and have been subjected to peer review. This may include the scholarly activities relative to discovery, integration, application, and teaching. See Appendix B

A-3. Service
Faculty members of the department are required to serve their department and programs by participating in routine committee work, attending program and department meetings and advising students as assigned. Selected service obligations may merit re-assigned time. Examples of such service obligations might include but are not limited to duties associated with Department Chair, Program Director, clinical education, admissions, programmatic assessment, and dual-degree coordination.

A-4. Clinical Activities
Faculty with clinical credentials may maintain their professional knowledge and expertise by participating in clinical activities when possible. They shall not interfere with University responsibilities and must conform to policies governing outside activities (http://www.uwlax.edu/uploadedFiles/Offices-Services/Human_Resources/OAR_Guidelines.pdf) Faculty participating in clinical practice [if greater than 4 hours/wk during the academic year] are expected to submit an alternative workweek schedule. (Employee Handbook, Section C-11 and

E-2; http://www.uwlax.edu/uploadedFiles/Offices-Services/Human_Resources/UW-LHandbook2015.pdf and or http://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/outside-activity-reporting/

A-5. Outside Activities
Faculty may engage in outside activities such as research, consulting, or other activities that are not part of their required university responsibilities. These activities shall not interfere with university responsibilities and must conform to policies governing outside activities that are explained in Appendix C.

As a guideline for the purposes of these bylaws, clinical activity and/or outside activities that result in more than 8 hours of University time per week may be considered excessive and likely to negatively impact on the individual's obligations to the University and department.

Per Ch. UWS 8, Wisconsin Administrative code, all faculty, academic staff, and limited employees must report, in writing, their involvement in outside activities every year before April 30th. All faculty, academic staff, and limited employees must submit these reports using the form provided at the link below, whether or not they have engaged in outside activities.

B. Instructional Academic Staff

Responsibilities and Expectations

Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) responsibilities are referenced in section IV of the Faculty Senate Bylaws entitled "Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons." A complete set of the by-laws are available on the Faculty Senate webpage under "Articles, bylaws and policies" https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/

Instructional Academic Staff in the department are expected to maintain high levels of professional competency in areas of teaching & service. Individual programs may require scholarly contributions as well. IAS are expected to be contemporary in content areas related to their expertise. One way to maintain this expertise may involve participation in clinical activity.

Appendix B will assist IAS in classifying their professional activities in ways that are consistent with departmental and university expectations regarding teaching, service, and scholarship. Sections IV & VI will serve to further clarify how IAS contributions will be evaluated.

Requests for IAS hiring will be presented to the college dean. The request will indicate one of the standard titles from the lecturer or clinical professor series. http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/committees/ias/pages/titling.html and will outline specific duties including teaching and any additional workload. Total workload for IAS is defined as a standard minimum teaching load plus additional workload equivalency activities. https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/committees/faculty-senate/faculty-senate-manual-021417.pdf

B-1. Teaching
Instructional Academic Staff members of the department are required to maintain currency in assigned course content. Additional information can be found in individual position descriptions.

Instructional Academic Staff members are required to work with the department chair and/or program director(s) to facilitate student evaluation of instruction in each course they teach (See Section III D. Student Evaluation of Instruction for details).

The department includes several professional clinical programs and utilizes instructional and clinical expertise of individuals outside of the university. Instructional Academic Staff in these programs have responsibility for the development of courses, establishment of evaluative criteria, arrangement of clinical educational experiences, and development of affiliations with individual clinicians and institutions.

B-2. Scholarship
IAS members of the department may be required to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship according to individual program accreditation criteria and in accordance with individual professional development plans.

B-3. Service
IAS members of the department are required to serve their department**,** college, and university by participating in committee work, attending program and department meetings, and advising students as assigned. Selected service obligations may merit re-assigned time. Examples of such service obligations might include but are not limited to duties associated with Program Director, clinical education, admissions, programmatic assessment**,** and dual-degree coordination.

B-4. Clinical Activities
IAS with clinical credentials may maintain their professional knowledge and expertise by participating in clinical activities when possible. They shall not interfere with University responsibilities and must conform to policies governing outside activities https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/offices-services/human-resources/oar_guidelines.pdf Faculty participating in clinical practice are expected to submit an alternative work week schedule (Employee Handbook, Section C-11 https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/employee-handbook/). As a guideline for the purposes of these bylaws, outside activities that require use of more than 8 hours of University time per week for a full time equivalent position may be considered excessive and likely to negatively impact on the individual's obligations to the University and department. (See Appendix C of these bylaws).

B-5. Outside Activities
IAS may engage in outside activities such as research, consulting, or other activities that are not part of their required university responsibilities. These activities shall not interfere with

university responsibilities and must conform to policies governing outside activities that are explained in Appendix C.

C. Non Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations

Responsibilities and expectations for non-instructional academic staff are based on their individual position descriptions. Specific responsibilities will be decided by their program director and the department chair.

D. Student Evaluation of Instruction

The department will follow the UW-La Crosse's Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) policy and procedure available off the Faculty Senate webpage http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/ Ranked Faculty & SEIs. Results from the Faculty Senate approved SEI questions are required for retention, tenure, and promotion in the form of (1) the single motivation item and (2) the composite SEI consisting of the 5 common questions. These numbers will be reported using the Teaching Assignment Information (TAI) form. The department will add both the motivation item and the composite SEI fractional median for each course. In addition, the candidate's overall fractional median for the term on both the single motivation item and the composite SEI are reported. Finally, the department adds the departmental fractional median for both the single motivation item and the composite, the minimum and maximum composite SEI for the department, and the candidate's rank in SEI scores relative to all departmental ranked faculty (tenure-track or tenured) for that term (e.g. 3 of 15). For IAS renewal and promotion, the same information as above is reported; however, no TAIs are generated for IAS.*

These evaluations will take place during the last three weeks of course instruction, or at the conclusion of the clinical internships except for courses in which the chair has deemed the use of SEI's to be inappropriate (e.g., courses with enrollments of fewer than 5 students). In recognition of the variety of roles that instructors of record may play within courses, additional evaluative data may be collected but may not replace the university SEI instrument.

The SEI instrument will be administered by a faculty or IAS member other than the course instructor; appropriate data collection methods will be used to ensure student anonymity as outlined in the Classroom Administration Guidelines section of the SEI Background Information. https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B5olNNrU5bquUUlGTy1SVTZjbXc/view

Students receive notification of SEI's and fill them out electronically. It is the responsibility of program directors and the department chair to ensure that the evaluation is performed. Programs may require additional data be collected by ranked faculty/IAS for purposes of individual and/or programmatic development as well as programmatic assessment.

IV. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)

The results of merit reviews for all faculty/IAS who have completed at least one academic year at UWL are due to the Dean's Office on December 15 annually. Merit reviews reflect activities during the prior academic year ending June 1.

All faculty and IAS must participate in the merit process after the first year of employment.

- This evaluation is accomplished by a review of each individual's faculty development plan/evaluation with their program director or department chair.
- There are parallel but separate merit pools at UWL for faculty and IAS, therefore faculty and IAS merit rankings are separate.
    - "Exceptionally Meritorious" is the highest rating. This requires a second level of departmental review if supported by the program director. Only the exceptional meritorious rating requires a second level of review detailed below.
    - "Highly Meritorious" is given if the PDP goals were met or exceeded and supported by the program director or chair.
    - "Meritorious" is given if the PDP goals were partially met and supported by the program director or chair.
    - "No Merit" is given if the PDP goals were not met and supported by the program director or chair.
- Each faculty/IAS will submit an Activities Report from Digital Measures (for the academic year to be reviewed) and their completed PDP and both documents will be reviewed by their program director.
- Program directors will be reviewed by the Health Profession's chair.
- Health Profession's department chair will be reviewed by the Dean.
- The highest rating, "Exceptionally Meritorious" requires a second level of review. Faculty who are working on obtaining tenure or faculty/IAS who are participating in the promotion process are encouraged to submit merit materials for a more extensive review by the HP department merit committee for exceptionally meritorious.
    - HP Department Merit committee for faculty will consist of 2 faculty and HP chair. Merit committee for IAS will consist of 2 IAS members and HP chair. The HP chair will appoint the 2 members of each committee.
- To have merit materials evaluated for the rank of "Exceptionally Meritorious", the following steps are to be followed:

    1. Complete the annual review (completed PDP & Activities Report) with the program director or department chair.
    2. Submit (completed FDP & Activities Report) to the HP department merit committee by September 1 and this committee will make a decision before October 1.

A. Evaluation Processes & Criteria

A-1. Faculty

Consistent with UWS 3.05 and UWL 3.05, the performance of all faculty and continuing IAS in the department will be reviewed annually. Areas to be evaluated for IAS include teaching and service. As noted earlier, scholarship is generally not expected for IAS though it may be included for programmatic reasons. Specific dates for completion of annual evaluations of faculty and IAS are specified by UW-L administration. These dates are distributed to departmental chairs at the beginning of the fall semester.

Purpose: The purpose of annually reviewing faculty and IAS is to provide constructive feedback to guide professional development needed to support the program, department, college, and institution. The results of this review process will be used for multiple purposes including distribution of merit pay, promotion, retention, tenure, post-tenure review, construction of the departmental annual report for the college, and updating professional development plans.

Teaching: The definition of teaching can be found in Appendix B. Teaching includes traditional classroom and laboratory instruction, academic and clinical mentoring of professional program students, and advising of undergraduate and graduate student research. Teaching is ranked as the area of greatest importance in terms of faculty and IAS responsibility.

Teaching effectiveness will be assessed using student evaluation of instruction (SEI) scores obtained from each of the courses in which the individual plays an identifiable traditional instructional role. Where faculty or IAS have a non-traditional role, alternative evaluation forms will be created to solicit student evaluation scores. Other evidence of successful teaching or teaching improvement may be submitted for consideration including, but not limited to, peer evaluation of teaching, teaching awards, published educational materials, development of unique teaching resources, and mentoring student research.

Probationary faculty and IAS are required to undergo peer evaluation of instruction during each of their first five years of employment in the department (See Section 4-3). Faculty are also required to include peer evaluation of instruction information for promotion to the ranks of Associate and Full Professor (See 5.1 and 6.2). In addition, faculty may use peer evaluation of instruction for post-tenure review (see Section 5-4.1).

Courses that have less than 8 students enrolled may be evaluated with tools other than SEI to preserve student anonymity. Faculty/IAS who choose to evaluate a small enrollment course with other means collaborates with the program director to ensure that data collected is compatible with the program's curricular assessment plan

Scholarship: The department requires faculty members to have a record of ongoing scholarly activity and evidence that external peer review has judged it to be of value. Scholarship is defined in Appendix B.

The UW-L academic affairs website has useful information regarding scholarship as defined by the Joint Promotion Committee. http://www.uwlax.edu/academic-affairs/provost-promotion-resources/

Service: The definition of service can be found in Appendix B. Service contributions shall be judged by the impact on and contribution to the program, department, college, university, community, and/or profession.

The form in Appendix D will be used for the faculty/IAS annual program level review.

B. Distribution of Merit Funds

Each faculty and IAS member's average merit score will be classified as not meritorious, meritorious, highly meritorious, or exceptionally meritorious based on review.

With each annual pay plan, merit pools of *P* dollars are separately directed to the department for faculty and academic staff. Of these pools, 67% will be allocated to individuals in the top three meritorious categories as a percentage of their base salary. The remaining 33% of the pool will be used for supplemental merit for individuals in the "high" and "exceptional" categories, which will be distributed as follows.

If there are *m* individuals in the "highly meritorious" category and *M* individuals in the "exceptionally meritorious" category, then the value *V* of a supplemental merit unit is given by $V = 0.33P/(m + 1.5M)$. Each person in the "highly meritorious" category will receive *V* dollars and each individual in the "exceptionally meritorious" category will receive $1.5V$ dollars.

Instructional academic staff members are awarded merit using different funds than tenure-track faculty. Therefore, merit awards for the two groups will be calculated separately, although the same distribution procedure will be used for each group.

C. Appeal Procedures (if applicable)

A faculty or IAS member may request a reconsideration of his/her merit rating. This request must be made in writing to the department chair within one week of the initial merit rating (annual review). The HP Department Chair will appoint a new Merit Evaluation Committee to convene no later than the first week of September following the request for reconsideration, and the committee's final evaluation decision will be communicated in writing to the faculty or IAS member. The chair may similarly appeal their performance rating with the Dean.

Appeals beyond the departmental level may be presented to the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals, and Academic Freedom Committee (see Section II. G. of the Faculty Senate Bylaws).

https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/

Additional information of Complaints and Grievances are available on the Human Resources website:

https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/unclassified-personnel-rules/

D. Annual Professional Development Plans and Selection of Mentors

At the beginning of the annual review cycle in the fall, faculty and IAS will meet with the program director to determine their professional development plans. These plans must reflect the needs of the program, department, college, institution, and the individual. The sum of all professional development plans must provide coverage of all of program and department goals.

D-1. Selection of Mentors for Newly Hired Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff

To help new faculty and IAS implement their initial professional development plans (and thus start successful programs of teaching, scholarship, and service), program directors will formally assign an experienced mentor to each newly hired faculty and IAS member. Each mentor will work closely with her/his mentee during the initial three years (or longer upon request by the mentee) of employment in the department. For new faculty, each mentor must be a tenured faculty member from the department. For new IAS members, each mentor should be an experienced faculty or IAS member from the department. Other informal mentors may also be solicited from within or outside the department by the program director or mentees.

D-2. Components of the Professional Development Plan

Professional development plans will be completed on a form devised by the department (see Appendix D). Information on this form will address:

- Specific goals for the upcoming year in performance areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. (Note: These goals shall be consistent with programmatic goals.)
- Strategies to be used to successfully meet these goals.
- Resources needed (time, money, equipment, continuing education, reduced teaching load, etc.).
- Expectations of the program/department in order to meet its goals/objectives.
- Methods for measuring accomplishments.

After the professional development plan has been reviewed and approved by the program director, the faculty or IAS member and the program director will both sign the document, indicating their understanding of the plan. A copy of the plan will be placed in the faculty or IAS member's personnel file.

Each faculty and IAS member will meet with the program director annually to review the professional development plan, identify obstacles, and construct solutions. Program directors and the department chair will also draft their own professional development plans. Plans of program directors and the department chair will be reviewed and approved by the department chair and Dean, respectively.

E. Peer Review of Teaching

Probationary faculty and IAS members will have their teaching evaluated by two peers visiting their classrooms during each of the first five years of their employment in the department. For years one and two, peer review must occur during each semester. For years three through five, peer review must occur at least once each year. Peer reviewers will be selected by program directors in consultation with the faculty or IAS being reviewed. For probationary faculty undergoing peer review, reviewers must be selected from tenured faculty within the department (see Section V.A.). For IAS, peer reviewers can be selected from experienced faculty or IAS within the department. A peer reviewer may also serve as a mentor (see Section IV.D.1) assigned to the faculty or IAS being reviewed.

In addition to classroom visitation, syllabi and evaluation instruments will be reviewed. An evaluation form (see example in Appendix E) will be completed by each peer reviewer and submitted to the faculty or IAS member, program director, and department chair. This review will be considered as evidence of teaching effectiveness and progress.

Other faculty or IAS members may elect (or be required) to have their teaching reviewed by peers. For example, peer review of teaching is one component of the promotion process (Section VI.B.) and may be used as evidence to support post-tenure review (Section V.C.).

F. Annual Activity Reports

By May 31 of each year, each faculty and IAS member will prepare an "Annual Activity Report," using Digital Measures which is a self-assessment of their accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service from June 1 to May 31. Faculty and IAS members who are on professional leave are expected to submit annual activity reports that describe their leave and other professional activities by May 31. Additional descriptions of their activities may also be prepared for the department or program.

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)
https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/employee-handbook/

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 **May 8, 2009.**

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)

i. Faculty under review provide an electronic portfolio related to their teaching, scholarship, and service activities extracted from their date of hire to date pf review. Hyperlinked syllabi are required and the candidate may choose to provide additional evidence.
ii. Department will provide the following materials to the dean: 1. Department letter of recommendation with vote; 2. Teaching assignment information (TAI) datasheet that summarizes the courses taught, workload data, grade distribution and SEIs by individual course and semester (which are only available after completing a full academic year) and departmental comparison SEI data; and 3. Merit evaluation data
iii. The initial review of probationary faculty shall be conducted by the tenured faculty of the appropriate department in the manner outlined below.
iv. Starting with tenured-track faculty hired effective Fall 2008, all first-year tenure-track faculty will be formally reviewed in the spring of their first year. A departmental letter will be filed with the Dean and HR. Formal reviews resulting in contract decisions will minimally occur for tenure-track faculty in their 2nd, 4th and 6th years.
v. 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 same process as for formal evaluations. The review must be conducted and reports submitted to the dean by MAY 1.

B. Retention/Tenure Review Committee

The Retention/Tenure Review Committee shall consist of all tenured members of the department. In cases where a committee consists of fewer than three faculty members, the department chair shall work with the Dean to establish an appropriate committee. Early each fall semester, the Retention/Tenure Review Committee shall meet and elect a chair (who may be the department chair) to a one-year term by a simple majority of the committee members.

C. Review Process

Each probationary faculty member shall undergo peer review of classroom teaching as described in Section IV –E.

Retention reviews on faculty hired before Fall 2008 will be conducted in the fall semester. At least 20 calendar days prior to the annual retention review, the department chair will notify each probationary faculty member in writing of the time and date of the review meeting. The chair will also remind candidates to update their electronic materials within 7 days of the review. The department chair will supply the results of student evaluations and peer review of classroom instruction for each probationary faculty member to the committee. Probationary faculty members may make oral or written presentations at the review meeting. The requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meeting law shall apply to the review meeting.

The Retention/Tenure Review Committee shall evaluate each probationary faculty member's performance based on electronic materials, peer review of instruction reports, student evaluations, and any other information (written or oral) presented to the committee by the probationary faculty member or by others who have been involved with the probationary faculty member in a professional capacity. Votes shall be cast by a show of hands on a motion to retain. At least a two-thirds majority of eligible voters is necessary for a positive retention recommendation. The committee chair will record the results of the vote.

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

In the case of a non-renewal recommendation, the committee shall prepare written reasons for its decision and communicate these to the Dean. These reasons shall otherwise be retained by the committee chair unless requested in writing by the probationary faculty member. This request must be made in writing within 10 calendar days of notification of the recommendation for non-renewal. Written reviews shall be provided to the faculty member within 10 calendar days of the receipt of the written request. Once requested, these reasons become part of the faculty member's personnel file Written review shall be provided to the faculty member within 10 calendar days of the receipt of the written request.

D. Department Retention and Tenure Criteria

The members of the Retention/Tenure Review Committee shall judge the performance of each probationary faculty member in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. (See Appendix B). Of these areas of responsibility, teaching is most important. A program of continuing scholarship and service is necessary for retention and ultimately a positive tenure recommendation.

Probationary faculty are required to have a successful record of accomplishments in all three areas of responsibility by the time of their tenure recommendation. Criteria to use when judging the quality of teaching, scholarship, and service are explained in Appendix B.

E. Reconsideration

If the faculty member wishes a reconsideration of the initial nonrenewal recommendation, he/she shall request a reconsideration meeting in writing within two weeks of the receipt of the copy of the reasons. A meeting for reconsideration with the committee shall be held within two weeks of the receipt of the request. The faculty member shall be notified a minimum of seven calendar days prior to the meeting. At the reconsideration meeting, committee members and the faculty member shall be present. 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 chair 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 subchapter IV of Chapter 19, Wisconsin Statutes.

At the meeting for reconsideration, the faculty member is entitled to present documentary evidence. The reconsideration is not a hearing nor an appeal and shall be non-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. Following the reconsideration, the committee chair shall forward a recommendation (with written reasons) to the Dean. A copy of the recommendation and the reasons shall also be sent to the probationary faculty member within seven calendar days of the reconsideration. Additional procedures for the reconsideration process and for appealing nonrenewal decisions are explained in UW-L Faculty Personnel Rules, Sections 3.07 and 3.08.

F. Tenure Review and Departmental Tenure Criteria (Appendix B)

G. Post-Tenure Review

Department follows the UW Regent Policy Document 20-9 that indicates a review "at least once every five years, of each tenured faculty member's activities and performance, in accordance with the mission of the department, college, and institution."
https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/post-tenure-review-policy/

G-1. Criteria

An ongoing program of successful teaching will be indicated by student evaluation of instruction scores and other evidence included in the review materials. Additional evidence (including peer evaluation of instruction) is optional, but may also be submitted at the discretion of the faculty member being reviewed.

Tenured faculty are also expected to show evidence of ongoing accomplishments in the areas of scholarship and service. It is expected that these accomplishments should contribute toward goals of the program, department, and/or university.

G-2. Process

Members of the committee will formally vote on the following three questions:

(1) Do the teaching activities of the faculty member demonstrate a successful teaching program as indicated by student evaluation of instruction, peer evaluation of instruction, and/or other indicators of success?

(2) Do accomplishments of the faculty member demonstrate coherent, ongoing programs of scholarship and service?

(3) Have the scholarly and/or service accomplishments of the faculty member made a substantive contribution toward goals of the program, department, and/or university?

A majority vote of *ad hoc* committee members in the affirmative for each of these three questions will constitute a satisfactory review. Lack of a majority vote for one or more of these questions will constitute an unsatisfactory review.

In cases of unsatisfactory reviews, a written explanation will be presented to the faculty member by the department chair (or when the chair is being reviewed, by a member of committee elected to serve in the chair's absence). The chair, program director, and faculty member will meet to devise a professional development plan to correct the areas of concern.

If the faculty member wishes that an unsatisfactory review be reconsidered, he/she will submit a written request for reconsideration to the committee chair within two weeks after receiving the written explanation.

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

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

H-1. Review Process

The Promotion Recommendation Committee(s) shall consist of all tenured faculty at the same or higher rank to which a promotion is being considered. In cases where a committee consists of fewer than three faculty members, the department chair shall work with the Dean to establish an appropriate committee using these department bylaws as guidelines. During the first week of classes each fall semester, the department chair shall convene the Promotion Recommendation Committee(s), as needed. At its first meeting, the committee(s) shall elect a chair (who may be the department chair) for a one-year term by a simple majority vote and establish the date(s) of the promotion consideration meeting(s).

Lists of faculty who will meet the minimum university eligibility requirements for promotion in the coming academic year are distributed by the Dean to department chairs. These lists will be reviewed for accuracy by the department chair. The department chair will notify the faculty members who are eligible in writing of their eligibility and upon request will provide a Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report Form, copies of the university and departmental regulations on promotion, and information on the provisions of the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law. Faculty member will inform chair of plan to seek promotion at this time.

During the second week of classes of the fall semester, names of individuals on the list who meet the minimum department criteria for promotion will be forwarded to chair(s) of the Promotion Recommendation Committee(s). The department chair will notify in writing faculty eligible for promotion of the date of the promotion meeting, which will be at least 20 calendar days in the future. Faculty who are eligible and wish to be considered for promotion must

submit a completed Faculty Promotion Report and vita to the department chair with the accompanying materials in electronic format via Digital Measures at least seven days prior to the date of the promotion consideration meeting. The department chair will forward these materials and student evaluation information to the members of the Promotion Recommendation Committee prior to the promotion meeting date. Faculty may submit other written materials and/or make an oral presentation at the consideration meeting. The requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meeting law shall apply to this meeting.

After discussion of a candidate's performance with respect to the criteria in Section V: D.2 below, votes shall be cast by a show of hands on a separate motion to promote for each candidate. At least a two-thirds majority of faculty eligible to serve on the Promotion Recommendation Committee is necessary for a positive promotion recommendation. The results of the vote shall be recorded by the committee chair and entered on the committee's portion of the Promotion Transmittal Form. The committee shall prepare written rationale for their recommendations.

Within seven calendar days of the promotion meeting, the department chair shall notify each candidate of the committee's recommendation. For positive recommendations, the committee chair shall include a letter of recommendation on behalf of the committee as part of the Faculty Promotion Evaluation Form. With these materials, the department chair shall also provide a written recommendation to the Dean. A copy of these letters shall be provided to the candidate at least one day prior to the submission of the promotion file to the Dean.

H-2. Criteria

To be considered for promotion to a higher rank, faculty must meet the minimum university criteria (see Faculty Promotion Resources web site) as well as the minimum departmental criteria. For the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must provide evidence of teaching excellence, establishment of a program of scholarship, and a record of service. Evidence of teaching excellence shall include the results of self, peer, and student evaluation of instruction. Scholarship shall be consistent with the department's definition of scholarly activity (see Appendix B). Service shall also be consistent with the department's definition of service (Section IV and Appendix B.). To be promoted to the rank of Professor, a faculty member must show evidence of continued excellence in teaching, significant scholarly productivity, and substantial service activity. Continued teaching excellence is measured by the results of self, peer, and student evaluations. Significant scholarly productivity is judged by the quality and quantity of presentations, publications, and grant acquisitions. Substantial service activity will include service to the department, the institution, and the profession.

H-3. Reconsideration

Candidates who are not recommended for promotion may request the reasons for the non-promotion recommendation. This request must be submitted in writing to the department chair within seven days of the notice of the committee's recommendation. Within two weeks of receiving the written reasons, a candidate may request, by writing to the department chair, reconsideration by the Promotion Recommendation Committee. The Reconsideration meeting

will be held within 10 days from Department Chair receipt of faculty request of the meeting. The faculty member will be allowed an opportunity to respond to the written reasons for non-promotion recommendation using written or oral evidence at the reconsideration meeting. Written notice of the reconsideration decision shall be forwarded to the Dean within seven days of the reconsideration meeting.

I. Instructional Academic Staff Review

I-1. Annual Review

In Accordance with Faculty Personnel rules UWS 3.05-3.11 and UWL 3.08, academic staff will be evaluated annually. The Department uses the PDP (Appendix D) to fulfill the university requirement for an IDP. IAS will complete a PDP annually in collaboration with the program director. The completed PDP will be reviewed annually with the program director and will serve as the IAS annual evaluation. The outcome of this meeting will be a merit ranking of no merit, meritorious, or highly meritorious by the program director for each IAS. Program director will share that ranking with the IAS at the conclusion of the meeting and in writing. The Individual Development Plan (IDP) form will accompany the department's evaluation. The faculty/IAS review form and PDP are located in Appendix D. PDP's are to be sent to the dean's office no later than July 31 (in a non-contract renewal year) and in Spring semester in contract renewal years).

I-2. Annual Review Appeal Procedure

IAS have the right to appeal their merit recommendation. This request must be submitted in writing to the department chair within seven days of the notice of the recommendation. Within two weeks of receiving the evaluation, a candidate may request, by writing to the department chair, reconsideration of the review. The reconsideration meeting will be held within 10 days from Department Chair receipt of request of the meeting. The faculty member will be allowed an opportunity to respond to the written reasons for the merit recommendation using written or oral evidence at the reconsideration meeting. Written notice of the reconsideration decision shall be forwarded to the IAS within seven days of the reconsideration meeting.

I-3. Promotion Procedures

University policies and procedure guiding promotion for IAS are available at http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/committees/ias/pages/CareerProgression.html.*

I-4. Promotion Recommendation Committee

The HP Department IAS Promotion Recommendation Committee will consist of the department chair, all IAS in the department at the same or higher rank to which a promotion is being considered. In the event that there are fewer than 3 committee members (including the chair), tenured faculty will be appointed to the committee by the chair.

I-5. Reconsideration

Candidates who are not recommended for promotion may request the reasons for the non-promotion recommendation. This request must be submitted in writing to the department chair within seven days of the notice of the committee's recommendation. Within two weeks of receiving the written reasons, a candidate may request, by writing to the department chair, reconsideration by the IAS Promotion Recommendation Committee. The Reconsideration meeting will be held within 10 days from Department Chair receipt of faculty request of the meeting. The faculty member will be allowed an opportunity to respond to the written reasons for non-promotion recommendation using written or oral evidence at the reconsideration meeting. Written notice of the reconsideration decision shall be forwarded to the Dean within seven days of the reconsideration meeting.

The faculty member will be allowed an opportunity to respond to the written reasons using written or oral evidence at the reconsideration meeting. Written notice of the reconsideration decision shall be forwarded to the Dean within seven days of the reconsideration meeting.

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

In Accordance with Faculty Personnel rules UWS 3.05-3.11 and UWL 3.08, academic staff will be evaluated annually. The Individual Development Plan (IDP) form will accompany the department's evaluation. IDP Form: https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/employee-relations/performance-appraisals/. Performance review due to Dean's office no later than July 31.

VII. Governance

A. Department Chair

A-1. Election of the Department Chair

Specific details of the selection process are contained in Faculty Senate Bylaw VII: The Selection of Department Chairs. Any tenured faculty member with ≥ 50% appointment in the department is eligible to serve as chair. The term of office is three years. All faculty members, IAS, and non-instructional academic staff with faculty status are eligible to vote for the chair.

A-2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair

The department will adhere to the selection and duties of the Chair that are delineated in the Faculty Senate By-Laws (revised 2006) http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate under the heading "IV. Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons " and "V. The Selection of Department Chairpersons" and "VI. Remuneration of Department Chairpersons." in addition references to chair-related duties are stated throughout the Faculty Handbook http://www.uwlax.edu/HR/F_Handbook.htm.*

Such duties include the following:

- Promoting the needs of the department to the college and the university administration.
- Overseeing and monitoring the department budget.
- Convening department meetings and appointing faculty to departmental committees.
- Overseeing and coordinating the annual evaluation of department staff (including faculty, instructional academic staff, non-instructional academic staff, and university staff).
- Coordinating the preparation of promotion, tenure, and retention documents.
- Appointing and monitoring search and screen committees for departmental vacancies.
- Preparing departmental reports and audits.
- Representing the department in various university matters and activities.
- Overseeing the professional development of department members.
- Supervising non-instructional academic staff and program assistants.
- Oversight of departmental personnel records.
- Serving on Health Science Center committees.
- Supporting the continued development of programs within the department.
- Administers and oversees resources and functions that programs collaboratively share.
- Overseeing the department's strategic planning process and the advancement of short and long term goals.
- Providing mentoring to program directors on non-discipline specific issues.

It is assumed that program directors are best qualified to prepare class schedules, make teaching assignments, request classrooms, and manage the budgets assigned to each program, and that they will routinely perform these activities. However, as stipulated in Senate Bylaws VI.H, the department chair shall retain ultimate responsibility for implementation and oversight of these activities.

In addition, given the collective expertise derived by housing multiple programs within the department, one of the chair's most significant responsibilities will be to encourage inter programmatic discussions of teaching, scholarship, and service activities with the goal of strengthening individual programs within the department while discouraging programmatic isolation.

In accordance with Senate Bylaw VIII, the department chair shall be granted a 0.5-FTE reassignment for administrative duties, provided that the department consists of a minimum of 10 faculty and academic staff members. The department chair shall also receive a partial summer appointment for fulfilling the responsibilities of the chair.

B. Program Directors

B-1. Selection and Appointments

Selection and appointment of Program Directors follow accreditation, program and University policy and procedures. The Provost makes the final appointment.

B-2. Responsibilities of Program Directors

Program directors administer and oversee all aspects of their respective program. Each Program Director had direct access to the Dean for purposes of advocating for program needs and assuring organizational expectations are satisfied. These duties include, but are not limited to the following:

- Managing program budgets
- Providing written and oral information related to retention, tenure and promotion decisions
- Promoting professional development of faculty and IAS within the program, including approval of professional development plans
- Determining faculty and IAS workload assignments
- Oversight for developing and accessing curriculum
- Maintaining program accreditation
- Serving as a liaison between the university and clinical partners
- Advocating for the program within the university and within the community
- Successfully recruiting students to the program
- Preparing class schedules
- Fostering positive alumni relationships
- Encourage members from other programs within the department to review and discuss teaching, scholarship, and service activities that occur within their respective programs

C. Evaluation of Program Directors and Department Chair

Program directors will be evaluated annually by the Department Chair to include the assessments of teaching, scholarly activity (if appropriate), service, additional responsibilities and assessment of their current and proposed professional development plans. The Chair will solicit feedback from the faculty and staff for the Program Director evaluation. The Department Chair will be evaluated by the Dean, with feedback from the department's program directors.

D. The Health Professions Department

The Health Professions Department includes an array of excellent programs with an unusually diverse pool of expertise and traditions. The department will consciously embrace this diversity, recognizing that each of its programs has a unique opportunity to learn and benefit from each other. Thus, one of the department’s primary responsibilities will be to actively create traditions and structures that nurture constructive, inter-program dialogue and critique rather than programmatic isolation.

D-1. Departmental Committees
The department will establish standing committees as listed below. Recognizing that some programs within the department have specific needs not addressed by these departmental committees, individual programs are encouraged to continue or establish program-specific committees to meet their needs.

The purposes of any standing department committee are fact-finding and making recommendations to the chair and department. Charges will be given to each standing committee by the department chair. A charge will contain specific goal(s) and the expected date of completion.

D-1-A. Committee Membership
Faculty and IAS members are encouraged to submit to the department chair their areas of committee interest. The Department Chair oversees the appointment of members to the committees. Committee members will be representative of as many programs as possible.

The purpose of any standing committee is fact finding and making recommendations to the Chair and the department. Charges will be given to each standing committee by the department chair. A charge will contain specific goal(s) and the expected date of completion.

D-1-B. Committee Organization
A committee chair will be appointed by the department chair. The committee, chair, with the aid of fellow members, will determine meeting dates and times, set the agenda for meetings, generate minutes of meetings and file minutes in the department office. The Chair may appoint additional ad hoc committees as needed. Additional standing committees may be established by a two-thirds vote of the department.

- Chair and Program Directors Committee
- Merit Evaluation Committee
- Retention and Tenure Committee
- Promotion Recommendation Committee
- Clinical Affiliate Appointment Review Committee
- Student Recruitment Committee

D-1-B-1. Chair and Program Directors Committee
The Chair and Program Directors Committee shall consist of the chair and program directors of each program. This committee will consider and make recommendations to the chair regarding the following issues: assignment of workload among department faculty and IAS, advisory review of program and departmental curriculum, review and coordination of program budgets within the department, review and modify guidelines for adjunct faculty appointments and make appropriate recommendations regarding these appointments to the college office and other issues of interest across the department and its programs.

D-1-B-2. Merit Evaluation Committee
The Merit Evaluation Committee shall be appointed by the department chair from faculty and IAS members in the department who are eligible for merit review in that year. The committee will consist of at least three members and will represent at least three programs in the department. Each committee member will review the teaching, scholarship, and service activities of all members in the department, excluding the review of their own activities. The department chair will chair the committee.

D-1-B-3. Retention and Tenure Committee
The Retention and Tenure Committee shall be determined as described in section V A. above.

D-1-B-4. Promotion Recommendation Committee
The Promotion Recommendation Committee shall be determined as described in section V.D.

D-1-B-5. Student Recruitment Committee
The Student Recruitment Committee shall have oversight of Campus Close-Up events, Health Career Nights, and other recruiting activities designed to promote student interest in department programs. This committee will communicate with the directors of other health programs in the College of Science and Health in order to coordinate recruitment activities.

The department has no standing committees. The Department Chair may appoint committees (faculty retention/promotion recommendation, IAS promotion recommendation, merit, etc.) as described earlier in these bylaws and at the chair's discretion.

D-1-B-6. Departmental Programmatic Assessment Plan
Program assessment and assessment of student learning outcomes is addressed by each program in the department.

D-1-B-7. Additional Departmental Policies

1. Sick Leave:
Department members will account for sick leave in adherence to the most current UW System guidelines: **https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/benefits/leaves/**.

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

3. Faculty & Academic Staff Equity Adjustments:
Purpose: The intent of this policy is to provide a mechanism to address the perception of a salary inequity. The following policy statement is the response of the Department of Health Professions to the requirement that we have a policy for the identification of salary inequities and procedures for recommending equity adjustments to the dean of the college. It is based on the "Policy on Faculty & Teaching Academic Staff Equity Salary Adjustments" which was approved by the Chancellor on August 24, 1993.

Definition: An equity adjustment is a salary adjustment that results from the need to address unusual salary disparities both within a program and within the Health Professions Department.

An equity adjustment may be recommended for reasons such as:
(1) to address issues of gender or race equity;
(2) to address inequities due to salary compression or inversion;
(3) to address inequities resulting when individuals acquire advanced degrees, (4) to address changes in one's assigned responsibilities.

Equity adjustments should not be made which negate past merit adjustments.

Department salary equity adjustment requests shall be presented in writing to the dean of the college with evidence that consultation with the faculty member occurred. A request for a salary equity adjustment may be initiated by:

The Department Chair and/or Program Director:
The Department Chair is the department custodian of current salary data as well as relevant historical salary adjustment information. It is the responsibility of the Chair and Program Director to periodically review this information and request of the dean an appropriate equity adjustment when it is believed that a salary inequity exists. Such requests must be in writing and include supporting documentation and rationale. Consideration may be given to the salaries of programmatic or departmental peers or commensurate clinical salaries including local or relevant regional or national salaries.

Or

Faculty Member:
A faculty member may request an equity adjustment in one's own behalf. This request must be presented, in writing, with documentation and rationale to the Department Chair and Program Director. Documentation and rationale must relate to one or more of the four criteria defined above The Department Chair and Program Director may add a written recommendation and additional documentation to the request prior to forwarding to the dean. The Department Chair and Program Director shall provide the involved faculty member with copies of any added recommendations/ documentation.

Notice on action taken on salary equity recommendations will be directed to the Department Chair, Program Director and the affected faculty member according to the "Policy on Faculty & Teaching Academic Staff Equity Salary Adjustments"

VIII. Search and Screen Procedures

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

A. Tenure-track faculty

The approved UW-L tenure track faculty recruitment and hiring policy and procedures are found at https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/offices-services/human-resources/uwl-recruitment-policy.pdf. Additionally, UW-L's spousal/partner hiring policy can be found at https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/spousal-and-partner-hiring/.

B. Instructional Academic Staff

Hiring policy and procedures are found at https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/offices-services/human-resources/uwl-recruitment-policy.pdf.

C. Contingency Workforce (Pool Search)

Hiring policy and procedures are found at https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/offices-services/human-resources/uwl-recruitment-policy.pdf.

D. Academic Staff

Hiring policy and procedures are found at https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/offices-services/human-resources/uwl-recruitment-policy.pdf.

IX. Student Rights and Obligations

A. Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures

A-1. Grade Appeals (Appendix A)

Students who believe that the grade they received for a course does not reflect their performance in that course may appeal the disputed grade. This appeal must take place before the end of the term immediately following the term in which the grade was recorded. If the disputed grade involves a course that is not part of the department, students should contact the department chair.

A-2. Academic Non-Grade Appeals

Students may initiate and resolve complaints regarding faculty or IAS behavior. Such complaints shall be lodged either orally or in writing with the program director, department chair, or Dean of the college within 90 days of the last occurrence. The hearing procedures for these non-grade concerns are detailed in UW-L's *Eagle Eye*.

A-3. Program Policy Appeals

Where individual programs in the department have policies governing the status of students within the program, such policies should describe a process to appeal program decisions.

When a student chooses to appeal a program decision, the chair of the department is to be informed of the appeal.

B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct

Academic and nonacademic misconduct policy referenced: https://www.uwlax.edu/student-life/student-resources/student-handbook/#tm-academic-misconduct--chapter-uws-14-

Students who enroll in courses offered by the department are expected to attend and participate in these classes. The department expects that students will devote sufficient non-class time to complete all class assignments in a timely manner and to undertake additional study of the material as necessary to demonstrate satisfactory mastery of the material as required by departmental programs.

As departmental programs are professional programs in the clinical arena, students are responsible for demonstrating a high level of knowledge, skills, and professional attributes in their program. These programmatic student performance expectations may exceed and be in addition to general UW-L standards of academic and non-academic conduct described in the UW-L catalogue and the *Eagle Eye*. Student performance attributes in some of these areas are quite objective and can directly be reflected in course grades. Other performance attributes are less objective and are not as easily reflected in course grades. Thus, academic grades alone may not be sufficient to warrant promotion within or graduation from department programs, and factors other than grades may be considered as grounds for probation or dismissal from department programs. The standards for these performance attributes and professional conduct are defined by the individual program policies and are routinely provided to the students in departmental programs. The department expects students to demonstrate competency in knowledge, skills, and professional behaviors and reserves the right to dismiss students who fail to attain sufficiently high levels of competency in any of these categories.

C. Advising Policy

C-1. Advisement of Students in Professional Programs

Each student enrolled in a professional program offered by the department will be assigned a faculty or IAS member as their advisor in the program. Students are required to meet with their faculty or IAS advisor at least once each semester to discuss their academic progress, career interests, and course schedules.

C-2. Evaluation of Students in Professional Programs

Programs will review the academic performance, clinical performance, and professional behaviors of each student enrolled in the professional program on a regular basis in a manner deemed appropriate by the program.

Faculty and IAS advisors will be responsible for bringing notes or comments concerning student performances in their classes to student review meetings. Program directors will be

responsible for disseminating the results of these evaluations in a manner deemed appropriate by the program.

C-3. Advisement of Pre-Professional Students

Pre-professional students are required to declare a major in addition to their pre-professional major. These students are typically assigned (and advised by) an advisor within their primary major who receives their SNAP reports. Program directors may also request duplicate SNAP reports for students declaring a pre-professional major and then offer supplemental advising opportunities for these students. In addition, students with undeclared majors who have a pre-professional major may be assigned a department advisor in the relevant program.

X. Appendices

A. Procedure for Hearing Grade Appeals
B. Definition of Teaching, Service and Scholarship
C. Policy on Outside Activity
D. Template for Professional Development Plans and Faculty/IAS Evaluation
E. Report Form for Peer Evaluation of Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff

Appendix A

Department of Health Professions
Procedure for Hearing Grade Appeals

Relevant Bylaws:

1.2.1 Grade Appeals

Students who believe that the grade they received for a course does not reflect their performance in that course may appeal the disputed grade. This appeal must take place before the end of the term immediately following the term in which the grade was recorded.

Appeals Process:

The Department of Health Professions appeal process has four steps: Instructor, program director, department chair, department. The process will be detailed for each step:

Instructor

The request to appeal a grade will be put in writing and addressed to the individual course instructor. The appeal will contain the reason for the grade appeal and any supporting materials. Acceptable reasons for appeal are limited to the following:

- Instructor used different grading standards for student work than for other students in the class
- Grading for student was biased, arbitrary, or capricious.

The instructor will acknowledge the appeal was received via e-mail within 1 working day of receipt of the appeal. The instructor will contact the student within 5 working days of receipt of the appeal and schedule a formal meeting with the student. This meeting will be attended by the course instructor, another faculty member or program director, the student, and anyone else the student wishes to bring (if desired). If the course instructor is the program director, another faculty member or department chair will be asked to attend the meeting. The meeting will be recorded by notes and audiotape.

The possible outcomes of this appeal hearing are:

- Instructor accepts student's appeal for grade change and changes the grade
- Student acknowledges instructor's rationale for grade and accepts the grade
- Instructor does not change the grade; student does not accept the decision and decides to appeal to the next level.

The outcomes of the appeal will be documented by the course instructor with a copy sent to the student and placed in his/her file.

Program Director (optional step: may be skipped if the program director has been involved in the initial appeal hearing with the individual faculty member).

The request to appeal the grade will be put in writing and addressed to the program director. The appeal will contain the reason for the grade appeal and supporting materials. Acceptable reasons for appeal are limited to the following:

- Instructor used different grading standards for student work than for other students in the class
- Grading for student was biased, arbitrary, or capricious.

The program director will acknowledge the appeal was received via e-mail within 1 working day of receipt of the appeal. The program director will contact the student within 5 working days of receipt of the appeal and schedule a formal meeting with the student. This meeting will be attended by the program director, the student, and anyone else the student wishes to bring (if desired). The meeting will be recorded by notes and audiotape. The program director may seek additional information from the course instructor and /or student before rendering a judgment.

The possible outcomes of this appeal hearing are:

- Support for the instructor and a recommendation that the grade should stand as given.
- Recommendation to instructor to change the grade
- Student accepts the grade and ends the appeal process.
- Student does not accept the grading decision and decides to appeal to the next level.

The outcomes of the appeal will be documented by the program director with a copy sent to the student and placed in his/her file.

Department Chair

The request to appeal the grade will be put in writing and addressed to the department chair. The appeal will contain the reason for the grade appeal and supporting materials. Acceptable reasons for appeal are limited to the following:

- Instructor used different grading standards for student work than for other students in the class
- Grading for student was biased, arbitrary, or capricious.
- Program director recommended a grade change to the instructor; instructor did not change the grade.

The department chair will acknowledge the appeal was received via e-mail within 1 working day of receipt of the appeal. The program director will contact the student within 5 working days of receipt of the appeal and schedule a formal meeting with the student. This meeting will be attended by the department chair, the student, and anyone else the student wishes to bring (if desired). The meeting will be recorded by notes and audiotape. The department chair will speak to the course instructor after meeting with the student to gather information about the grading. The department chair may also formally seek additional information from the course instructor and /or student before rendering a judgment.

The possible outcomes of this appeal hearing are:

- Support for the instructor and a recommendation that the grade should stand as given.
- Recommendation to instructor to change the grade.
- Student accepts the grade and ends appeal process.
- Student does not accept the grading decision and decides to appeal to the next level.

The outcomes of the appeal will be documented by the department chair with a copy sent to the student and placed in his/her file.

Health Professions Department Level

A student may request for a formal appeal at the Health Professions Department Level. The appeal must be filed in writing with the department chair. The appeal will contain the reason for the grade appeal and supporting materials. Acceptable reasons for appeal are limited to the following:

- Instructor used different grading standards for student work than for other students in the class
- Grading for student was biased, arbitrary, or capricious.
- Department chair recommended a grade change to the instructor; instructor did not change the grade.

The department chair will acknowledge receipt of the written appeal within 1 working day. The department chair will appoint a five-member ad hoc committee to hear the appeal. The committee will consist of five faculty/staff of the Department who have not yet been involved in the appeals process.

The department chair will appoint one of the committee members to chair the committee The department chair shall not be a member of this committee but will attend the committee meeting as observer and witness. The instructor will also attend this meeting but will not be a voting member. This appeals committee will meet within 1 week of receipt of the written grade appeal. The committee members will be given copies of the documentation of the previous 3 levels of appeal prior to the appeal hearing.

The appeals hearing will be conducted as follows:

- Student will be given 15 minutes to describe the basis for the appeal and provide supporting documentation to the committee.
- Involved teacher will be given 15 minutes to describe the rationale for the grade and reason for not changing the grade.
- Department chair will be asked to describe involvement in the situation and outcome of actions.
- The student, instructor, and department chair will be excused and committee will deliberate.

- The committee may ask for additional information from any of the parties involved. The committee will specify the time frame for supplying the materials. The request for additional materials will be put in writing.
- If additional materials are requested, the committee meeting will be adjourned. The committee will reconvene within one week after deadline for receipt of the requested materials.
- The possible decisions the committee can make are:
    1. Support the appeal and make a recommendation to the course instructor to change the grade.
    2. Deny the appeal and support the grade as given.

The appeals committee chair will communicate the outcome of the appeal hearing in writing to the student, course instructor, and department chair within 5 days of the final committee hearing. A copy of the student's written appeal and the response of the committee will be given to the student and placed in the student's permanent record.

Any further appeal will be directed to the Dean of the College of Science and Health.

Appendix B

Department of Health Professions

Classification of Teaching, Service and Scholarship

The Department of Health Professions will utilize these definitions when clarifying roles and responsibilities for faculty and instructional academic staff and when making decisions regarding, merit, career progression, retention, tenure and promotion. Teaching, Service and Scholarship are dependent upon the support of the College and University.

TEACHING: The ranked faculty member or IAS is an effective educator [examples include]:

- Ensures course content reflects contemporary knowledge/practice/skill
- Concern for the student's total learning experience.
- Openness to constructive criticism and a willingness to improve teaching as a result of the peer and student evaluation process.
- Accessible to students regarding learning support, professional advice and counsel.
- Effective organization of coursework.
- Quality of student work and outcomes of learning.
- Serves as a positive role model for students both academically and professionally.
- Holds high academic standards

SERVICE: The ranked faculty member or IAS is expected to serve the program, the department, the university and their profession in a collegial fashion.
Examples:

- Serving on program, department and university committees.
- Providing professional development continuing education programming.
- Serving in leadership roles.
- Actively participating in the daily business of the program, department and/or university.
- Serving professional organizations.
- Providing professional services to the community.

SCHOLARSHIP:
The ranked faculty member or IAS will have ongoing scholarly activity accomplishments evaluated based on evidence of potential for continued achievement of scholarly work. Common elements of scholarly work require work to be peer reviewed and is disseminated through publication.

Scholarship is critical to the success in achieving tenure and promotion for faculty. These scholarship expectations should follow a general scheme based on the individual faculty's

expertise. While there is no set number of scholarly products provided, one must strive to progress in scholarship. The key element of scholarship lies in the concept of peer review. Peer review is an independent jury of that body of work from experts. While there is a large range of faculty products that can be recognized as scholarship, the fundamental tenet to all these forms is the concept of peer review. Some common forms of scholarship include the dissemination of work through presentation and publication. Scholarly presentations often have a submission process that provides a peer review of work based on a formal submission process. Journal publications also largely use the peer review process to determine if the quality of the submitted work is notable. A goal that tenure track faculty should consider is the submission and publication of a journal manuscript each calendar year. While the publication of journal manuscripts are not the only method of scholarship this form of academic currency is non-disputed as a means of scholarship across the institution and should be of focus.
In general, the department tenure/promotion committees expect a progression of work where local and regional presentations of work may be followed by national or even international presentations. Scholarly efforts from presentations may be then disseminated through journal publications and provide preliminary data for seeking intramural and extramural funding. Diversification of mechanisms for dissemination of scholarly activities is largely encouraged. It is likely that a portfolio has an array of materials that display a consistent effort in producing scholarship at this institution. These expectations are aligned with those of the university to place the faculty member in a competitive position to achieve promotion.

Please see the attached table for details.

- Scholarship that is in the planning stages is more valued than scholarship that has not been planned out.
- Scholarship that is being conducted is more valued than scholarship that is being planned.
- Scholarship that has been recently accomplished is more valued than scholarship that is being conducted.
- Scholarship that has been funded is more valued than scholarship that has only been submitted for funding.
- Scholarship that has been funded by agencies external to UW-L is more valued than internally funded projects.
- Scholarship that has been accepted for publication is more valued than scholarship that has been submitted for publication.
- Scholarship that has been presented at a national or international conference is more valued than scholarship that has been presented at a regional conference.
- Scholarship that has been published with peer review is more valued than scholarship that has been published without review.
- Scholarship produced as a team leader is more valued than scholarship produced as a member of the team.

Characteristics of Scholarship

Scholarly work	Typical examples: (not limited to the following)	Accomplishment is peer-reviewed and publicly shared:
1. Scholarship of discovery: contributes to the development or creation of knowledge	Inquiry design (qualitative and/or quantitative) is consistent with the question being explored Examples: a. Primary empirical research b. Theory development c. Philosophical inquiry d. Methodological studies	1. **Peer-reviewed** publications of research, theory or philosophical essays* 2. **Peer-reviewed** invited presentations of research, theory or philosophical essays 3. **Grants** awarded in support of research or scholarship** 4. Positive **peer evaluations** of a body of work. 5. **Creation** of new treatment techniques published in a peer-reviewed publication*. 6. **Development** of innovative pedagogical technique published in a peer-reviewed publication*. **work can be submitted and not published.* ***work can be evaluated and not funded.*
2. Scholarship of integration: work that gives meaning to knowledge	1. Book chapters 2. Review articles 3. White papers 5. Papers related to areas of expertise designed to influence organizations or governments. 6. inter-disciplinary projects	1. Peer-reviewed publications: · policy analysis · case studies · meta-analyses · annotated bibliographies · integrative reviews of the literature. 2. Published books 3. Copyrights, patents 4. Disseminated policy papers related to practice 5. Interdisciplinary grant awards 6. Disseminated reports of interdisciplinary programs
3. Scholarship of Application: works that applies knowledge to solve real problems in the discipline	1. Development of clinical knowledge 2. Application of research knowledge to solve a problem	Formal documentation of a record of the activity, indication of the amount of the contribution made, and positive formal evaluation by users of the work: 1. Consultations 2. Program evaluation 3. Development of practice patterns 4. Reports of clinical demonstration projects 5. Policy papers on practice 6. Reports compiling & analyzing patient or health service outcomes 7. Peer-reviewed professional presentations related to practice.

4. Scholarship of teaching: work that develops curriculum addresses pedagogy and promotes teaching & learning.	1. Program development & assessment 2. Innovative use of technology 3. Development of student assessment methods 4. Application & evaluation of pedagogical techniques	Formal documentation of a record of the activity and positive formal evaluation by users of the work: 1. Peer-reviewed publications related to teaching/learning. 2. Efficacy studies such as comprehensive program reports 3. Evidence of successful application of technology applications. 4. Grant awards related to teaching 5. Peer-reviewed professional presentations related to teaching/learning.

(Ernest L. Boyer, Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990).

Draft 11/26/2007; updated and approved 5/8/2009

Appendix C

Department of Health Professions
Policy on Outside Activities

An outside activity is anything in which a faculty or instructional academic staff (IAS) member engages that is not part of their required university responsibilities. It is further defined in the University of Wisconsin System "Guidelines for Reporting Outside Activities" which can be found at www.uwlax.edu/hr/Forms/OutsideActivities.pdf. The department recognizes that it can be mutually beneficial for our students, faculty, and instructional academic staff alike if classroom instructors maintain and enhance their skills through clinical practice, research, consulting, publications, and other outside activities.

In February 2003, the UW-L Faculty Senate passed a resolution on outside activities that may be accessed at http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/outside.activity/OutsideActivities.pdf. Faculty and IAS members have a professional responsibility to be aware of potential conflicts of interest or interference with meeting their University obligations that may result from their involvement in outside activities. As a guideline for the purposes of these bylaws, outside activities that require use of more than 8 hours of University time per week may be considered excessive and likely to negatively impact on the individual's obligations to the University and department.

If a department member feels negatively impacted by the outside activities of another member, multiple routes exist to address these concerns. Such concerns may be raised with the department member involved in outside activities, the appropriate program director, or the chair of the department. Alternative choices could include the UW-L Ethics Advisory Committee, the dean, or chancellor. The aggrieved department member is encouraged to pursue resolution of the concern at the lowest levels and to attempt to resolve the issue within the department; however, whistle blowing is a legitimate mechanism for resolving ethical dilemmas and can be used if there is fear of retribution.

UWS 8.025 contains the annual reporting requirement for outside activities. The process for reporting is initiated by the UW-L Human Resources Department in early spring of each year. Completed forms are to be turned in to the department chair on or before April 30th. The chair then forwards these to the Dean of CSAH. The reporting form requires signatures of the Chair/Director and Dean/Designee, and may be accessed at www.uwlax.edu/hr/Forms/OutsideActivities.pdf.

Faculty and IAS who are engaged in outside activities that may produce a perceived or actual conflict of interest should familiarize themselves with the requirements of Chapter 8, in particular those sections defining conflicts of interest, the role of the Ethics Advisory Committee (8.035), actions to avoid possible conflicts of interest (8.04), and the potential sanctions for violating the policy (8.05).

All outside activities that involve teaching at another institution require prior approval of the Chancellor. Ultimately, the Chancellor has the final authority to determine whether an outside activity is creating a conflict of interest.

Appendix D

Professional Development Plan

Name:	Program Director: Signature	Date:
Date Developed:	Staff: Signature	Date:
Revised:		

Areas to Develop/ Enhance/Explore (Research, Scholarship, or Development)	Goals:	Method/Activity/ Resources to Achieve Goal	Target Date	Date Completed	Outcomes/ Revisions
Teaching Scholarship Service					

UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN LA CROSSE

Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) - Annual Review

Employee Name:	**Employee ID:**
Title:	**Department:**
Review Completed by:	**Review period – from to**
Department Chair:	**Review Date:**

IAS ANNUAL REVIEW FORM REQUIRED ELEMENTS:

1. TABLE 1 - Teaching Quality Evidence

SEIs (comparable to department median and rank for IAS)	**REQUIRED**	☐Does Not Meet Expectation (discuss with IAS and in letter*) ☐Meets Expectation OR ☐Exceeds expectations
Syllabi^	**REQUIRED**	☐Does Not Meet Expectation (discuss with IAS and in letter*) ☐Meets Expectation OR ☐Exceeds expectations
Learning outcomes are included in course syllabi^	**REQUIRED**	☐Does Not Meet Expectation (discuss with IAS and in letter*) ☐Meets Expectation OR ☐Exceeds expectations
Participation in departmental or college level required course-based assessments	**IF RELEVANT**	☐Does Not Meet Expectation (discuss with IAS and in letter*) ☐Meets Expectation OR ☐Exceeds expectations
^Required for all courses (except independent study) as of Fall 2017 by Faculty Senate.		
Departments vary in the extent to which they use or require the following – check "not applicable" if not used in review		
Grade Distributions	☐Not applicable	☐Does Not Meet Expectation (discuss with IAS and in letter*) ☐Meets Expectation OR ☐Exceeds expectations
Student Comments	☐Not applicable	☐Does Not Meet Expectation (discuss with IAS and in letter*) ☐Meets Expectation OR ☐Exceeds expectations
Peer Evaluation	☐Not applicable	☐Does Not Meet Expectation (discuss with IAS and in letter*) ☐Meets Expectation OR ☐Exceeds expectations

IAS self-reflection/ teaching philosophy	☐Not applicable	☐Does Not Meet Expectation (discuss with IAS and in letter*) ☐Meets Expectation OR ☐Exceeds expectations

**if letter is provided (required for IAS who are 50% or more and Redbooked)*

Employee Name:	**Department:**

2. **All duties contained in the position description are being performed satisfactorily.**

   YES NO (If no, must be reflected in a letter).

3. **If applicable based on accreditation: professional licensures, certifications, and/or productivity guidelines appropriate to the department or program have been discussed during this review.**

   Not applicable YES NO

4. **Merit – Semester completed** _____
   Merit Designation _____

5. **Reassigned time (if applicable) %_____**
   Brief Description_____
   (Supervisors need to provide a letter and PD for reassigned time outside the department.)

_____ Date: _____
Department (or Committee) Chair Signature

_____ Date: _____
Employee signature

The signature of an employee on this annual review form indicates that the review has occurred and that the information contained on this form represents the feedback that has been discussed with the IAS member under review. It does not necessarily indicate agreement with the results of the review.

CHAIRS – Submit a copy of this form and a letter (required for all 50% or higher IAS who are Redbooked) to the IAS, the Dean's Office and HR.

Appendix E

REPORT FORM FOR PEER EVALUATION OF FACULTY AND INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF

Observation of: _____ Course: _____

Dates: _____ Peer reviewer: _____

(This form may be customized to specifically address the course being taught.)

Organization	Needs Improvement		Adequate		Does Well
Previews lecture/discussion content	*	*	*	*	*
Provides summaries and transitions within lecture	*	*	*	*	*
Summarizes and distills main points at the end of class	*	*	*	*	*

Presentation	Needs Improvement		Adequate		Does Well
Uses instructional supports effectively (Overheads, Power Point, videos)	*	*	*	*	*
Responds to changes in student attentiveness	*	*	*	*	*
Uses space in the classroom well (does not hide behind podium)	*	*	*	*	*
Speaks audibly and clearly	*	*	*	*	*
Communicates a sense of enthusiasm toward content	*	*	*	*	*
Establishes and maintains eye contact with class	*	*	*	*	*
Selects teaching methods appropriate for content	*	*	*	*	*
Presentation facilitates note taking	*	*	*	*	*

Rapport	Needs Improvement		Adequate		Does Well
Knows and uses student names	*	*	*	*	*
Responds respectfully when student response demonstrates ignorance or misunderstanding	*	*	*	*	*

Listens carefully to student comments and questions	*	*	*	*	*
Recognizes when students do not understand	*	*	*	*	*

Content	Needs Improvement		Adequate		Does Well
Includes examples & illustrations	*	*	*	*	*
Makes course content relevant with references to clinical applications	*	*	*	*	*
Answers student questions clearly and directly	*	*	*	*	*
Gives students enough time to respond to questions	*	*	*	*	*
Responds to wrong answers constructively	*	*	*	*	*
Coaches students when answering difficult questions by providing cues	*	*	*	*	*
Respects diverse points of view	*	*	*	*	*

Active Learning	Needs Improvement		Adequate		Does Well
Clearly explains directions or procedures	*	*	*	*	*
Clearly explains the goal of the activity	*	*	*	*	*
Allows adequate time to complete the activity	*	*	*	*	*
Gives prompt attention to individual problems	*	*	*	*	*
Provides individuals constructive verbal feedback	*	*	*	*	*
Demonstrations are clearly visible to all students	*	*	*	*	*

Topics for discussion based on observations:

Principles of learning employed
Alternative methods considered
Instructional methodologies
Suggestions for follow-up