

Department of Health Professions Bylaws

Approved for Consideration by Dean:	September 26, 2003
Approved in principle by Dean:	October 21, 2003
Departmental modifications:	November 21, 2003
Approved by Dean:	December 4, 2003

Table of Contents

0.0 Organization and Operation	3
0.1 Vision Statement.....	3
0.2 Mission Statement	3
0.3 Bylaw Adoptions	3
0.4 Meeting Rules of Order.....	3
0.5 Quorum.....	3
0.6 Proxy Votes	3
0.7 Bylaws Amendments	3
0.8 Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff	4
0.9 Department Membership and Voting Privileges.....	4
1.0 Student Rights and Obligations.....	4
1.1 Evaluation of Teaching	4
1.2 Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures.....	5
1.3 Advisement and Performance Evaluations	6
1.4 Expectations/responsibilities of Students.....	6
2.0 Faculty Responsibilities	7
2.1 Teaching.....	7
2.2 Scholarship.....	7
2.3 Service.....	8
2.4 Outside Activities	8
3.0 Academic Staff responsibilities	8
3.1 Appointments.....	8
3.2 Responsibilities.....	9
3.3 University Governance: Faculty Status and Voting Rights of Instructional Academic Staff	10
4.0 Annual Evaluation and Merit Review.....	10
4.1. Evaluation Process.....	10
4.2 Annual Professional Development Plans and Selection of Mentors	11
4.3 Peer Review of Teaching.....	13
4.4 Annual Activity Reports.....	13
4.5 Annual Review of Merit Materials	13
4.6 Determination of Merit Status and Distribution of Merit Funds.....	14
4.7 Evaluation of Program Directors and Department Chair.....	15
4.8 Appeals.....	15
5.0 Retention and Tenure REcommendations for Faculty	15
5.1 Review Process.....	15
5.2 Criteria	17
5.3 Reconsideration.....	17
5.4 Post-tenure Review	17
6.0 Promotion Recommendations	18
6.1 Review Process.....	18
6.2 Criteria	19
6.3 Reconsideration.....	20
7.0 Governance.....	20
7.1 Selection of the Chair	20
7.2 Responsibilities of the Chair	20
7.3 Responsibilities of Program Directors.....	21
7.4 The Department as a Whole.....	22
7.5 Standing Departmental Committees	22
Appendix A. Classification of Teaching, Scholarship, and Research Activities^{1,2}	25
Appendix B. Policy on Outside Activity	26
Appendix C. Template for Professional Development Plans.....	27
Appendix D. Peer Evaluation of Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff	28
Appendix E. Supplemental Information for Annual Merit Review	30
Appendix F. Timeline for Retention Decisions for Probatory Faculty	31

0.0 ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION

0.1 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.

0.2 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.

0.3 Bylaw Adoptions

The bylaws in this document were 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.

0.4 Meeting Rules of Order

Meetings of the department and its committees are conducted in accordance with *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised*.

0.5 Quorum

For meetings of the department and its committees, a quorum is defined as the simple majority of the entire membership eligible to participate. 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.

0.6 Proxy Votes

Proxy votes are not permitted in meetings of the department and its committees.

0.7 Bylaws Amendments

Changes to these bylaws may be adopted if supported by two-thirds of the voting members of the department (as defined in Section 0.9). 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.

0.8 Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff

The department utilizes both tenure-track faculty and instructional academic staff (hereafter, IAS) for instructional roles. The distinction between these categories is based on the position description used in hiring the individual filling that position.

0.9 Department Membership and Voting Privileges

Voting members of the department shall include all tenure-track faculty and IAS who have $\geq 50\%$ FTE departmental appointments and who maintain a campus presence of ≥ 20 hours per week during the academic year. Other faculty or IAS, i.e., those with $< 50\%$ FTE appointments in the department or who maintain a campus presence of < 20 hours per week during the academic year, may be accepted into or removed from departmental voting membership by a 2/3 majority vote of the department. The term of membership for department members so accepted will be determined at the time of acceptance. 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 except as described above.

Faculty and IAS have similar voting rights except that academic staff shall not vote on personnel issues such as retention, tenure and promotion.

1.0 STUDENT RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS

1.1 Evaluation of Teaching

Students will have an opportunity to evaluate their instructor of record in each course offered by the department. These evaluations will take place during the last three weeks of course instruction, or at the conclusion of the clinical internships, using a common Department of Health Professions Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) instrument. Except for courses in which the chair has deemed the use of an SEI to be inappropriate, this instrument shall be used by all faculty or instructional academic staff regardless of the role required of the "lead instructor" for any particular course (including lab/lecture/clinical instruction, clinical coordination, internship coordinator, academic course coordination, and problem-based learning course facilitation). Numeric data resulting from this form will provide consistent data upon which faculty/instructional academic staff members are judged for merit, retention, tenure, and promotion. In recognition of the variety of roles that instructors of record may play within courses, additional evaluative data may be collected and submitted as additional data for consideration, but may not replace the departmental SEI instrument.

Items on the SEI instrument will be scored on a 5-point Likert scale. SEI scores will be determined by calculating the composite fractional median from all questions on the 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. It is the responsibility of program directors and the department chair to ensure that the evaluation is performed and that it addresses programmatic needs and course learning environments.

1.2 Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures

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. The student should first discuss this difference with the instructor. If a student-instructor meeting is not possible or if such a meeting does not result in a resolution of the disputed grade, the student should contact the program director. If the disputed grade involves a course that is not part of a department professional program, students should contact the department chair. After meeting with the student, the program director will discuss the student concern with the instructor, if possible. Following these meetings, the program director will make a recommendation to the instructor regarding the potential grade change.

If the contact with the program director does not result in resolution, the student should contact the department chair. After meeting with the student, the department chair will discuss the student concern with the instructor, if possible. Following these meetings, the chair will make a recommendation to the instructor regarding the potential grade change.

After the chair's recommendation and the instructor's response, a student may file a written appeal for a grade change with the department chair. Upon receipt of the written request, the chair will form a five-member *ad hoc* committee consisting of three department members (not including the chair), the involved program director or the instructor, and one faculty or IAS member from outside the program to review the appeal. This committee may request additional information from the student and the instructor before forming and forwarding its recommendation to the instructor. The decision to change a grade remains the prerogative of the instructor unless the instructor is no longer available, in which case the decision to change a grade becomes that of the department chair in consultation with the appropriate program director.

1.2.2 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*.

1.2.3 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.

1.3 Advisement and Performance Evaluations

1.3.1 *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.

1.3.2 *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.

1.3.3 *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.

1.4 Expectations/responsibilities of Students

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.

2.0 FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES

Faculty in the department are expected to maintain high levels of professional competency in areas of teaching, scholarship and service. In addition, faculty member's clinical knowledge and expertise is critical to the education of students in the health professions. Faculty therefore have a responsibility to keep abreast of current trends in practice. One mechanism for maintaining clinical knowledge and expertise is to remain clinically active and/or engage in the scholarship of practice. This will enhance their effectiveness while teaching in the classroom, laboratories, and various clinics.

Appendix A is a guide to assist faculty and IAS in classifying their professional activities at the university in ways that are consistent with college and university expectations regarding teaching, scholarship, and service. Guidelines useful for judging contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service are discussed in Section 4.0.

2.1 Teaching

Faculty members of the department are required to keep current in their subject and professional areas, to update the curriculum, and to work to improve student learning. Faculty members are responsible for motivating and challenging students to learn by using various pedagogical devices or techniques and by setting well-defined expectations. They are further responsible for offering additional time to address student questions by holding office hours. Office hours and other course details should be part of the course syllabus provided to students at the beginning of a course. In addition, faculty members are responsible for grading and returning student assignments, including examinations, in a timely fashion. Finally, faculty 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.

The department includes several professional clinical programs and utilizes instructional and clinical expertise of individuals outside of the university. Faculty in these programs have responsibility for the development of curriculum, establishing evaluative criteria, arranging clinical educational experiences, and developing affiliations with individual clinicians and institutions. These are considered instructional activities because they create classroom and clinical educational curricula in which students enroll and are tested. In addition, grants obtained to support instructional improvement or acquisition of equipment used for teaching are considered as instructional activities.

2.2 Scholarship

Faculty members of the department are required to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship. Scholarship exemplifies one fundamental tenet in the health professions – evidence-based practice. It also is an indicator of professional competency and enables faculty to be perceived as role models for their students.

Scholarly activity in the department is generally defined by three criteria: (1) it represents a novel contribution to the discipline (as established by relevant literature review), (2) it involves systematic observation/collection of data and subsequent analysis of these observations, and (3) it generates a product that is disseminated via publication or presentation in a professional forum following a peer-review process that is prescribed by that forum. Research grants and other activities that directly support research endeavors are also considered as scholarship.

The department recognizes that scholarly activity may include fields of study that lie outside the "basic sciences." As noted in Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities for the Professoriate*, scholarship can include various fields of investigation, including discovery, integration, application, and pedagogy. Specifically, the department recognizes that scholarly study may include traditional laboratory investigation as well as clinical studies, case studies, novel clinical practices, classroom teaching practices, and instructional program development. However, the process used to investigate these topics should conform to the three criteria of scholarship as noted above.

2.3 Service

Faculty members of the department are required to serve their department by participating in routine committee work and attending program and department meetings. Duties performed by program directors (e.g., program administration, organizing curriculum delivery by faculty and IAS, maintaining program accreditation, and guiding professional development of staff members) are also important service activities. In addition, faculty are encouraged to participate in other types of professional service, including service for the university, professional societies, or the healthcare community or by providing professional service to community groups.

2.4 Outside Activities

Faculty may engage in clinical practice, research, consulting, or other activities that are not part of their required university responsibilities. These activities, though of potential benefit to both students and faculty, shall not interfere with university responsibilities and must conform to policies governing outside activities that are explained in Appendix B.

3.0 ACADEMIC STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES

3.1 Appointments

Academic staff appointments fulfill many UW-System functions designated in the following series titles including but not limited to: Lecturer, Professor (CSC), Clinical Professor, Adjunct Professor, Laboratory Manager, Research Associate, and Faculty Associate. These positions can be considered to be (1) instructional academic and (2) non-instructional academic staff.

3.1.1 Instructional Academic Staff

IAS employed by the university in the department are often appointed as Lecturers. The department also utilizes the professional expertise of individuals not primarily

employed by the university in both the classroom and clinical settings. Most of these individuals are appointed as members of the UW-L Adjunct and Clinical Faculty and are usually appointed without direct university compensation. The positions to which these individuals may be appointed include but are not limited to the following series of titles: Professor (CSC), Clinical Professor, and Adjunct Professor. Their university responsibilities are limited to the classroom or clinical instructional role associated with their appointment and do not carry expectations for scholarship and service. Their performance is monitored, reviewed, and when appropriate, considered for promotion by their supervising department faculty member or program director. They do not, however, undergo merit evaluation or tenure review. These IAS members are welcome to participate in department meetings and activities but are not considered voting members of the department.

3.1.2 Non-instructional Academic Staff

Individuals in administrative and other non-instructional roles in the department have appointments commensurate with their responsibilities and the UW-System functions. These staff members are welcome to participate in department meetings and activities but are not considered voting members of the department.

3.2 Responsibilities

As described for faculty in Section 2.0, IAS are also expected to maintain professional competency and remain knowledgeable about current trends in practice. This may be accomplished in various ways including remaining clinically active. Teaching and service responsibilities of IAS are typically similar to those of faculty members as described in Sections 2.1 and 2.3. Scholarship may be included upon the request of the program director but is not an expectation of the department. IAS are also subject to policies on outside activities as explained in Appendix B.

3.2.1 Instructional Academic Staff with UW-L as their primary employer

Responsibilities of IAS members primarily employed by UW-L will reflect their position description, contract letter, professional development plan, and assignment of responsibilities. Percent of effort assigned to teaching, scholarship, and service categories will be established in the academic staff member's professional development plan.

3.2.2 Instructional Academic Staff Not Primarily Employed by UW-L

IAS not primarily employed by UW-L will be held to similar teaching expectations within the context of their defined instructional responsibilities for departmental programs. These academic staff generally will not have scholarship and service expectations unless specifically defined in the contract with the department or dictated by programmatic need.

3.2.3 Non-Instructional Academic Staff

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.

3.3 University Governance: Faculty Status and Voting Rights of Instructional Academic Staff

IAS members employed by UW-L and with credit-producing assignments with $\geq 50\%$ appointments in the department shall be accorded faculty status at the level of university governance during the second full year of their appointment. Once accorded faculty status, a member of the IAS with an appointment title of Lecturer shall continue to hold faculty status rights in university governance as long as employment continues with consecutive appointments within the department.

Note: Academic staff with faculty status are allowed to nominate, vote for, and serve on Faculty Senate per UW-L Faculty Senate bylaws. They are also allowed to serve on most university committees.

4.0 ANNUAL EVALUATION AND MERIT REVIEW

4.1. Evaluation Process

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: 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, and development of unique teaching resources.

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 Sections 5.1, and 6.2). In addition, faculty may use peer evaluation of instruction for post-tenure review (see Section 5.4.1).

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. Evidence of scholarship includes, but is not be limited to, research articles or abstracts submitted and/or published, grant applications and funding, research consultation, and professional platform or poster presentations at peer-reviewed conferences. Scholarly pursuits shall be judged on the quality and quantity of contributions.

Scholarly products appearing in forums with rigorous peer review and thus having relatively high rates of rejection (e.g., an article in a rigorously peer-reviewed journal) are judged to be more noteworthy than products with less rigorous peer review and lower rates of rejection (e.g., presentations made to a regional conference of a professional society or a poster co-authored with a student for UW-L's Annual Celebration of Undergraduate Research and Creativity).

Other examples of scholarship often judged as noteworthy include books (or book chapters) that have been accepted after rigorous peer review and research grants from competitive extramural sources. Such scholarship is further valued when it advances the scholarly agenda of the program, clinical partners, department, college, university and/or profession. The UW-L Human Resources web site has useful information regarding scholarship as defined by the Joint Promotion Committee.

Service: Evidence of service includes, but is not limited to, membership and/or leadership on committees (e.g., committees of the program, department, college, university, or profession), program/department administrative duties, external consultation, peer review of professional journal articles or books, pro-bono services, and serving as an officer in a professional society. Service contributions shall be judged by the impact on and contribution to the program, department, college, university, community, and/or profession.

4.2 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.

4.2.1 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.

4.2.2 Components of the Professional Development Plan

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

- Proposed percentages of effort (and equivalent points based on a 20-point scale) allocated among the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.
- 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.

Percentages of effort specified in the annual professional development plan are allocated among the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service and shall fall within the minimum and maximum values listed in the following chart.

Responsibility	Instructional Academic Staff		Faculty ¹	
	% Time Allotment	Points ²	% Time Allotment	Points ²
Teaching	40 - 95%	8 - 19	30 - 75%	6 - 15
Scholarship	0 - 40%	0 - 8	10 - 40%	2 - 8
Service	5 - 60%	1 - 12	5 - 60%	1 - 12
Total	100%	20	100%	20

¹ Maybe adjusted to accommodate increased service by the department chair.

² Points correspond to the 20-point scale used in calculating merit scores.

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 in January to review the professional development plan, identify obstacles, and construct solutions. The program director will meet with the department chair to review these plans.

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.

4.3 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 5.1). 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 4.2.1) 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 D) 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 6.1) and may be used as evidence to support post-tenure review (Section 5.4.1).

4.4 Annual Activity Reports

By May 31 of each year, each faculty and IAS member will prepare an "Annual Activity Report," which is a self-assessment of their accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service from June 1 to May 31. This report will be submitted to the college office for use in preparing its annual report and to the department chair for the fall merit review process. The report should be organized using a classification of activities prepared by the college office as a guide or an equivalent alternative (see example in Appendix A).

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.

4.5 Annual Review of Merit Materials

Early in the fall semester, each department member will submit the following merit materials to the department chair:

- (1) The professional development plan (see Section 4.2), which includes the percentage of effort allocation targets (and corresponding values based on a 20-point scale) for teaching, scholarship, and service,
- (2) The annual activity report (see section 4.4), and
- (3) A supplemental information grid (Appendix E) that lists courses taught, contact hours, course enrollments, and SEI scores. This grid includes courses in which the faculty or IAS serve as the "instructor of record."

Additional information, including peer evaluation of instruction forms (Appendix D), a summary of activities completed while on sabbatical, etc. should also be submitted when applicable. Program directors and the department chair may seek colleague feedback about their own activities and submit this information with their merit materials.

The Merit Evaluation Committee will evaluate merit material, awarding 0 points (lowest) to 20 points (maximum) to each member. However, reviewers shall not exceed the point targets for teaching, scholarship, and service specified in professional development plans.

For example, assume that the professional development plan for faculty member "X" allocated 14, 3, and 3 points among teaching, research, and service, respectively. Each reviewer could then award 0-14 points for teaching, 0-3 points for research, and 0-3 points for service. (Thus, 15 points could not be awarded for teaching, 5 points could not be awarded for research, etc.)

Scores for each faculty and IAS member will be averaged to determine an "average merit score" and then summarized for review and discussion by the Merit Evaluation Committee without identifying the individual reviewers. By the end of the day following the committee discussion of the scores, individual committee members will have the opportunity to revise their scores. Within seven calendar days of the review, the department chair shall notify each member of the department in writing of his/her average merit score including average subscores in the areas teaching, scholarship, and service.

New faculty and IAS will not undergo this process during their first year of contract with the department. If they are retained for the following year, they will be given the average percentage of salary increase generated by the pay plan.

4.6 Determination of Merit Status and Distribution of Merit Funds

Each faculty and IAS member's average merit score will be classified as not meritorious, meritorious, or highly meritorious as follows:

Merit Category	Average Merit Score
Not meritorious	0.00 - 8.99
Meritorious (solid performance):	9.00 - 12.99
Highly meritorious	13.00 - 16.99
Exceptionally meritorious	17.00 - 20.00

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.

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

4.7 Evaluation of Program Directors and Department Chair

The Dean will be invited to participate in the evaluation of the department chair and to assign 0-20 points using the merit rating table in Section 4.6 as a guide. The Dean will be invited to participate in the discussion by the Merit Evaluation Committee. The chair's merit rating will be the average of the department score and the Dean's score. If the Dean does not participate in this process, the chair's merit rating will be her/his departmental score.

Program directors will undergo regular "programmatic" evaluations conducted by the college office, which will seek input from faculty and IAS teaching in the program, students and alumni, university administration, and external clinical partners. The college office will summarize this information and review this summary with each program director. This information may be shared with the department as deemed appropriate by the college office.

4.8 Appeals

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 distribution of merit ratings. The Merit Evaluation Committee will reconvene within one week following the request for reconsideration, and the committee's final evaluation decision will be communicated in writing to the faculty or IAS member. Chairs 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 I. E. of the Faculty Senate Bylaws).

5.0 RETENTION AND TENURE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FACULTY

5.1 Review Process

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.

Each probationary faculty member shall undergo peer review of classroom teaching as described in Section 4.3.

Retention reviews are usually conducted in the fall semester. Exceptions are as follows: (1) first-year faculty who begin in the fall are reviewed in the spring of the first year, and (2) second-year faculty are reviewed in both the fall and the spring of the second year. For second-year faculty, these evaluations impact retention for years three and four, respectively (see Appendix F).

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 submit the most recent copy of their annual activity report, a current vita, and any supplemental materials they deem appropriate to the committee. These materials are to be submitted at least seven calendar days prior to the date 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 the completed Annual Activity Report (Section 4.3), vita, 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 (see also section 5.3). Written review shall be provided to the faculty member within 10 calendar days of the receipt of the written request.

5.2 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. 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 in judging the quality of teaching, scholarship, and service are explained in Section 4.1.

5.3 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.

5.4 Post-tenure Review

The purpose of post-tenure review is to provide constructive feedback to tenured faculty about their performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty who have achieved tenure are expected to maintain active programs in each of these areas, thus supporting the department and its programs while serving as role models for probationary faculty. Each tenured faculty member will be reviewed at least once every five years. An *ad hoc* committee of tenured faculty appointed by the chair will

conduct this review. The committee will use materials prepared by the faculty member for annual merit review processes during the most recent five-year period. When relevant, promotion materials may be used in place of merit review materials. Faculty are required to submit these materials to the department chair.

5.4.1 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.

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.

6.0 PROMOTION RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 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.

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 Evaluation Report Form and vita to the department chair 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 6.2 below, votes shall be cast by a show of hands on a separate motion to promote for each promotion 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 Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report Form. The committee shall prepare written reasons for each of its 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 transmit 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.

6.2 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 comments in Section 4.1) and include peer-reviewed publication. Service shall also be consistent with the department's definition of service (Section 4.1). 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.

6.3 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 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.

7.0 GOVERNANCE

7.1 Selection of the Chair

Specific details of the selection process are contained in Faculty Senate Bylaw VII: The Selection of Department Chairs. Any tenured or tenure-track faculty member with $\geq 50\%$ appointment in the department is eligible to serve as chair. The term of office is three years. All faculty members and IAS with faculty status are eligible to vote for the chair.

7.2 Responsibilities of the Chair

A thorough listing of the chair's responsibilities is contained in Faculty Senate Bylaws (Revised 2002) VI.H: Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members, and Department Chairs. Such duties include the following:

- Promoting the needs of the department to the college and the university administration.
- Overseeing and monitoring the department budget and program accounts.
- 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 classified 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.

The chair is responsible for several other significant departmental activities, including:

- Overseeing preparation of class schedules.
- Facilitating the development and implementation of authorized curricula.
- Oversight of the department's role in the classroom assignment process.

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 among-program discussion of teaching, scholarship, and service activities. This will be done in a collegial manner, and the goal of such discussions will be to strengthen individual programs within the department. Thus, one of the chair's primary responsibilities will be to foster active dialogue among programs rather than to encourage them to develop in isolation of one another.

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.

7.3 Responsibilities of Program Directors

These duties include the following:

- Preparing class schedules and making workload assignments.
- Developing curricular revisions.
- Maintaining program accreditation.
- Serving as a liaison between the university and clinical partners.
- Being an effective advocate of the program within the university and in the community.
- Promoting professional development of faculty and instructional academic staff within the program, including approval of professional development plans.
- Managing budgets assigned to each program.
- Successfully recruiting students to the program.

In addition, a primary responsibility of the program director will be to encourage members from other programs within the department to review and discuss teaching, scholarship, and service activities that occur within their respective programs.

7.4 The Department as a Whole

The department as a whole will have responsibility for the following: setting departmental goals and discussing these goals with the Dean; voting on the recommendation for the chair as described in Section 7.1 above; creating amendments to bylaws (when needed) as described in Section 0.5; reviewing and when appropriate approving recommendations of department committees; and providing input in department staffing and personnel decisions. In consultation with the Dean, the department is also responsible for establishing departmental goals and reviewing and modifying these goals on an annual basis.

Because the Department of Health Professions includes an array of excellent programs, it has 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 the expertise and traditions in other programs. 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 to encourage programs to develop in isolation.

7.5 Standing 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.

Committees will be expected to produce an annual report at the end of each academic year. The report should contain such things as outcomes of the committee, unfinished business, and recommendations for the future.

7.5.1 Committee Membership

Faculty and IAS members are encouraged to submit to the department chair their areas of committee interest. The chair will then appoint the initial committee members. Once a committee is established and has been functioning for a minimum of two years, the year-one committee member will rotate off and one new member will be appointed to the committee. This insures that there is always at least one experienced faculty or IAS member on a committee.

At the end of each academic year, the department chair will make new assignments to the committees. The chair of each committee will be responsible for informing the

department chair which committee member will be rotating off the committee. Each department standing committee shall always have membership from a minimum of three programs within the department.

7.5.2 Committee Organization

At the first meeting of a committee, a chair will be elected by the committee members and a meeting schedule will be determined. 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 following are standing department committees. 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

7.5.2.1 Chair and Program Directors Committee

The Chair and Program Directors Committee shall consist of the chair, the program directors of each program, and one department faculty or IAS member-at-large appointed by the chair. 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, and other issues of interest across the department and its programs.

7.5.2.2 Merit Evaluation Committee

The Merit Evaluation Committee shall be appointed each year 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, except that committee members will not participate in the review of their own activities. The department chair will chair the committee.

7.5.2.3 Retention and Tenure Committee

The Retention and Tenure Committee shall be determined as described in section 5.1 above.

7.5.2.4 Promotion Recommendation Committee

The Promotion Recommendation Committee shall be determined as described in section 6.1 above.

7.5.2.5 Clinical Affiliate Appointment Review Committee

The Clinical Affiliate Appointment Review Committee shall consist of program directors and representatives from an affiliated clinical institution and the college office. Committee responsibilities include functions of individuals appointed as Adjunct and Clinical Faculty. The committee will review and modify as appropriate the guidelines for such appointments; review recommendations for appointment, promotion, inactive status, and retirement for these functions; and make appropriate recommendations regarding these appointments to the college office.

7.5.2.6 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 the Nuclear Medicine Technology and Clinical Laboratory Science programs in order to coordinate recruitment activities.

APPENDIX A. CLASSIFICATION OF TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES^{1,2}

Teaching

- New course created and added to curriculum
- Innovative pedagogy (examples: innovative techniques, unique teaching resources)
- Grant/contract for instruction, equipment, or facilities
- Undergraduate research supervision
- Graduate research supervision/grad student committee(s)
- Other (examples: courses taught for first time, teaching awards, evidence of improvement)

Scholarship

- Manuscript/book/book chapter/abstract in press or published -- refereed
- Manuscript under review -- refereed
- Other publication
- Presentation/poster (examples: presentations at local, regional, national, and international professional meetings; posters co-authored with students presented at UW-L's Annual Celebration of Undergraduate Research and Creativity and at NCUR)
- Faculty research grant/contract
- Other (examples: manuscript in preparation, research consulting)

Service

- Department (examples: program administration, departmental committees, advising students and student organizations)
- College/university (examples: Faculty Development Committee, Faculty Senate)
- Professional (examples: journal referee, editorial board member, officer in professional society, in-service or workshop given)
- Grant/contract (example: grant to support inservice workshops)
- Other professionally related service (examples: public service activities, clinical consulting)

Other

- Workshop/conference attended or course taken
- Other noteworthy award or accomplishment
- Professional memberships maintained

Note: Specific subcategories listed under Teaching, Scholarship, and Service may be modified somewhat from year to year in accordance with suggestions from the college office.

¹ See Section 4.1 for suggestions about judging the relative value of these categories for purposes of merit, retention, tenure, and promotion.

² As explained in Section 4.4, this outline (or an agreed upon alternative) will be used by faculty and IAS members to create their Annual Activity Reports. This report will be prepared at the end of the spring semester and submitted to the college office for the college report. The same report will be submitted to the department chair for the fall merit review process.

APPENDIX B. POLICY ON OUTSIDE ACTIVITY

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 C. TEMPLATE FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Name: _____ Program Director: _____ Date: _____
 Date Developed: _____ Staff: _____ Signature _____
 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
<p>Teaching = ____% of effort = ____ /20 points</p> <p>Scholarship = ____% of effort = ____ /20 points</p> <p>Service = ____% of effort = ____ /20 points</p>					

APPENDIX D. 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

Includes examples & illustrations Needs Improvement * Adequate * Does Well *

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

Clearly explains directions or procedures Needs Improvement * Adequate * Does Well *

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

APPENDIX E. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FOR ANNUAL MERIT REVIEW

SCHOOL YEAR _____

NAME _____

1. SUMMER SESSION (if relevant)

Student Evaluation of Instruction score (fractional median) for semester: _____

Courses ¹ - Lectures and Laboratories	Enrollment	Credit Hours	Contact Hours With Students Each Week

¹ Please also include classes for which you are the instructor of record but deliver relatively little instructional content.**2. FALL SEMESTER**

Student Evaluation of Instruction score (fractional median) for semester: _____

Courses ¹ - Lectures and Laboratories	Enrollment	Credit Hours	Contact Hours With Students Each Week

¹ Please also include classes for which you are the instructor of record but deliver relatively little instructional content.**3. SPRING SEMESTER**

Student Evaluation of Instruction score (fractional median) for semester: _____

Courses ¹ - Lectures and Laboratories	Enrollment	Credit Hours	Contact Hours With Students Each Week

¹ Please also include classes for which you are the instructor of record but deliver relatively little instructional content.

APPENDIX F. TIMELINE FOR RETENTION DECISIONS FOR PROBATORY FACULTY

Year as Probationary Faculty	Semester of Departmental Review & Contract Year Affected	
	Fall Semester	Spring Semester
1		2
2	3	4
3	5	
4	6	
5	7	
6	Tenure recommendation	