I. DEPARTMENT OF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATION BY-LAWS (05/2018)

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. UWL policies and rules;
4. College policies and rules;
5. Shared governance by-laws and policies for faculty and academic staff; and
6. Departmental by-laws.

A. Preamble

The Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education (SAA) graduate program at UWL has been in existence since 1967 and received UWL Faculty Senate approval for departmental status in 2012. The Department consists of a mix of tenured, tenure track, instructional academic staff (IAS), and adjunct faculty (see Section III B). Ranked faculty, IAS, and some adjunct faculty are involved in curriculum and program policy development, teaching, selection of new students, as well as organizing special events. The majority of other adjunct faculty only teach courses for the department. The combination of ranked and adjunct faculty is an effective staffing model that students consistently note as a strength of the program. As of July 2017, the following are voting adjunct faculty members of the department based on their previous membership as Core faculty: Dr. Larry Ringgenberg, Dr. Mary Vahala, and Nizam Arain.

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 UWL 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.

In 2013, SAA engaged in a partnership with UW-River Falls to host a group of students in Graduate Student Internship (GSI) positions on UWRF's campus, all of whom are enrolled in our online program. UWRF cohort students receive a blended form of M.S.Ed. education and our faculty travel to UWRF a few times per term.

In 2015 (and ratified with an MOU in 2018), SAA engaged in a partnership with UW-Eau Claire and UW-Stout to host a group of students in GSI positions on UWEC's and UW-Stout's campus. All students in these positions are enrolled in SAA's online program.

In 2015-16, the SAA program received UW System and Higher Learning Commission (HLC) approval to offer a Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree in Student Affairs Administration & Leadership. This is a 54-credit program that includes a dissertation.

By the Fall of 2018, SAA will operate 2 on-campus M.S.Ed. cohorts, 1 UWRF blended M.S.Ed. cohort, 2 online M.S.Ed. cohorts, and 2 online Ed.D. cohorts for a student total of about 100. To this SAA will add one more doctoral cohort in the fall of 2019.

Our mission is to advance the field of student affairs by preparing scholar-practitioners for leadership in the multifaceted context of 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
(http://www.doj.state.wi.us/sites/default/files/dls/open-meetings-law-compliance-guide-2010.pdf)
summary at (https://www.wisconsin.edu/general-counsel/legal-topics/open-meetings-law/).

Minutes will be recorded by the departmental ADA or a voting member and distributed in a timely
fashion to department members. Copies of the minutes of department meetings and committee
meetings shall be kept in a secure location in the department. Minutes from closed meetings will
be taken by the Department Chair and written within one week of the proceedings. They will be
available by request.

C. Definitions of Membership & Voting Procedures

In general, the department functions as a committee-of-the-whole, headed by an elected or
appointed Department Chair. Members of the department are defined as ranked (tenured and
tenure-track), instructional academic staff with at least a 50% contract, non-instructional
academic staff with 100% appointments, and clinical-faculty for the purpose of conducting
business at any regular meeting. Adjunct faculty are not voting members of the department.

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. Department members who join virtually using an online medium and
who 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 members of the department
(as defined above) 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.

D. 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.

 E. Changing by-laws

The by-laws 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. These by-laws maybe be amended according to the following procedures: A 2/3 majority of
the current department membership present and eligible to vote on by-laws is required to amend
the by-laws. Any proposed amendment(s) shall be presented and distributed in writing at a

department meeting and voted on at the next subsequent meeting. Policies pertaining to personnel issues, which are the responsibility of the ranked faculty (tenured or tenure-track) may only be changed by the voting of the ranked faculty. Second readings can be waived for by-laws that do not perstain to personnel decisions. Amendments to these by-laws shall become effective five days following their adoption.

III. FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Faculty
Faculty responsibilities are referenced in section IV of the Faculty Senate by-laws entitled "Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons" (http://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/).

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). See Appendix A for department definition of teaching.

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

3. Service
All faculty members of the department are required to serve their department by leading or participating in routine committee work, regularly attending program and department meetings, advising students as assigned, and attending special events including Capstone Day, and the SAA Graduation Celebration. See Appendix D for department definition of service.

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 D.

B. Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations

Requests for IAS hiring will be presented to the college dean. The request will indicate one of the standard titles from the lecturer or clinical professor series https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/classification/ and will outline specific duties including teaching and any additional workload. Total workload for IAS is defined as a standard minimum teaching load plus additional workload equivalency activities. https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B5olNNrU5bquTmdYZDRmcHl5UHM/view.

1. Teaching
Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) members of the department are required to keep current in their subject and profession. IAS 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 are not required to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship. They are, however, encouraged to pursue their own line of research and publication, or to collaborate with other SAA faculty on scholarship.

3. Service
IAS members of the department are required to serve their department by leading or participating in routine committee work, regularly attending program and department meetings, advising students as assigned, and attending special events including Capstone Day, and the SAA Graduation Celebration.

4.Outside Activities
IAS members of the department 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.

C. Non Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations

Responsibilities and expectations for potential non-instructional academic staff are based on their individual position description or contracts. SAA typically does not employ non-instructional academic staff.

D. Clinical Faculty

As of the 2018/19 academic year, the clinical faculty members of the department are Dr. Larry Ringgenberg, Dr. Mary Beth Vahala, and Nizam Arain. These are voting members of the department in non-personnel contexts. Clinical Faculty members meet the following criteria: a) be currently employed in an administration or student affairs position orhave retired from that position, b) teach SAA courses, and c) participate regularly in the business of the department, including being present at faculty meetings, serve on or chair departmental committees, engaging in the M.S.Ed. recruitment process and Visit Day, engaging in curriculum and policy development.

E. Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty are non-voting members of the department who are recruited and hired for the purpose of teaching courses in the M.S.Ed. and/or Ed.D. programs. Adjunct faculty are not expected to participate in the regular business of the department.

F. Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) *revised and passed April 28, 2018 *
The department will follow the UWL SEI policy and procedure available on the Faculty Senate webpage (https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/#tm-student-evaluation-of-instruction---sei) Results from the Faculty Senate approved SEI questions are

required for retention, tenure, and promotion for ranked faculty and for renewal and promotion of Instructional Academic Staff in the form of (1) the single motivation item and (2) the composite SEI consisting of the 5 common questions. For ranked faculty contract-renewal and both faculty and IAS promotion these numbers will be reported using the Teaching Assignment Information (TAI) form. The department will add both the motivation item and the composite SEI fractional median for each course. In addition, the candidate's overall fractional median for the term on both the single motivation item and the composite SEI are reported. Finally, the department adds the departmental fractional median for both the single motivation item and the composite, 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).

SAA recognizes that SEI rankings of faculty have limited value in a small department. The Department Chair will gather collected SEI data and disseminate results to individual faculty. SEI scores for tenure track faculty will be compared as a group and IAS will be compared as a group, and a final comparison of all teaching faculty will be compiled. Information on the rankings of all individuals teaching in SAA will also be computed and retained for informational purposes.

1. SAA asks six additional questions on SEIs. Four of these additional questions are structured on the 5-point scale (Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree): a) the instructor fostered an environment of inclusive excellence by presenting multiple perspectives, b) the instructor encouraged me to consider issues of privilege, oppression, and social justice, c) the instructor provided feedback that improved my performance and/or learning, and d) the instructor incorporated both theoretical and practical elements in this course. The remaining two questions are open-ended questions: a) what did the instructor do that contributed the most to your learning or skill development, and b) comment on what your instructor could do to improve this course for the benefit of future students.

G. Program Directorships
Ranked faculty and full-time IAS in SAA are eligible to assume the role of program director. Faculty serve in this role for one year, but can renew their role from year to year in consultation with the other faculty and the Department Chair. The Department Chair shall not serve in the role of a program director. Directing a program carries with it a 1-course reassignment for the specific academic year. In consultation with the Department Chair, the Program Director can choose during which semester they take the course reassignment.

1. M.S.Ed. Program Director Responsibilities
The M.S.Ed. Director provides leadership for the recruitment, admissions, enrollment, orientation, and retention of students in the SAA master's programs. Each spring, this involves recruitment of on-campus and online cohorts of about 35 students. The Director oversees the campus visit day experience and interview process for on-campus cohort applications. The Director oversees the virtual interview process for online cohort applicants. The Director directs all marketing and recruitment efforts, including attending graduate school fairs and professional conferences, visual recruitment materials, social media presence, and management of recruitment website. The Director directs all face-to-face and online orientation efforts for all enrolled master's students at the beginning of their first semester in the program. The Director establishes plans to recruit students from traditionally underrepresented or marginalized populations. The Director is responsible for the "SOS Process" to navigate potential student-supervisor conflicts. The Director leads all efforts to recruit M.S.Ed. assistantship providers on- and off-campus and to place

students into these positions. The Director directs all efforts to recruit M.S.Ed. practicum providers on- and off-campus, and leads the placement of students into these positions.

2. *Ed.D. Program Director Responsibilities*
The Ed.D. Program Director represents the department on Collaborative Ed.D. Program Steering committee at state meetings of the Collaborative Ed.D. Program and makes decisions on behalf of the department. The Director coordinates faculty development of the new doctoral courses. The Director leads all marketing and recruitment efforts, including attending graduate school fairs and professional conferences, visual recruitment materials, social media presence, and management of recruitment website. The Director establishes plans to recruit students from traditionally underrepresented or marginalized populations. The Director oversees the management of the application process, ensuring that application materials are complete or, if not, prospective students are notified. The Director organizes virtual interview process. The Director coordinates advising assignments for newly admitted doctoral students and leads all orientation and cohort-development efforts for all enrolled doctoral students at the beginning of their first semester in the program. The Director collects data and analyzes trends in enrollment, including demographics, completion rates, loan rates to drive recruitment efforts for doctoral applicants.

IV. MERIT EVALUTION (ANNUAL REVIEW)

The results of merit reviews for all ranked faculty who have completed at least one academic year at UWL are due to the Dean's Office on Dec. 15 annually. Merit reviews reflect activities during the prior academic year ending May 31.

The purpose of merit evalution is to recognize, celebrate, and award outstanding faculty productivitiy in the department, allowing colleagues to understand and appreciate the work of one another.

A. Evaluation Processes & Criteria
The results of merit reviews for all ranked faculty and IAS who have completed at least one academic year at UWL are due to the Dean's Office on Dec.15 annually. Merit reviews reflect activities during the prior academic year ending June 1.

All faculty and IAS have a June 1st deadline for entering teaching, scholarship, and service activities into the electronic portfolios system (Digital Measures) on activities from the prior year, June 1st – May 31st.

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

(1) An annual activity report with hyperlinks of the previous academic year
(2) A 200-word abstract of the accomplishments and highlights of teaching, research, and service of the previous year.

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 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.

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.

1. Ranked 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 definition of scholarship can be found in Appendix B. The department requires ranked faculty to have a record of ongoing scholarly activity and evidence that external peer review has judged it to be of value.

The UWL 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 C. 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 in Permanent Budgeted Instructional Lines (otherwise see VI).

3. Department Chair (if applicable)
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. Distribution of Merit Funds
Each faculty and IAS member's average merit score will be classified as not meritorious, meritorious, highly meritorious, or exceptionally meritorious as follows:

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

With each annual pay plan, merit pools of P dollars are separately directed to the department for faculty and academic staff. Of these pools, 67% will be allocated to individuals in the top three meritorious categories as a percentage of their base salary. The remaining 33% of the pool will be used for supplemental merit for individuals in the "high" and "exceptional" categories, which will be distributed as follows.
If there are m individuals in the "highly meritorious" category and M individuals in the "exceptionally meritorious" category, then the value V of a supplemental merit unit is given by $V = 0.33P/(m + 1.5M)$. Each person in the "highly meritorious" category will receive V dollars and each individual in the "exceptionally meritorious" category will receive $1.5V$ dollars.

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

C. Appeal Procedures (if applicable)

A faculty or IAS member may request a reconsideration of his/her merit rating. This request must be made in writing to the Department Chair within one week of the initial 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).

V. FACULTY PERSONNEL REVIEW

The department will follow the policies regarding retention and tenure described in the Faculty Personnel Rules (UWS 3.06 - 3.11 and UWL 3.06 -3.08) ttp://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Unclassified-Personnel-Rules/

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

08/31/2010

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

A. Retention (Procedure, Criteria, and Appeal)
1. Ranked faculty under review provide an electronic portfolio related to their teaching, scholarship, and service activities extracted from their date of hire to the date of departmental review. Hyperlinked syllabi are required and the candidate may choose to provide additional evidence.

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

3. The initial review of probationary faculty shall be conducted by the tenured faculty of the

appropriate department in the manner outlined below.

> The Retention/Tenure Review Committee will consist of all tenured members of the department. If the department has fewer than three tenured members, the Department Chair will seek out external faculty for review in consultation with the Dean of the CLS. Review committees must include 5 faculty members including the Department Chair, and one of the reviewers must be from a college outside of CLS. 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. All first-year tenure-track faculty will be formally reviewed in the spring of their first year. A departmental letter will be filed with the Dean and HR. Formal reviews resulting in contract decisions will minimally occur for tenure-track faculty in their 2nd, 4th and 6th years. In the non-contract review years (1st, 3rd, 5th) tenure-track faculty will be reviewed by the same retention/tenure review committee mentioned above. The Department Chair will send the review letter to the faculty member under review, the Dean, and HR no later than by the first Friday in May.

B. Tenure Review and Departmental Tenure Criteria

1. Retention Process

a. Notice: Subsequent to the call of the Provost, the Department Chair 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) Scholarly and Research Activity, 3) Service, including service to the department, the college, the university, and the community and profession.

b. Meeting: The date, time, and place of the 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. The Department Chair presides over the meeting and keeps detailed minutes of the action and vote. These minutes must be kept under lock and key for 7 years. The probationary faculty shall have the opportunity to make a written and/or oral presentation at the meeting to provide highlights regarding teaching, scholarship, and service.

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 activity report from the most recent year. 3) The Department Chair will provide merit, SEI, and TAI summary information.

d. Action: After the faculty member under review completes their written and/or oral presentation regarding teaching, scholarship, and service, the Department Chair will excuse the faculty member under review from the meeting. Prior to the beginning of the review of

the candidate, the meeting will go into closed session according to Section 19.85 in the Wisconsin Statutes. To go into closed meeting, the Department Chair will entertain an according motion and a second. Review committee members present will indicate their approval in a roll call vote. During the closed session 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: After discussion about the faculty member under review, the Department Chair entertains a motion and a second to vote on the retention/tenure of the candidate. Once the motion passes, the vote must occur via secret ballots the Department Chair brings to the meeting. 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. In the review meeting, the Department Chair announces the votes in favor, in opposition, and in abstention (if applicable). Individual votes of review committee members will not be revealed. Ballots must be kept for 7 years under lock and key.

f. Communication of Vote: The faculty member under review will be informed verbally and in writing of the decision of the review committee within 7 days of the vote taking place in committee. How individual review committee members voted is only known to the Department Chair and will not be revealed to the faculty member under review.

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.

The process for tenure follows the retention process outlined above. 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. A3 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 UWL in a tenure-track position. Achieving tenure in SAA reflects:

- Consistent evidence of a strong commitment to student learning and to quality teaching. See Appendix A for Statement on Teaching.
- Evidence of a consistent program of scholarly inquiry (as defined by the department's statement on scholarship). See Appendix B for Statement on Scholarship.
- Evidence of consistent service to the department and evidence of consistent service to the university and/or the faculty member's profession. Community service that utilizes professional expertise is encouraged but not required. See Appendix C for Statement on Service

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.

3. Reconsideration

Any candidate wishing to appeal their 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 Department 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 department follows the UWL procedure and schedule regarding post-tenure review https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/post-tenure-review-policy/

1. Relationship to Annual Review and other Personnel Review

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

2. The Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee & Notification

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Post-Tenure Review Categorization

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

> a. Meets expectations. This category is awarded to those tenured faculty members whose performance reflects the expected level of accomplishment based on departmental by-laws.

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

5. Evidence for Consideration

Although the departmental committee provides an overall categorization of "meets expectations" or "does not meet expectations," the committee must also consider and report on the faculty member's performance in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Departmental by-laws, particularly with regard to scholarship appropriate to the discipline, shall be used as the criteria for review. In addition, the department may also draw on foundational expectations in terms of professional ethics such as those articulated in the AAUP's statement on professional ethics https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-professional-ethics.

6. Procedure when Faculty Member "Meets Expectations"

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

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

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

The Dean forwards the letter to HR and the Provost (Chancellor's designee) no later than February 1.

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

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

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

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

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

The Dean reviews the file and submits a letter to the Provost (Chancellor's designee) and the faculty member (with a cc: to the Department Chair and HR) by February 1 of the same academic year of the departmental post-tenure review.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The final remediation plan:

- shall be the product of mutual discussion between the faculty member, the departmental post-tenure review committee chair, and the Dean, shall respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and shall be flexible enough to allow for subsequent alteration.
- is referred to as developmental as its purpose is to help the faculty member reach appropriate improvement goals in line with the area(s) of deficiency identified. A good developmental remediation plan should reflect the mission/goals/objectives of the department/college/university and the faculty member's professional development needs and objectives.
- shall list resources for appropriate support from the department, Dean, and/or other campus resources as applicable (e.g., Center for the Advancing of Teaching and Learning). Specific financial resources, including supplies and equipment, reassignment time, etc. for supporting a scholarly agenda should also be identified and agreed upon, if needed.
- shall clearly indicate a deadline (not to exceed three academic semesters starting the Fall subsequent to the development of remediation plan) by which time all elements of the plan must be satisfied. The faculty person can request an earlier deadline if s/he wishes.
- shall indicate that 1) a progress meeting will be scheduled with the Dean, the departmental post-tenure review committee chair, and the faculty member approximately one semester into the plan to help determine progress and identify additional

improvement resources that may aid the faculty member, and 2) that a final remediation follow-up meeting will occur between the Dean, the departmental post-tenure review committee chair, and the faculty member after the deadline, but before the start of the subsequent academic semester, and not to exceed 21 calendar days past the deadline (e.g., if three semesters are provided, within 21 calendar days of the close of the 3rd semester to allow for student evaluations to be accessed, etc.).

- shall indicate the specific consequence(s) of not meeting the operationalized goals of the remediation plan by the deadline. Consequences can range from informal sanctions such as workload assignments, to discipline short of dismissal for cause (such as suspension without pay), or in extreme instances, dismissal for cause, under UWS Chapter 4.

Within 7 days of the meeting, the departmental post-tenure review committee chair will provide the finalized remediation plan to the Dean, who will forward the plan to the Provost and HR. The final remediation plan will be on official UWL letterhead and will be signed by the faculty member named in the remediation plan, the departmental PTR committee chair, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Provost. All signatories will receive a final signed electronic copy of this plan from HR within 14 days of the meeting.

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

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

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

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

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

8. Appeals and Grievances

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

9. Post-tenure Review Opportunities

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

10. Information, Documentation and Reporting

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

D. Faculty Promotion Procedures (procedure, criteria and appeal) The department will follow the guidelines and schedules regarding faculty promotion available at http://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Faculty-Promotion-Resources/

1. Review Process

The SAA Promotion Recommendation Committee (PRC) 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 retention/tenure review committee of the candidate under review shall serve. The Department Chair presides over the promotion consideration review. Should the Department Chair be up for promotion, they will work with the Dean to designate an appropriate chair of the PRC.

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.

The Department Chair will notify in writing faculty eligible for promotion of the date of the promotion meeting with at least 20 calendar days notice. 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 secret ballot. At least a 2/3 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 Department Chair and entered on the committee's portion of the Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report Form. The Department Chair, in consultation with the committee, shall prepare written reasons for their recommendations.

Within seven calendar days of the promotion meeting, the Department Chair shall notify each candidate of the committee's recommendation. For positive recommendations, the Department 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 seven days 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 Provost website for Faculty Promotion and HR website for Faculty Promotion Resources) 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 (see Appendix A). Scholarship shall be consistent with the department's definition of scholarly activity (see Appendix B). Service shall also be consistent with the department's definition of service (see Appendix C).

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. Teaching excellence also includes a record of assessment of student learning, such as through direct or indirect measures. 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. The review committee must consist of members who have been promoted to Professor.

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 (Lecturer or Associate Lecturer and Clinical Faculty)

A. Annual Review
In accordance with Faculty Personnel rules UWS 3.05-3.11 and UWL 3.08, academic staff will be evaluated annually. https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/faculty-and-staff/performance-

The Department Chair serves as the supervisor for IAS and will preside over the annual IAS review process. The Department Chair may choose to involve ranked department members in the IAS review process, specifically if they have observed or evaluated a course of the IAS. Evaulation will be based on review of syllabi and SEIs, and any additional evidence a candidate wishes to provide in the categories related to career progression. All IAS are required to have an annual review based on their contract and/or position description.

1.Annual Review Expectations

Teaching: IAS members engaged in graduate instruction typically teach between one and three courses per contract terms.

Scholarship: IAS members are not expected to engage in scholarly activities. However, if an IAS member desires career progression, scholarship requirements must be met according to career progression guidelines found at at http://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/ias-promotion-resources/

Service: IAS members are not expected to engage in service activities, other than serving or chair departmental committees, being engaged in the regular business of the department, and advising M.S.Ed. and/or Ed.D. students. Clinical faculty are expected to chair or serve on departmental committees and be engaged in the business of the department. If an IAS member desires career progression, service requirements must be met according to career progression guidelines found at at http://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/ias-promotion-resources/

B. IAS Promotion Procedures
Policies and procedure guiding promotion for IAS are available at http://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/ias-promotion-resources/

IAS may choose to advance through Career Progression. All ranked members of the department shall serve on the IAS Promotion Committee. IAS desiring career progression are evaluated on the basis of their teaching, scholarship, and service.

C. Appeal Procedures re: Annual Review

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. GOVERNANCE

A. Department Chair

1. Election of the Department Chair

The Dean appoints the Chair of the SAA Department in consultation with the ranked and clinical faculty until the department has two or more tenured faculty. At that point, the Department 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, IAS, and clinical 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 Department Chair, the Department Chair will be appointed by the Dean.

2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair

The department will adhere to the selection and duties of the Chair that are delineated in the Faculty Senate Policies (revised 2008) http://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/ under the heading "IV. Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons," "V. The Selection of Department Chairpersons," and "VI. Remuneration of Department Chairpersons." In addition, references to chair-related duties are stated indicated in the Employee Handbook http://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Employee-handbook/

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

1. **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. The chair of the committee is appointed by the Department Chair. Members serve for one year and can be reappointed.

2. **Curriculum Committee**

   The committee shall be composed of four department members. The M.S.Ed. and Ed.D. Program Directors must both serve on this committee. The duties of the committee are to recommend to the department: a) the content of the departmental curricula for the Ed.D. and M.S.Ed. Programs, b) new courses and deletion of unneeded ones, c) any policies which affect instruction. The chair of the committee is appointed by the Department Chair. Members serve for one year and can be reappointed.

   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

3. **Merit Evaluation Committee**

   The Merit Evaluation Committee shall include all ranked faculty and IAS members of the department. The chair for the committee will be appointed each year by the Department Chair. 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 chair of the committee is appointed by the Department Chair. Members serve for one year and can be reappointed.

4. Student Appeals Committee
The Appeals Committee hears student grade appeals and program dismissal appeals. The committee shall include three members of the department and the Department Chair. The Department Chair will appoint the chair of the committee and the Department Chair will function as a neutral observer during any appeal hearing. The chair of the committee is appointed by the Department Chair. Members serve for one year and can be reappointed.

5. SAA Commencement Committee
The Commencement Committee organizes and implements SAA's Capstone Day and SAA Graduation Celebration. The committee shall include 3 to 4 faculty member. One member has to be one of the SAA 790 instructors; that member may or may not share the committee.

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

1. Mission
Our mission is to advance the field of student affairs by preparing diverse scholar-practitioners for leadership in the multifaceted and complex context of 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.

D. Additional departmental policies

1. Sick leave. Department members will account for sickleave in adherence to the most current UW System guidelines: http://www.uwsa.edu/hr/benefits/leave/sick.htm. Vacation. For unclassified staff, 12-month employees garner vacation time, 9-month employees do not.
2. Salary Equity Policy. a) The Salary Equity Policy of SAA is intended to be consistent with and implement the salary equity policy of the University, which states that: b) Consideration of individual equity requests will depend upon the availability of funding.

Equity requests will be based upon instances of inversion (substantially dissimilar salaries for individuals with substantially similar qualifications and records), compression (reduction in the spread of salaries within and between ranks over time, often the result of hiring salaries increasing faster than pay plan increases) and retention (individuals who are offered higher salaries for comparable positions at other institutions). c. Requests for equity adjustments may be initiated by individuals or as a result of departmental review. If the Department does not support an individual request the individual may appeal directly to their Dean. d. Departments will be provided with salary data for their units, which allows them to make comparisons and judgments about equity adjustments.

3. Graduate faculty status. All SAA faculty must obtain graduate faculty status as granted by UWL Graduate Council and/or the Director of Graduate Studies. The Department Chair will initiate this process for each new faculty member.

4. Course assignment. Course assignments are made by the Department Chair in consultation with the individual faculty member.

5. Summer teaching. Summer teaching for faculty in SAA is not guaranteed. The Department Chair will approach departmental faculty members about summer teaching. Faculty do not have to teach over the summer if they choose not to.

6. Peer Review of Teaching. Probationary ranked faculty will have their teaching evaluated by two peers visiting a classroom or reviewing their online class 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 ranked faculty being reviewed. Clinical faculty or IAS will be reviewed once annually and peer reviewers can be selected from experienced faculty or IAS within the department, or be selected in consultation with the Department Chair. A peer reviewer may also serve as a mentor (see Section IV.D.1) assigned to the faculty or IAS being reviewed. Adjunct faculty will be reviewed and evaluated by the Department Chair after each course taught.

In addition to classroom visitation or online class review, syllabi and evaluation instruments will be reviewed. An evaluation form (Appendix E) will be completed by each peer reviewer and submitted to the ranked faculty, IAS, or clinical faculty member, and Department Chair along with a letter summarizing the review. This review will be considered evidence of teaching effectiveness and progress.

At any time, ranked faculty, IAS, or clinical members may elect, or be required by the Department Chair to have their teaching reviewed by peers. For example, peer review of teaching is one component of the promotion process and may be used as evidence to support post-tenure review.

VIII. SEARCH AND SCREEN PROCEDURES

The department will follow recruitment and hiring procedures prescribed by the University's Office of Human Resources (HR) in conjunction with AAO, UW System and WI state regulations. The UWL Search and Screen Policy and Procedures are to be followed for all faculty and staff recruitments at UWL.

A. Tenure-track faculty
Approved UWL tenure track faculty recruitment and hiring policy and procedures:
https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/recruitment/#tab-recruitment-processes

A tenure-track faculty member search and screen committee must be chaired by a tenured or tenure-track faculty member. The Department Chair appoints the committee. In case a panel search is chosen as the venue to select the tenure-track faculty member, the Department Chair chairs the IAS search and screen process.

Additionally, UWL's spousal/partner hiring policy can be found at http://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Spousal-and-partner-hiring/

B. Instructional Academic Staff
Hiring policy and procedures: https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/recruitment/#tab-recruitment-processes (same for IAS & NIAS)

The search and screen procedures followed for an IAS position are identical to those that are utilized for faculty searches. An IAS search and screen committee must be chaired by a tenured or tenure-track faculty member. The Department Chair appoints the committee. In case a panel search is chosen as the venue to select the IAS, the Department Chair chairs the IAS search and screen process.

C. Pool Search (See also D)
Hiring policy and procedures: https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/recruitment/#tab-recruitment-processes.

Candidates who apply to the SAA pool of instructors may not be contacted by SAA, depending on current teaching need as deemed by the Department Chair or faculty. All potential adjunct faculty must apply to the pool and be officially hired through the HR process before they can begin teaching.

D. Adjunct Faculty
Potential adjunct faculty must be nominated by a member of the department or the Department Chair. Candidates must submit a letter of interest and CV to the SAA pool of instructors on the HR website. A simple majority vote of the voting department members is required to obtain adjunct faculty status. The Department Chair will provide reasons in writing when adjunct faculty status is not recommended.

IX. STUDENT RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS

A. Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures

1. Grade Appeals (Appendix F)
Students may appeal a course grade if they deem the grade they received for a course does not reflect their performance in that course. This appeal must take place before the end of the term immediately following the term in which the grade was recorded and the student must send a letter of appeal to the Department Chair in that timeframe. Students can expect an initial

response within 30 days. If additional time for review is needed the Department Chair will notify the student.

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. SAA follows the procedures for non-grade appeals as outlined in UWL's Student Handbook.

3. Program Policy Appeals
Students may appeal a program policy or decision. In this case, students should send a letter of appeal to the Department Chair within 30 days of the occurrence. Students can expect an initial response within 30 days. If additional time for review is needed the Department Chair will notify the student.

B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct (Academic and nonacademic misconduct policy referenced: https://www.uwlax.edu/student-life/student-resources/student-handbook/)

Students who enroll in the on-campus option of the M.S.Ed. in SAA are expected to attend and participate in all classes. Students who attend the online options are expected to 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 (typically, two to three times the amount of credit hours in which they enroll per week) 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.

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 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.

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 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 an incomplete with the instructor of that course. In case an incomplete is granted, the faculty member will provide the timeline for completion of the course. That timeline will not extend more than 1 year past the original course end date.

Academic Misconduct
SAA follows the procedures outlined by the university for academic misconduct.

Non-Academic Misconduct
SAA follows the procedures outline by the university for non-academic misconduct. Should a student be found responsible for non-academic misconduct, the department reserves the right to ex-matriculate the student from the academic program.

C. Advising Policy

Each student enrolled in the M.S.Ed. option of SAA will be assigned a faculty advisor. Faculty are expected to confer with their advisees at least once each semester to discuss their academic

progress, career interests, and course schedule. Faculty should connect with online advisees each semester virtually or via phone. All faculty members are expected to be accessible to students throughout the academic year and to respond to all advisee questions with 48 hours.

In the Ed.D. Program, all students are assigned a program advisor. The above statement holds true for Ed.D. program advisors as well. Dissertation advisors may be different from program advisors and are chosen by the student in conjunction with the faculty program advisor.

XII. Appendices

Appendix A: Statement of Teaching in the Department of Student Affairs Administration

Teaching is the primary focus for individuals in ranked and IAS positions in SAA. Adjunct faculty are full-time student affairs or academic affairs professionals who teach SAA courses on overload. SAA faculty pursue this aim within the context of guiding graduate students who intend to become student affairs practitioners. Thus, SAA faculty implement good teaching practices with the goal of supporting practitioner candidates as they acquire content knowledge, skill, and professional awareness. This includes incorporating innovative teaching techniques that are relevant to the higher education and student affairs setting, for example integration of relevant technology, making connections between theory and practice in the classroom, and implementing social justice pedagogy for all learners.

Minimal expectations for teaching activities:
All faculty are expected to set well-defined expectations, distribute syllabi (in electronic format), stay current in their field (including aligning objectives with competency standards), demonstrate competency in the applicable learning management system, return assignments and communicate with students in a timely manner, hold regular office hours or otherwise be available for regular student consultation, and implement the approved course curriculum.

Teaching in SAA
Effective Teaching:
For merit review and retention, tenure, and promotion decisions, faculty are expected to demonstrate effective teaching and should provide evaluative evidence in their Digital Measures that aligns in accordance with JPC guidelines and substantiates teaching effectiveness. IAS and adjunct faculty also must demonstrate effective teaching that will be reviewed annually by the Department Chair. Types of evidence documenting effective teaching may include, but is not limited to:

- **Self-assessment of teaching**. This assessment may take the form of a narrative which addresses a teaching philosophy and statement of personal growth, course expectations, grading methodology, and other methods used for self-assessment. Any self-assessment should also articulate how responses to direct and indirect assessment outcomes inform teaching practices and affect student learning.

- **Peer evaluation of teaching.** The teaching effectiveness of all faculty will be peer-reviewed and documented on an annual basis. Probationary faculty, faculty undergoing post-tenure review, and IAS should also recruit faculty colleagues external to the department to review a course annually. Faculty may choose whether they would like an on-campus or online course to be reviewed.

- **Student evaluation of instruction:** Student evaluations given in each of the courses taught will also be used as *one* measure to judge teaching effectiveness. SEI results from the Faculty Senate approved SEI questions are required for retention, tenure, and promotion. SAA uses additional questions as part of the SEI instrument. SAA acknowledges that SEIs are inherently biased and subjective and tend to disproportionately underrate faculty who identify as women and/or persons of color.

Additional Teaching Contributions:
Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) often make additional teaching contributions outside of the classroom. SAA highly values these contributions, which can take many forms, including, but not limited to:
- Course/curriculum development/revision/innovation
- Course/curriculum grants and/or teaching materials/assessments
- Professional development related to teaching and/or licensure
- Non-credit instruction
- Student program advising

Candidates for merit, retention, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review should provide evidence indicating the scope and impact of these types of contributions.

Statement on Grading:
Grading student performance in SAA involves assessing mastery. Faculty are responsible for determining if students are proficient in all ten student affairs professional competencies. Through this process, faculty provide substantial feedback that is used by students to continually revise and expand their work to meet competency standards. Further, grades in graduate programs tend to be higher because a C is the lowest passing grade in graduate programs. In SAA, compared to some undergraduate disciplines, grades tend to be high (typically As and Bs) because assessment is an iterative process that leads students to mastery. It is important for reviewers of faculty portfolios to appreciate mastery grading when reviewing SAA course grade distributions.

Appendix B: Statement of Scholarship in the Department of Student Affairs Administration

Faculty in SAA are expected to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship. Scholarship activity reflects the faculty's role in student affairs practitioner preparation, which is to provide instruction to graduate candidates in a theory-to-practice curriculum that is relevant to professional positions in a multitude of functional areas in student affairs and academic affairs administration.

Minimal Expectations for Scholarship:
Faculty members are expected to be actively engaged in scholarship. This could involve collecting and/or analyzing data, writing manuscripts and/or grants, presenting, reviewing, and/or publishing results. Active engagement will take different forms depending on the individual and their area of scholarship.

Scholarship in SAA:
The department's definition of scholarship reflects its commitment to a practitioner preparation program that is field-based and is dedicated to developing reflective practitioners. Student affairs is an applied discipline and as such our faculty reach different audiences in different ways. However, for all of our research, the value of reaching practitioners who do student affairs practice work is of equal value to peer-reviewed research published in academic journals. Faculty may engage in content-focused research in their specific line of inquiry, and/or they may engage in self-study or use other rigorous research methods to carefully examine their *own* instruction. Both types of scholarship ultimately result in the dissemination of findings. Grants that focus on the act of teaching and/or instructional methods are also considered scholarly products.

Faculty are expected to report their scholarly activities and accomplishments on an ongoing basis in their Digital Measures database. Contributions are generally viewed as having a higher impact when subject to peer review and directed towards a student affairs practitioner audience. Narratives describing scholarly activity should contextualize the strength and audience of the publication outlet in which faculty are publishing when they submit their materials for review.

The Department of SAA values many levels of engagement in scholarship. Benchmarks for retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review are articulated in the body of these bylaws. A guide to the different scholarly activities and products is given below.

Primary Areas of Scholarly Activity are those that are highly competitive and subject to rigorous peer review by individuals or organizations external to the University. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- Publication in a peer-reviewed forum, with contextualization of the forum and its impact
- Publication of textbooks, monographs, manuals, books, or book chapters
- Editor or Co-Editor of peer-reviewed journal or book
- Keynote or invited speaker at regional, national or international conferences
- Peer-reviewed research presentation for a national or international audience
- Principal or Co-Principal Investigator for an external grant (public or private funding) that is related to student affairs

Secondary Areas of Scholarly Activity are those that are subject to less rigorous peer review by individuals or organizations external to the University or to review by peers at the University. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- Publication of a review of a book or media in a peer-reviewed journal
- Publication in a non-peer-reviewed forum, with contextualization of the forum and its impact
- Session leader at a national, regional, or local conference or webinar (e.g., scholarly paper sessions, poster sessions, leader of discussion or presentation panel)
- Peer-reviewed non-research based talk, poster, or paper presentation for a national, regional, local, or internal audience
- Chairing SAA doctoral student dissertation committees

- Principal or Co-Principal Investigator for an internal grant at the System or University-Wide level that is related to student affairs

Tertiary Areas of Scholarly Activity are those that are not subject to external peer review but may receive some form of internal review. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- Reviews of books, articles, grants, dissertations, awards, or conference proposals
- Non-peer reviewed presentations at local conferences
- Serving as a Supporting Author on a grant
- Mentoring undergraduate and graduate research
- Attending conferences or symposia in support of scholarly development
- Conducting research (including collecting and analyzing data, writing manuscripts, applying for grants)
- Principal or Co-Principal Investigator for an internal grant in the College of Liberal Studies, or at the Department/Program level, that is related to student affairs

Appendix C: Statement of Service in the Department of Student Affairs Administration

SAA faculty are expected to participate in service that aligns with and informs practitioner preparation in student affairs. SAA faculty are also expected to serve the department and their profession in a collegial fashion.

The service obligations for the SAA faculty are greater than the obligations for most faculty. Given the applied nature of the program, increased emphasis is placed on relationships with the students, their assistantship and practicum providers, and to a wide variety of local, state and national organizations.

Such service activities include:
- Serving on local community organizations
- Serving on regional or national professional associations, including serving in leadership roles
- Program Directorship, either as M.S.Ed. Program Director or Ed.D. Program Director
- Serving on or chairing department committees
- Serving on or chairing CLS-level committees or university-wide committees
- Developing partnerships and collaboration with practitioners who employ SAA graduate students in graduate assistantships/internships or practica
- Participating in SAA student recruitment, outreach, and support activities
- Serving as program advisor to SAA M.S.Ed. and/or doctoral students
- Delivering service presentations to constituents of the college, the university, the community, or the profession of student affairs
- Assisting in the continuous development of program alums
- Advising student organizations

Appendix D: Policy on Outside Activities

An outside activity is an activity 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 affected 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 UWL 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 UWL Human Resources Department in early spring of each year. Completed forms should be turned in to the Department Chair on or before April 30th. The chair then forwards these to the appropriate Dean. 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, while under contract at UWL, 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 E: Peer Review of Teaching Forms

1. Peer Review of Teaching Form for Online and Blended Courses

University of Wisconsin-La Crosse
Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education
Peer Evaluation Form for Online Courses

Instructor:_____   **Date:**_____

Evaluator:_____   **Course:**_____

Respond to each statement using the following scale:
  1- Not observed   2- More emphasis needed   3- Accomplished

Course Structure:

1.	The syllabus was complete and well designed.	1	2	3
2.	The course learning outcomes were clearly communicated.	1	2	3
3.	The course was well organized.	1	2	3
4.	Course requirements were clearly communicated.	1	2	3
5.	Rubrics for grading were provided for important assignments.	1	2	3
6.	Course content was appropriate for the time frame.	1	2	3
7.	The course format considered different learning styles.	1	2	3
8.	The course included meaningful resources.	1	2	3

Comments:

Instruction:

1.	The instructor displayed enthusiasm in teaching this course.	1	2	3
2.	The instructor demonstrated command of the subject matter.	1	2	3
3.	The instructor utilized a variety of instructional activities.	1	2	3
4.	The instructor has the ability to communicate concepts.	!	2	3
5.	The instructor had an online presence in the course.	1	2	3
6.	The instructor was successful in communicating the subject matter.	1	2	3
7.	The instructor motivated students' critical thinking.	1	2	3
8.	The instructor promoted student-to-student interaction.	1	2	3
9.	The instructor encouraged student-to-instructor interaction.	1	2	3
10.	The instructor provided timely feedback.	1	2	3

Comments:

What were the instructor's major strengths?

Improvements for future courses:

Rev 2/13

2. Peer Review of Teaching Form for On-campus Courses

University of Wisconsin-La Crosse
Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education
Peer Evaluation Form for On-Campus Courses

Course:_____   Date:_____

Evaluator:_____

Respond to each statement using the following scale:
  1- Not observed   2- More emphasis needed   3- Accomplished

Course Structure:

9.	The syllabus was complete and well designed.	1	2	3
10.	The course learning outcomes were clearly communicated.	1	2	3
11.	The course was well organized.	1	2	3
12.	Course requirements were clearly communicated.	1	2	3
13.	Rubrics for grading were provided for important assignments.	1	2	3
14.	Course content was appropriate for the time frame.	1	2	3
15.	The course format considered different learning styles.	1	2	3
16.	The course included meaningful resources.	1	2	3
17.	The course incorporates issues of diversity and inclusion into the subject matter.	1	2	3

Comments:

Instruction:

11.	The instructor displayed enthusiasm in teaching this course.	1	2	3
12.	The instructor demonstrated command of the subject matter.	1	2	3
13.	The instructor utilized a variety of instructional activities.	1	2	3
14.	The instructor has the ability to communicate concepts.	1	2	3
15.	The instructor had a professional presence in the course.	1	2	3
16.	The instructor was successful in communicating the subject matter.	1	2	3
17.	The instructor motivated students' critical thinking.	1	2	3
18.	The instructor promoted student-to-student interaction.	1	2	3
19.	The instructor encouraged student-to-instructor interaction.	1	2	3
20.	The instructor provided timely feedback.	1	2	3
21.	The instructor intentionally facilitates discussions where all voices can be heard (practices inclusive excellence).	1	2	3

Comments:

What were the instructor's major strengths?

Improvements for future courses:

Rev 1/14

Appendix F: Procedure for Hearing Grade Appeals

Students who deem that a 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 must 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 their 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 <u>not</u> 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