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I. The Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education Department

The Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education Department is an instructional unit within the College of Liberal Studies at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (UW-L).

NOTE: URLs in these bylaws are provided for convenience and should be reviewed regularly for accuracy.

The Bylaws in this document were adopted by the members of the Department of Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education in accordance with the University of Wisconsin System (UWS) and University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (UWL) Faculty and Academic Staff Personnel Rules.

These bylaws were last updated and adopted on …… at a regularly scheduled department meeting.

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 bylaws.

A. Preamble

The Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education (SAA) graduate program at UW-L has been in existence since 1967. The Department consists of a mix of ranked and core faculty (see Section III B). All of the core faculty are involved in curriculum and program policy development, teaching, assessment, advising, and supervision of graduate student thesis and applied research projects. The combination of ranked and core faculty is a very effective model which students consistently note as a strength of the program.

In 2007, the SAA program received Higher Learning Commission (HLC) approval to offer the SAA degree online, thus becoming the first online graduate program offered by UW-L with no partner institution collaboration. The program also adheres to the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) for masters-level student affairs preparation programs.

Using a theory to practitioner model, the mission of the Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education master’s degree program is to prepare student affairs professionals with the competencies to work effectively within the complex political, economic, cultural, and social contexts of student affairs and higher education

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.
C. Definitions of Membership

In general, the department functions as a committee-of-the-whole, headed by an elected or appointed Department Chair. The department will consist of a mix of ranked and core faculty.

D. Voting Procedures

1. Unless specifically indicated otherwise, a simple majority of those voting carries the vote (50% + 1). Voting occurs with a voice vote or a hand vote and any member can call for a roll call vote. Proxy voting is not allowed. Members who join by teleconference and have heard all the deliberation are eligible to vote. “Robert’s Rules indicates that abstentions do not affect the voting outcome (they are non-votes).” Paper balloting will be allowed upon request by any voting member of the department. All core faculty members of the Student Affairs Administration Department have equal voting privileges on departmental matters except for ranked faculty personnel decisions. Paper ballots must be signed and kept securely for seven (7) years.

2. Late or non-received ballots, a non-response to a vote, or improperly marked ballots shall be treated the same as a non-vote and will not be counted in determining the vote. In addition, abstentions and blank votes are treated as non-votes and are ignored. (For example, if 20 ballots were cast with 2 voting yes, 1 voting no, and 17 abstaining, the motion would pass). Abstention votes in retention, promotion, or tenure matters are discouraged except when a conflict of interest exists or the voter has no or little knowledge of the person being considered.

E. Definitions of Quorum and Majority

A quorum for the purpose of conducting business at any department meeting shall be a simple majority of the persons eligible to vote. For personnel meetings a quorum is achieved with 2/3 of those eligible to vote.

F. Changing bylaws

The bylaws in this document were adopted by the members of the Department of Student Affairs Administration in accordance with the University of Wisconsin System (UWS) and University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (UWL) Faculty and Academic Staff Personnel Rules.

1. Amendments to bylaws.
   These bylaws may be amended according to the following procedures:

   a. Any proposed amendment(s) shall be presented and distributed in writing at a department meeting and voted on at the next subsequent meeting.

   b. A two-thirds majority of the current department membership eligible to vote on bylaws is required to amend the bylaws.

   c. Policies pertaining to personnel issues may be changed only by the voting of the appropriately responsible group.
d. Second readings can be waived for bylaws that do not pertain to personnel decisions.
e. Amendments to these bylaws shall become effective five days following their adoption.

III. Faculty/Staff Responsibilities

All 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.

1. Teaching

All 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 to facilitate student evaluation of instruction in each course they teach (see Section III F).

2. Scholarship

Ranked faculty members of the department are required to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship. Core faculty are encouraged to pursue scholarly activity (see Appendix A for department definition of scholarship).

3. Service

All faculty members of the department are required to serve their department by participating in routine committee work, attending program and department meetings, and advising students as assigned.

4. 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 as explained in Appendix B.

A. Ranked Faculty

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 bylaws are available off the Senate webpage under "Senate Articles and Bylaws" [http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/](http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/).

B. Core Faculty

To be identified as a SAA Core Faculty member, an individual must meet the following criteria: (a) be currently employed in an administrative or student affairs area or hold emeritus status at UW-La Crosse; (b) teach SAA courses on a regular basis; (c) hold graduate faculty status; and (d) be engaged in programmatic responsibilities including serving on thesis/applied research projects, advising/mentoring students, supervising internship and graduate assistantship experiences, pursuing scholarship opportunities, participating in special projects and the "business" of the program – faculty meetings, assessment, admissions, and policy-making. Core faculty responsibilities are referenced in Section III C and procedures for becoming core faculty are referenced in Section IX B of these bylaws.

C. Instructional Academic Staff
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 bylaws are available on the Senate webpage under “Senate Articles and Bylaws” [http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/].

Instructional Academic Staff in the department are expected to maintain high levels of professional competency in areas of teaching & service. Some programs may additionally require contributions in scholarship. IAS are expected to be contemporary in content areas related to their expertise.

Appendix A will assist IAS in classifying their professional activities in ways that are consistent with departmental and university expectations regarding teaching, service, 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 series [http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/committees/ias/pages/titling.html] and will outline specific duties including teaching and any additional workload. Total workload for IAS is defined as a standard minimum teaching load plus additional workload equivalency activities. [http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/41st/3-29-07/IAS%20Appendix%20B.htm].

1. Teaching

Instructional Academic Staff members of the department are required to keep current in their subject and profession. Instructional Academic Staff members are required to work with the Department Chair to facilitate student evaluation of instruction in each course they teach (see Section III F.).

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.

3. Service

IAS members of the department are required to serve their department by participating in routine committee work, attending program and department meetings and advising students as assigned.

4. 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 B.

D. Non Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations

Responsibilities and expectations for non-instructional academic staff are based on their individual position description or contracts.

E. 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). IAS renewal and career progression. The same information as above is reported; however, no TAIAs are generated for IAS.

IV. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)
The results of merit reviews for all ranked faculty and IAS who have completed at least one academic year at UW-L are due to the Dean’s Office on Dec. 15 annually. Merit reviews reflect activities during the prior academic year ending June 1.

A. Evaluation Processes & Criteria

1. Faculty
Consistent with UWS 3.05 and UWL 3.05, the performance of all ranked faculty and continuing IAS in the department will be reviewed annually. Areas to be evaluated for IAS include teaching, service to the campus and community, and scholarship as defined by the program. 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 A. Teaching includes traditional classroom instruction and advising of 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, core 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 V.A). Faculty are also required to include peer evaluation of instruction information for promotion to the ranks of Associate and Full Professor (See Section V.D). In addition, faculty may use peer evaluation of instruction for post-tenure review. (see Section V.C).

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 A.

The UW-L Human Resources web site has useful information regarding scholarship as defined by the Joint Promotion Committee.
Service: The definition of service can be found in Appendix A. Service contributions shall be judged by the impact on and contribution to the program, department, college, university, community, and/or profession. Service can include serving on university committees as well as committees in the community and professional involvement in the national, regional, or state organizations.

2. Instructional Academic Staff

Merit for IAS is determined using the same process as described for faculty in Section V.1.A above.

3. Non-Instructional Academic Staff (see VI).

4. Evaluation of 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 IV 1. 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.

B. 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 (Appendix C), 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 (Digital measures) and
(3) A supplemental information grid (Appendix D) 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 E), a summary of activities completed while on sabbatical, etc. should also be submitted when applicable. The Department Chair may seek colleague feedback about their own activities and submit this information with their merit materials.

The Merit Evaluation Committee (see Section VIII.B.) 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.

C. 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Merit Category</th>
<th>Average Merit Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not meritorious</td>
<td>0.00 - 8.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meritorious (solid performance)</td>
<td>9.00 - 12.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly meritorious</td>
<td>13.00 - 16.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptionally meritorious</td>
<td>17.00 - 20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

D. 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 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).

E. 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 Department Chair to determine their professional development plans. These plans must reflect
the needs of the department, college, institution, and the individual. The sum of all professional development plans must provide coverage of all department goals.

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), the Department Chair 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 members, each mentor must be an experienced faculty or IAS member from the department. Faculty are eligible for the CLS mentoring program.

2. Components of the Professional Development Plan
Professional development plans will be completed on a form devised by the department (see Appendix C). 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Instructional Academic Staff</th>
<th>Faculty¹</th>
<th>Points²</th>
<th>Points²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Time</td>
<td>Points²</td>
<td>% Time</td>
<td>Points²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Allotment</td>
<td>8 - 19</td>
<td>30 - 75%</td>
<td>6 – 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>0 - 40%</td>
<td>0 - 8</td>
<td>10 - 40%</td>
<td>2 – 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>5 - 60%</td>
<td>1 - 12</td>
<td>5 - 60%</td>
<td>1 – 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Department Chair, the faculty or IAS member and the Department Chair will both sign the document, indicating their understanding of the plan. A copy of the plan will be sent to the Dean and placed in the faculty or IAS member’s personnel file.
Each faculty and IAS member will meet with the Department Chair in January to review the professional development plan, identify obstacles, and construct solutions.

The Department Chair will also draft his/her own professional development plan which will be reviewed and approved by the Dean.

**F. Peer Review of Teaching**

Probationary faculty, core 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 the Department Chair 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.) or members of the Retention/Tenure Review Committee. For core faculty or 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 (Appendix E) will be completed by each peer reviewer and submitted to the faculty or IAS member, and Department Chair along with a letter summarizing the review. 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.).

**G. 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. 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.

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.

**V. Retention and Tenure Review**

**A. Retention (procedure, criteria and appeal)**

1. **Procedure**
   Faculty under review provide an electronic portfolio related to their teaching, scholarship, and service activities extracted from their date of hire to date of review. Hyperlinked syllabi are required and the candidate may choose to provide additional evidence. Additional materials may be required for departmental review and will be indicated in these bylaws.
2. Departments will provide the following materials to the Dean:
   a. Department letter of recommendation with vote
   b. 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
   c. Merit evaluation data (if available)

3. Retention/Tenure Review Committee
   The Retention/Tenure Review Committee will consist of all tenured members of the department. If the department has fewer than three tenured members, the Retention/Tenure Review Committee will be established by the Dean of the College in consultation with the Department Chair. The department will endeavor to ensure that membership of this Committee will remain constant through each tenure-track faculty member’s probationary period.

4. Initial Review
   The initial review of probationary faculty shall be conducted by the Retention/Tenure Review Committee in the manner outlined below.

5. Review
   All first-year tenure-track faculty will be reviewed in the spring of their first year. This is a non-contract review. A departmental letter will be filed with the Dean and Human Resources (HR). Formal reviews resulting in contract decisions will minimally occur for tenure-track faculty in their 2nd, 4th and 6th years.

6. SAA Core Faculty Input
   When a probationary faculty member is reviewed for retention and/or tenure, the core faculty from the program will provide a letter by the date of departmental review indicating points of consensus regarding the candidate’s strengths and areas for improvement from the date of hire with particular emphasis on the past academic year. This letter will be provided to the Retention/Tenure Review Committee and to the candidate prior to the review.

B. Tenure review and departmental tenure criteria (if applicable).

The basic rules regarding retention and tenure are described in the Faculty Personnel Rules (UWS 838 3.06 - 3.11 and UWL 3.06 - 3.08). The following procedures are designed to enable the ranked and core faculty in the Department of Student Affairs Administration to maintain a staffing plan that is consistent with department and student needs.

1. Retention/Tenure Process
   a. Notice: Subsequent to the call of the Vice Chancellor, the department shall establish a review date and inform all probationary faculty with at least 20 calendar days notice to prepare a set of materials describing performance in the areas of:
      1) Teaching
      2) Department Service
      3) University Service
      4) Scholarly and Research Activity (see department statement on Scholarly Activity)
      5) Community and Professional Service
b. Meeting: The date, time and place of the above meeting shall be conducted in compliance with the Wisconsin Open Meeting Rule. For a retention and tenure meeting to take place, attendance by 2/3 of the tenured faculty or 2/3 of the Retention/Tenure Review committee constitutes a quorum. Core faculty may attend and participate in this meeting and remain in closed session but will not be voting members in tenure decisions. The probationary faculty persons shall have the opportunity to make a written and/or oral presentation at the meeting.

c. Materials: Candidates under review for retention should provide two reports from the electronic portfolio system:
1) A retention report drawn from the date of hire at UWL as an assistant professor (with appropriate evidence hyperlinks) with a narrative statement provided addressing (up to 3 pages) the candidate’s teaching philosophy, teaching development and appropriate context for scholarly and service work.
2) An annual report from the most recent year.
3) The Department Chair will provide merit and SEI summary information.

d. Action: Prior to the beginning of the review of the candidate(s) the meeting will go into closed session according to Section 19.85 in the Wisconsin Statutes. During the review meeting, the Department Chair shall entertain a motion regarding the retention of the candidate(s). Passage of a motion to retain a candidate(s) (and, if appropriate, to recommend tenure) shall require a 2/3 majority of those present who are eligible to vote.

e. Recording Vote: The department recommendation and decision (actual vote) shall be reported in writing with supporting documentation to the Dean. Retention requires a 2/3 majority vote by tenured faculty or 2/3 majority of the Retention/Tenure Review Committee.

2. Tenure
The granting of academic tenure represents a long-term commitment of institutional resources which requires proof of excellence in past performance and a forecast that an individual faculty member's intellectual vitality and future contributions will continue to be of high quality for many years to come. Non-tenured instructors should not expect an award of tenure solely on the fact that their contracts have been consistently renewed; however, the procedures for making tenure decision and recommendations for probationary faculty parallel procedures for retention and are based on the body of work evidenced during the individual’s time in rank. Tenure will be granted with a 2/3 majority vote by tenured faculty or 2/3 majority vote of the Retention/Tenure Review Committee. Until the department has tenured faculty, probationary faculty will be reviewed by the Retention/Tenure Review Committee as described in V. A above.

The decision to recommend a faculty member for tenure in the SAA Department is based on an appraisal of the candidate’s overall contribution from their date of hire at UW-L in a tenure-track position. Tenure in the Department of Student Affairs Administration reflects:
• Consistent evidence of a strong commitment to student learning and to quality teaching.
• Evidence of a consistent program of scholarly inquiry (as defined by the department’s statement on scholarship). See Appendix A for Statement on Scholarship, Service, and Teaching, respectively.
• Evidence of consistent service to the department and evidence of consistent service to the university and/or professional service. Community service that utilizes professional expertise is encouraged but not required.
• Specifics regarding departmental expectations demonstrating evidence of strong teaching, scholarship and service are indicated in the details of the merit and retention segments of these bylaws.
• Junior faculty should pay close attention to retention letters as guides for promotion and tenure recommendation from the department.

3. Reconsideration
Any candidate wishing to appeal his/her own department retention or tenure decision is required to submit a written petition to the Department Chair carefully detailing the basis on which this appeal is being made. This appeal must be filed with the Chair within two weeks of the notification of the contested retention/tenure decision. The Retention/Tenure Review Committee will then hold a special closed session hearing to review all evidence pertinent to this petition in the presence of the appellant. Subsequent to this hearing of the facts the Retention/Tenure Review Committee will dismiss the appellant from the hearing room chambers and will render its final decision on the appeal.

C. Post-tenure Review

The requirements for post-tenure review are described in the UWL Employee Handbook. Once every five years, each tenured faculty member’s activities and performance will be reviewed in accordance with the mission of the department, college, and University. The Post-tenure Review and Development Policy of the SAA Department follows UW-System and UW-La Crosse policy guidelines and builds upon the mission of the university and goals of the department. UW-La Crosse policy is detailed in the employee handbook under the section entitled “UWL Tenured Faculty Review and Development”.

Introduction: Every year the work of every member of the SAA Department is reviewed. One purpose of this review is to determine how merit pay is to be distributed for those who are eligible for merit. The same data gathering and peer review process can be used as a continuous quality improvement tool for tenured faculty and core faculty. This process is already used as part of the evaluation of probationary and core faculty and for determining whether academic staff should be retained.

Faculty undergoing post-tenure review will complete a full merit review portfolio, following the process detailed in Section IV of these bylaws. The goal statement should include a review of previous goals and a description of long term goals to cover the next five years until the next full review. The Department Chair is responsible for sending the post-tenure review letter to the Dean.

1. Identification of Areas of Concern
One part of the post-tenure process is aimed at detecting areas of concern that may develop after tenure has been granted. The following statements represent minimum expectations of every member of the department. A mechanism for determining when an area of concern might be identified is included.

a. Scholarship: The department expects each faculty member to engage in scholarly activities that (in decreasing order of importance):
   1) Maintains the quality of the faculty member’s teaching activities;
      a) Enables the faculty member to stay current in the field;
      b) Increases knowledge of what constitutes effective teaching in the discipline;
2) Develops new areas of knowledge germane to his/her discipline and that may be reflected in new teaching assignments;
3) Leads to professional presentations and publications.

Performance in this area may be deemed an area of concern if none of the above (or similar) activities occur at a satisfactory level for a period of two successive years, unless circumstances have led to an agreement between the department and the faculty member that scholarly activities be reduced (e.g., a faculty member having significant service responsibilities or an unusual teaching load) (See Appendix A) A majority of the tenured and core faculty members of the department must agree that no evidence of these activities has been provided for two years before this may be deemed an area of concern.

b. Service
The department expects faculty to volunteer for and serve on committees that contribute to the success of the SAA Department and University in fulfilling their missions. The department further expects faculty to respond to requests from members of the local community, region and state for professional service within their areas of expertise. Faculty are expected to participate in advising students. Faculty are expected to maintain professional affiliations outside the university and to respond to requests for service by such organizations.

Performance in this area may be deemed an area of concern if none of the above (or similar) activities occur at a satisfactory level for a period of two successive years, unless circumstances have led to an agreement between the department and the faculty member that service activities be reduced (e.g., a faculty member holding a significant research grant or an unusual teaching load). A majority of the tenured and core faculty members of the department must agree that no evidence of these activities has been provided for two years before this may be deemed an area of concern (See Appendix A).

c. Teaching
The department expects each faculty member to teach courses in his/her areas of expertise (or to engage in activities deemed teaching); the expected teaching load is the equivalent of 9 semester-hours. Under special circumstances faculty may be granted a reduced load (e.g., a faculty member holding a significant research grant or unusual service responsibilities). Faculty shall develop an acceptable (in the judgment of their peers) syllabus including appropriate readings and other activities for each course. Faculty shall develop acceptable (in the judgment of their peers) and fair (in the judgment of both their peers and students) methods of evaluation for each course. Faculty shall meet with their students as scheduled or make provisions for acceptable alternative activities.

Performance may be deemed an area of concern if, for more than three consecutive semesters, peers and/or students report that any of the above activities are not carried out at a satisfactory level. Taking into consideration both the reports of students and peers, a majority of the tenured and core faculty members of the department must agree that no evidence of these activities has been provided for three consecutive semesters before this may be deemed an area of concern (See Appendix A).

D. Faculty Promotion Procedures

The department will follow the guidelines and schedules regarding faculty promotion available at [http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/promo-resources.htm](http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/promo-resources.htm).
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, as needed. At its first meeting, the committee shall elect a chair (who may be the Department Chair) for a one-year term by a simple majority vote and establish the date of the promotion consideration meeting.

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 the chair of the Promotion Recommendation Committee. 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 V: D.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.

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 A). Service shall also be consistent with the department's definition of service (Appendix A). 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.

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.

VI. Instructional Academic Staff Review

A. Annual Review
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: http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/IDP/IDP.General.Info.html

B. Career Progression Procedures
Policies and procedure guiding career progression for IAS are available at http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/committees/ias/pages/CareerProgression.htm
IAS wishing to go through career progression will follow the guidelines and timetable as found on the following websites: http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/committees/IAS documents/IAS Career Progression & Portfolio Dev.htm
Department Chairs Guidelines for IAS Career Progression http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/committees/ias/pages/ChairsInfoCP.html
IAS Electronic Portfolio Guidelines http://www.uwlax.edu/provost/pvchome/eportfolios.htm

C. Appeal Procedures
Each career progression candidate will have the right to appeal the department's reconsideration decision to the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals and Academic Freedom Committee (CGAAF).
Written notice of the reconsideration decision will be transmitted to the candidate and the Dean within seven (7) days.

VII. 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: http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/IDP/IDP_General_Info.html.

VIII. Governance

A. Department Chair

The duties and selection of the Department Chair are determined by the Articles of Faculty Organization as printed in the Faculty Handbook.

1. Election of the Department Chair
The first Chair of the SAA Department will be appointed by the Dean in consultation with the ranked and core faculty in the department. When the department has reached a point where there are 2 or more tenured faculty in the department, the Chair will be elected by the department members. For Chair eligibility information, refer to the Articles of Faculty Organization. All department members as determined by department bylaws (i.e., all ranked and core faculty) are eligible to vote. The Dean shall send out nominating ballots to all eligible to vote. Any candidate who consents to serve and receives 60% of the ballots will be elected chair. If this does not occur, there will be a runoff between the two persons with the most nominations who have consented to run. If no one chooses to run for Chair, the Chair will be appointed by the Dean.

2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair
The duties of the Chair are stated in the Faculty Handbook (refer to Faculty Senate minutes Vol. 40, No. 17). The Chair is responsible for:

a. selection, supervision, merit rating and promotion of faculty (ranked, core and IAS) for regular and summer sessions and of graduate assistants and support staff;

b. for developing and implementing the curriculum, advising students and informing the administration of progress and problems;

c. for drawing up and supervising a budget, reporting textbook selections, assigning offices and space, and maintenance of facilities and equipment;

d. for scheduling classes and registering students in regular and summer sessions;

e. for convening and presiding at regular and special meetings of the department;

f. for convening department meetings and serving on various departmental committees;

g. for promoting the needs of the department to the college and the university administration and representing the department in various university matters and activities;

h. overseeing the department’s strategic planning process and the advancement of short and long term goals; and

i. other matters outlined in the Faculty Handbook including hearing and responding to student concerns.
j. Additionally, the handbook specifies that the Chair will assume a prominent role in creating a professional environment conducive to high morale and productivity in the department. The Chair may delegate performance of the duties to committees or members of the department.

B. Standing Departmental Committees

Standing committees of the Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education Department are described below. Chairs of all committees are to be elected by the department members at the last department meeting in May of each year and shall serve for one year beginning in June. Membership on these committees is determined at the last department meeting in May of each year. Department members at a regular meeting may establish or terminate ad hoc committees as the need arises. The committees serve to help the department function more efficiently. If timing concerns keep the committees from meeting prior to a department meeting, action items need not go through committee. However, these action items must be indicated on the meeting agenda and faculty must be properly notified of the meeting.

1. Admissions Committee

The Committee shall consist of three to five department members who shall have responsibility for determining admissions policy and coordinating the annual admissions process for the department. Members shall be designated at the last regular meeting of the department in May of each year and they shall serve for one year. Members may be re-appointed.

2. Assessment Committee

The Committee shall consist of three department members who shall have responsibility for developing, conducting, and reporting the results of appropriate assessments of all department programs. Members shall be designated at the last regular meeting of the department in May of each year, and they shall serve for one year from September to September. Members may be re-appointed.

3. Curriculum Committee

The committee shall be composed of four department members. The members of the committee shall be elected by department members at the last department meeting in May of each year and shall serve for one year. The duties of the committee are to recommend to the department:
   a) the content of the departmental curriculum.
   b) new courses and deletion of unneeded ones.
   c) the courses to be offered each semester and the faculty to teach those courses (i.e., load).
   d) any policies which affect instruction.

The committee shall also:
   e) periodically review the content of courses required for the Department and of approved courses,
   f) develop and supervise the advising program
Although the curriculum chair aids the Chair and the administrative assistant in scheduling concerns, neither the committee nor the department need to approve of the schedule or scheduling changes. However, the department must be apprised of these changes.

4. 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 three to five members. 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.

5. Promotion Recommendation Committee

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.

6. 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.

C. Departmental Programmatic Goals and Assessment Plan

1. Mission

Using a theory to practitioner model, the mission of the Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education master’s degree program is to prepare student affairs professionals with the competencies to work effectively within the complex political, economic, cultural, and social contexts of student affairs and higher education.

2. Program Goals

The Student Affairs Administration faculty is committed to helping students meet the basic level of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) Professional Competencies as approved by NASPA and ACPA in July 2010. The SAA curriculum is aligned with these competencies. The national competencies can be found at the following website: http://www.naspa.org/programs/profdev/default.cfm and can be found on the SAA website: http://www.uwlax.edu/saa/competencies.htm

3. Philosophy of Assessment

The Student Affairs Administration Graduate Program assessment activities provide valuable information that guides program innovation and change. The results of assessment are used to improve student learning, program competencies, course level learning outcomes, program quality, internship experiences, and the teaching effectiveness of the faculty.
The following broad national (2010 NASPA/ACPA) competencies categorize the areas around which the program and course learning outcomes are developed. These competencies provide the foundation for SAA program planning and assessment. Student learning outcomes identified in each course are linked to specific competencies.

a. Advising and Helping
b. Assessment, Evaluation, and Research
c. Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
d. Ethical Professional Practice
e. History, Philosophy and Values
f. Human and Organizational Resources
g. Law, Policy, and Governance
h. Leadership
i. Personal Foundations
j. Student Learning and Development

4. Assessment Methods and Practices
The SAA Department uses several direct and indirect measures to assess program goals and graduate student learning outcomes.

a. Electronic Portfolios: Students are introduced to the professional competencies and the electronic portfolio in SAA 700 during the first semester of the program. Over the course of the degree, students are required to demonstrate proficiency in each competency through submission of artifacts and reflective statements in the electronic portfolio. Portfolio submissions are required and assessed in every SAA class. In addition, each semester, the students confer with their SAA advisors to review and discuss the electronic portfolio. In addition, a pre and post assessment of student understanding and skill in the professional competencies is conducted.

b. Research Projects: Each student is required to complete a terminal project that includes a thesis or applied research project. The project requires students to demonstrate mastery of a number of the professional competencies.

c. Graduate Assistant/Internship Supervisor Data: To ensure that the graduate assistantship and internship experiences are contributing to the mastery of the professional competencies (basic level), those supervising students in this type of fieldwork meet periodically with the coordinator of the internship experience (an SAA faculty member). Data collected from these meetings are used to enhance the field experiences of SAA students.

d. Competency Assessment: Each academic year, the SAA faculty select one or two competency areas that receive increased assessment emphasis. For 2010-11, the focus was on “Critical Thinking & Problem Solving” and “Communication” skills. The department also participates in a study that involves UniLOA (University Learning Outcomes) assessment measures of SAA student growth, learning, and development. The results of this research enhance SAA faculty understanding of how well students are meeting critical learning outcomes.

e. SWOT Analysis: During annual summer retreats, SAA faculty typically engage in a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis process to continually monitor and enhance the quality of the program. Data from the SWOT analysis is used to improve the program.
f. Student Surveys: To learn more about what attracts students to the SAA department an annual survey of students who have applied for admission is conducted. The department also gathers data from students who were admitted but who decided not to come. This data is used to assist in improving the admissions process. Similarly, the department also conducts periodic alumni surveys in order to also identify strengths and weaknesses of the SAA faculty, curriculum, practical experience and post-graduation experience.

g. Academic Program Review: The department participates in the UW-L Academic Program Review process. The next Review is scheduled for Fall 2016.

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

A. Tenure-track faculty

The approved UW-L tenure track faculty recruitment & hiring policy and procedures are found at: http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/recruit/Faculty_Recruitment/Faculty.Recruitment.Hiring.Guidelines.pdf. Additionally, UW-L's spousal/partner hiring policy can be found at http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/unclasspp.html#spouse.partner.employment.

The search and screen committee will include a minimum of one ranked faculty member, one core faculty member, and one alumnus of the program.

The chair of the search and screen committee for tenure-track positions will provide the department with the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate who was interviewed. This will also be an opportunity for the department to present their opinions and thoughts to the search committee prior to the closing of the meeting and formal vote.

B. Core Faculty

Potential core faculty members must be nominated by a member of the department. Candidates must submit a letter of interest and vitae. Additional evidence of their qualifications is optional but may also be submitted at the discretion of the candidate being considered. A simple majority vote of the department members is required to obtain core faculty status. The Department Chair will provide reasons in writing when core faculty status is not recommended.

C. Instructional Academic Staff

Hiring policy and procedures are found at http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/fac.recruit.html.

D. Contingency Workforce (Pool Search)

Hiring policy and procedures are found at http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/instr.acst.POOL.search.htm

E. Academic Staff (if applicable)

Hiring policy and procedures are found at http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/acst.recruit.html.

X. Student Rights and Obligations
A. Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures

1. Grade Appeals (Appendix F)
   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. A letter of appeal should be sent in writing to the Department Chair. A response can be expected within 30 days. If additional time for review is needed the student will be notified.

2. Academic Non-Grade Appeals
   Students may initiate and submit complaints regarding a faculty member. Such complaints shall be submitted in writing to the Department Chair, within 90 days of the last occurrence. The hearing procedures for non-grade concerns are detailed in UW-L’s Eagle Eye.

3. Program Policy Appeals
   In the event that a student wishes to appeal a program policy or decision a process to appeal those decisions will proceed as follows: A letter of appeal should be made in writing to the Department Chair. A response can be expected within 30 days. If additional time for review is needed the student will be notified.

B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct

   Academic and nonacademic misconduct policy referenced:

1. Expectations
   Students who enroll in courses offered by the department on campus are expected to attend and participate in all classes or in the case of online courses, actively participate in all online discussions within the time frame designated, and to complete all course assignments in a timely manner. The department expects that students will devote sufficient non-class time to complete all course assignments in a timely manner and to undertake additional study of the material(s) as necessary to demonstrate satisfactory mastery of the material as required by each course.

2. Responsibilities
   Students are responsible for demonstrating a high level of knowledge, skills, and professionalism in the SAA program. The department expects all students to demonstrate competency in all core competencies specified by the department and reserves the right to dismiss students who fail to attain sufficiently high levels of competency in any of these categories.

3. Incomplete Grades
   As a matter of University policy, grades of “Incomplete” are issued to students strictly on the basis of illness or other unusual circumstances beyond the student’s control which have rendered the student unable to take the course final exam or to complete a limited amount of coursework. The department adheres to the university policy on incomplete grades. Incomplete grades will be granted at the instructor’s discretion pursuant to departmental guidelines. It is the responsibility of students to initiate a request for an incomplete with the instructor of that course.
C. Advising Policy

Each student enrolled in the SAA program will be assigned a faculty advisor. Student requests for a particular faculty advisor will generally be honored whenever it is feasible to do so. Students are expected to confer with their faculty advisor at least once each semester to discuss their academic progress, career interests, and course schedule. Online students should connect with their advisors each semester via email or phone. All faculty members are expected to be reasonably accessible to students throughout the academic year.

In addition faculty advisors will review advisees’ Electronic Portfolios and provide constructive feedback. Advisors also will read and provide feedback on other academic projects as needed.

XII. Appendices

A. Definition of teaching, service, and scholarship
B. Policy on outside activities.
C. Template for professional development plans.
D. Supplemental information for annual merit review
E. Peer review of teaching
F. Procedure for hearing grade appeals
Appendix A: Definition of Teaching, Service and Scholarship

The Department of Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education 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 and core 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 or core faculty member or IAS is expected to serve the department, the university and their profession in a collegial fashion.
Examples:

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

SCHOLARSHIP: The ranked or core 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.

Valued Scholarship:

- 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.
Appendix B: 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 C: Template for Professional Development Plans

| Name: __________________________ | Dept Chair: __________________________ |
| Signature: __________________________ | Date: __________________________ |
| Revised: __________________________ | |

### Areas to Develop/Enhance/Explore (Research, Scholarship, or Development)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Scholarship</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of effort</td>
<td>% of effort</td>
<td>% of effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/20 points</td>
<td>/20 points</td>
<td>/20 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals:</th>
<th>Method/Activity/Resources to Achieve Goal</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Outcomes/Revisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Supplemental Information for Annual Merit Review

SCHOOL YEAR _______________ NAME _______________________

1. SUMMER SESSION (if relevant)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; - Lectures and Internships</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Contact Hours With Students Each Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> 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: _____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; - Lectures and Internships</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Contact Hours With Students Each Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> 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: ______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses¹ - Lectures and Internships</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Contact Hours With Students Each Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Please also include classes for which you are the instructor of record but deliver relatively little instructional content.
Appendix E: Peer Review of Teaching

Report Form on Peer Evaluation of Teaching – On-Campus

Observation of: ___________________________  Course: ___________________________

Dates: ___________________________  Peer reviewer: ___________________________

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Needs</th>
<th>Does</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previews lecture/discussion content</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides summaries and transitions within lecture  * * * * *

Summarizes and distills main points at the end of class  * * * * *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation Needs</th>
<th>Does</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses instructional supports effectively</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Technology, Power Point, videos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rapport</th>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Does</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Does</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Includes examples & illustrations

Makes course content relevant with references to practical 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  * * * * *  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Does</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Learning</td>
<td>* * * * *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles of learning employed</th>
<th>Instructional methodologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative methods considered</td>
<td>Suggestions for follow-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer Review Process for Online Courses (adopted from Penn State)

Background

In 1987, Arthur Chickering and Zelda Gamson published “Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education,” a summary of 50 years of higher education research that addressed good teaching and learning practices. Their findings, and faculty and institutional evaluation instruments based on the findings, have been widely used to guide and improve college teaching.

While instruments such as the Student Rating of Teaching Effectiveness (SRTE) provide a measure of student satisfaction with a course, the Seven Principles provide a useful framework to evaluate the effectiveness of online teaching and learning. Therefore, this Peer Review Guide adapts the Seven Principles to facilitate the peer review of online courses in both undergraduate and graduate level online courses. Each principle is described in detail, including evidence of how a principle may be met. Examples of evidence to look for and resources for additional information are also included.

The Seven Principles

Good practice:

1. Encourages contact between students and faculty;
2. Develops reciprocity and cooperation among students;
3. Encourages active learning;
4. Gives prompt feedback;
5. Emphasizes time on task;
6. Communicates high expectations; and
7. Respects diverse talents and ways of learning.


While, ideally, good practice would suggest that all seven principles would be supported in some way in an online course, variations in course format, size, and faculty teaching experience can make reaching that ideal difficult. Like the SRTE, where achieving an overall score of “7” is rare, it is assumed that a peer reviewer will discover room for improvement when examining a course through the lens of the Seven Principles. This Peer Review Guide provides space for the peer reviewer to note teaching and learning strengths, as well as areas for improvement.
Recommended Peer Review Process

Peer review for online courses will adhere to the peer review of teaching guidelines identified in Section IV F. of the SAA bylaws. To help facilitate the peer review of online courses, the SAA Department will utilize the following process:

1. The Department Chair will identify a faculty peer (“peer reviewer”) to conduct the peer review of teaching.

2. The course instructor completes the “Instructor Input Form” and shares that document with the peer reviewer to convey contextual information about the course.

3. After reviewing the completed “Instructor Input Form,” the peer reviewer uses the “Peer Review Guide for Online Courses” to work through the online course, observing how well the instructor addresses each of the Seven Principles. The reviewer notes the instructor’s strengths and areas for improvement for each Principle in the space provided.

   NOTE: Reviewers should feel free to ask questions of the instructor any time clarification or information is needed during the review process.

4. The peer reviewer summarizes the feedback in the form of a letter to that instructor that can be included in the instructor’s electronic portfolio. The letter, as well as a copy of the completed Peer Review Guide, is then shared with the instructor and the Department Chair.
A Peer Review Guide for Online Courses (adopted from Penn State):

**Principle 1: Good practice encourages contact between students and faculty.**

Frequent and timely student-faculty contact is the most important factor in student motivation and involvement, particularly in a distance education environment. Evidence of faculty concern helps students get through challenging situations and inspires them to persevere. Knowing a few faculty members well enhances students' intellectual commitment and encourages them to think about their own values and future plans.

Examples of evidence to look for:

- A "welcome message" is provided at the beginning of the course that encourages student-to-instructor contact for course-related discussions or concerns.
- The instructor encourages and fosters a healthy exchange of ideas and sharing of experiences among course participants.
- The instructor initiates contact with, or respond to, students on a regular basis in order to establish a consistent online presence in the course (and prior notice is given to students in the event that the instructor will be unavailable for more than a few days, such as might be the case during professional travel).
- A prominent announcement area is used to communicate important up-to-date course information to students, such as reminders of impending assignment due dates, curriculum changes, scheduled absences, etc.
- The instructor holds regular office hours, and by appointment, that are mediated by technology (e.g., the telephone, chat areas, Adobe Connect Pro) to accommodate distance students.
- Student inquiries are responded in a timely manner.
- The instructor provides students with interaction space for study groups, "hall way conversations," etc.

**Feedback for the Instructor**

**Evidence Found:**

**Strengths:**
Where to look:

- Discussion forums
- E-mail messages
- Posted announcements
- Course syllabus
- Chat space

Resources:

- “What to do when opening a course” - https://www.e-education.psu.edu/facdev/pg3
- “Using online icebreakers to promote student/teacher interaction” - http://www.southalabama.edu/oll/jobaidfall03/Icebreakers%20Online/icebreakerjobaid.htm
Principle 2: Good practice develops reciprocity and cooperation among students.

Learning is enhanced when it is more like a team effort than a solo race. Good learning, like good work, is collaborative and social, not competitive and isolated. Working with others often increases involvement in learning. Sharing one's own ideas and responding to others' reactions sharpens thinking and deepens understanding.

Examples of evidence to look for:

- Regular opportunities for students to engage in one or more of the following activities:
  - Formal and/or informal discussions of course topics
  - Collaborative course assignments
  - Study groups
- A "meet one another" activity at the beginning of the course so students can begin to make personal connections.
- Encouragement to students to strengthen their online presence in the course by sharing links to their e-portfolio, personal Web site, and/or posting a photo of themselves to the class Web space (e.g., their ANGEL profile).
- Group assignments that follow the basic tenants of cooperative learning (see Resources, below) in order to avoid the common pitfalls of "group work."
- An explanation of the criteria for "good" discussion participation.
- Modeling of good discussion participation practices by the instructor.
- Discussion prompts that help to guide and elicit student participation in class discussion activities.
- Instructor facilitation of class discussions by encouraging, probing, questioning, summarizing, etc.
- Student interaction space(s) for study groups, "hall way conversations," etc.

Where to look:

- Instructional materials / Assignment directions
- Discussion forums
- E-mail messages

Feedback for the Instructor

Evidence Found:

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement:
• Course syllabus
• Chat space

Resources:
• “Strategies to Promote Online Discussion” - http://members.shaw.ca/mdde615/howcommunicate.html
• “Ice-breakers” - http://www.ion.uillinois.edu/resources/pointsclickers/2002_01/index.asp
Principle 3: Good practice encourages active learning.

Active learning methods engage students in the learning process by encouraging them to discover, process, and apply information. Empirical support for the positive impact of active learning on student achievement is extensive.¹

Examples of evidence to look for:

- Student activities that involve one or more of the following¹:
  - Active use of writing, speaking, and other forms of self-expression
  - Opportunity for information gathering, synthesis, and analysis in solving problems (including the use of library, electronic/computer and other resources, and quantitative reasoning and interpretation, as applicable)
  - Engagement in collaborative learning activities
  - Application of intercultural and international competence
  - Dialogue pertaining to social behavior, community, and scholarly conduct
  - For General Education courses, three or more of these activities are integrated into courses offered in the knowledge domains (http://www.psu.edu/ufs/geic/framewrk.html):
    - Opportunities for students to “customize” their learning by tailoring assignments to their personal and professional interests and needs.
    - Examples of student work where they
      - Think, talk, or write about their learning
      - Reflect, relate, organize, apply, synthesize, or evaluate information
      - Perform research, lab or studio work, or physical activities
      - Participate in, design, or develop educational games and simulations.

Where to look:

- Course syllabus

### Feedback for the Instructor

**Evidence Found:**

**Strengths:**

**Areas for Improvement:**
- Instructional materials
- Assignment dropboxes
- e-Portfolios
- Discussion forums

Resources:
- Active Learning (Illinois State University) - http://www.cat.ilstu.edu/additional/tips/newActive.php
Principle 4: Good practice gives prompt feedback.

Instructors help students frequently assess their knowledge and competence and provide them with opportunities to perform, receive meaningful suggestions, and reflect on their learning.

Examples of evidence to look for:

- Information about course feedback methods and standards on the course syllabus.
- Option (or requirement) for students to submit drafts of assignments for instructor feedback.
- Meaningful feedback on student assignments that is provided within a publicized, and reasonable, time frame.
- Assignment feedback that is clear, positive, specific, and focused on observable behavior that can be changed.
- Clearly communicated course and individual assignment grading criteria.
- Up-to-date, student-accessible course gradebook.
- An open discussion forum where students can ask questions, and receive instructor feedback, about course content and activities.
- Student surveys that provide the instructor with feedback for course improvement.
- Examples of student work that demonstrate advancement toward learning goals.

Where to look:

- Course syllabus
- Instructional materials / Assignment directions
- Assignment dropboxes and e-portfolios
- Course gradebook
- Discussion forums
- Survey instruments

Feedback for the Instructor

Evidence Found:

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement:

Resources:

- TLT Ideas for Giving Prompt, Better Feedback to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students -</th>
<th><a href="http://www.tltgroup.org/SEVEN/4_Feedback.htm">http://www.tltgroup.org/SEVEN/4_Feedback.htm</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collecting Feedback That Improves Teaching and Learning -</td>
<td><a href="http://www.schreyerinstitute.psu.edu/Tools/MidsemesterFeedback">http://www.schreyerinstitute.psu.edu/Tools/MidsemesterFeedback</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principle 5: Good education emphasizes time on task.

The frequency and duration of study, as well as effective time management skills, are critical for students and professionals alike. Students need help in learning to manage and prioritize their study time.

Examples of evidence to look for:

- A published course schedule that outlines topics to be covered and assignment due dates so students can plan their workload accordingly.
- Information on the course syllabus that provides an estimate of the amount of time students should spend on the course (e.g., “On average, most students spend eight hours per week working on course assignments. Your workload may be more or less depending on your prior experience with computing and the Web in general, and with this subject in particular.”)
- Time-to-completion information on course assignments (e.g., “This assignment should take you approximately 2 hours to complete.”)
- Course-specific study tips that provide students with strategies for utilizing their time well.
- Assignment feedback that provides students with information on where to focus their studies.
- Assignment due dates and timeframes that take into account the nature of the target audience. For example, a course targeted to working adult professionals might incorporate a weekend into an assignment timeframe.
- Course statistics that demonstrate that time-to-completion and weekly time-on-task estimates are on target.

Where to look:

- Course syllabus
- Instructional materials / Assignment directions
- Assignment dropboxes and e-portfolios
- “Report” tab in ANGEL

---

Feedback for the Instructor

Evidence Found:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Areas for Improvement:

Resources:
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Emphasize Time on Task (Ohio Learning Network) - <a href="http://www.olin.org/ILT/7_principles/time.php">http://www.olin.org/ILT/7_principles/time.php</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- iStudy Module (for students) on Time Management: <a href="http://istudy.psu.edu/modules.html">http://istudy.psu.edu/modules.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principle 6: Good practice communicates high expectations.

As the saying goes, “if you don’t know where you are going, how will you know when you get there?” Effective instructors have high, but reasonable, expectations for their students. They clearly communicate those expectations and provide support to their students in their efforts to meet those expectations.

Examples of evidence to look for:

- Explicit communication of the skills and knowledge every student needs to have in order to be successful in the course.
- Explanation of course learning goals and how assignments are designed to help students achieve those goals.
- Frequent feedback provided to students through written explanations and detailed feedback on assignments.
- Motivation and encouragement that inspires students to move past the easy answers to more complex solutions.
- Routine use of critical and probing questions when communicating with students about course assignments and activities.
- Examples and non-examples of high quality work, along with a discussion of the differences between these.
- Examples of student work that demonstrate advancement toward learning goals.

Where to look:

- Course syllabus
- Instructional materials / Assignment directions
- Assignment dropboxes and e-portfolios

Resources:

- “Checklist for a Course Assignment and Associate Grading Criteria” -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback for the Instructor</th>
<th>Evidence Found:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths:</th>
<th>Areas for Improvement:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Principle 7: Good practice respects diverse talents and ways of learning.

People bring different talents and styles of learning to the learning environment. Some bring a wealth of relevant experience to a course, while others may new to the topic at hand. Likewise, students who are strong in a discussion situation may be less adept at lab or studio work. Students need the opportunity to demonstrate their talents and to “personalize” their learning so that it is relevant to them. It is also important to give students opportunities to learn in ways that may be less comfortable in order to improve their learning skills.

Examples of evidence to look for:

- Use of a variety of assessment tools that gauge student progress.
- Alternative assignment options that allow students to demonstrate their progress in a manner that is best conducive to their talents. For example, a podcast might be allowed as learning evidence instead of a written paper.
- Supplemental online materials are provided to students who lack prerequisite knowledge or who would benefit from having content presented in an alternative manner.
- Timely, corrective feedback for online activities.
- A positive online climate where students are encouraged to seek assistance with course content and learning activities if needed.
- A policy for accommodations that is stated on the course syllabus.
- Accommodations are proactively offered for students with disabilities.

Where to look:

- Course syllabus
- Instructional materials / Assignment directions
- Assignment dropboxes and e-portfolios
- Discussion forums

Resources:

Feedback for the Instructor

Evidence Found:

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement:
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • “Learning effectively by understanding your learning preferences” –  
  http://www.mindtools.com/mnemlsty.html |
| • “Classroom assessment techniques” -  
| • Accessibility in course design forum on PSU Learning Design Community Hub -  
  http://ets.tlt.psu.edu/learningdesign/forum/4 |
| • Office of Disability Services Faculty Handbook –  
  http://www.equity.psu.edu/ods/faculty/overview.asp |
Appendix F: Procedure for Hearing 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 Department Chair.

After meeting with the student, the Department Chair will discuss the student concern with the instructor, if possible. Following these meetings, the Department 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 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.

When the student questions or disputes a final grade, it is expected that the student and course instructor will informally meet to discuss the situation. The student should come to the meeting prepared to explain why he/she believes the grade does not reflect his/her work and the instructor will explain the reasons for the grade given. The outcome of this informal meeting could be:

- Instructor recognizes an error or accepts student’s 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 begins a formal grade appeal.

Appeal Process:

The Department of Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education appeal process has three steps: Instructor, Department Chair, department. The process will be detailed for each step:

Instructor

The request to appeal the grade will be put in writing and addressed to the individual course instructor. 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 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 SAA faculty member, the student, and anyone else the student wishes to bring (if desired). If the
course instructor is the Department Chair, another faculty member or Department Chair from outside the
department 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 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 send 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.
- Department Chair 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 Department Chair 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 send to the student
and placed in his/her file.

Student Affairs Administration (SAA) - Department Level

If the student wished to pursue an appeal, the request for a formal appeal at the SAA Department Level
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 the five-member ad hoc committee to hear the appeal as indicated in the bylaws:

- Three faculty/staff of the department (whenever possible)
- The instructor
- One faculty/staff from outside of the program

The Department Chair will appoint one of the committee members (other than the course instructor) 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. 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.
- Student will be excused and committee will deliberate actions.
- 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 written appeal and the response of the committee will be given to the student and placed in the student’s permanent record.

Adopted 8/2011

---


2 Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs (2001). A clarification of ‘active learning’ as it applies to general education (Legislative). Located at http://senate.psu.edu/scca/curricula%20affairs%20reports/2-01%20CA%20RPT%202.pdf