

*Bylaws of the
Department of Philosophy
University of Wisconsin – La Crosse*



NOTE: *These bylaws follow the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse template and include the required language. Prior to making changes in any area of these bylaws, the department should consult the template and the required language by going to: <http://www.UW-Lax.edu/provost/administration/by-laws.html>.*

Table of Contents

- I. The Philosophy Department 5
- II. Organization and Operation..... 5
 - A. Mission and History 5
 - B. Meeting Guidelines..... 6
 - 1. Meetings 6
 - 2. Recording of Minutes..... 7
 - C. Definition of Membership & Voting Procedures 7
 - 1. Membership..... 7
 - 2. Voting..... 7
 - D. Definition of Quorum and Majority..... 8
 - E. Changing By-laws. 8
- III. Faculty/Staff Responsibilities 9
 - A. Faculty..... 9
 - B. Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations 10
 - C. Non-Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations 11
 - D. Student Evaluation of Instruction 11
- IV. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)..... 13
 - A. Evaluation Processes and Criteria..... 13
 - 1. Faculty..... 13
 - 2. Instructional Academic Staff (if included in merit processes, otherwise see below)..... 14
 - 3. Non-Instructional Academic Staff (if included in merit processes, otherwise see VII) n/a 15
 - B. Distribution of Merit Funds..... 15
 - C. Equation for Merit Distribution 15
 - D. Appeal Procedure for Merit..... 15
- V. Faculty Personnel Review..... 16
 - A. Retention (procedure, criteria and appeal) 16
 - 1. Procedure..... 16
 - 2. Criteria..... 18
 - 3. Appeal 19
 - B. Tenure Review and Departmental Tenure Criteria..... 19
 - 1. Procedure..... 20

2.	Appeal	20
C.	Post-tenure Review.....	20
D.	Faculty Promotion Procedures (procedure, criteria and appeal)	21
1.	Composition of Promotion Committee.....	22
2.	Review Process.....	22
3.	Criteria.....	23
4.	Reconsideration	23
VI.	Instructional Academic Staff Review	24
A.	Annual Review	24
B.	IAS Promotion Procedures.....	25
C.	Appeal Procedures.....	26
VII.	Non-Instructional Academic Staff Review (if applicable)	26
VIII.	Governance.....	26
A.	Department Chair	26
1.	Election of the Department Chair	26
2.	Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair	27
3.	Formative Evaluation of Chair.....	27
4.	Summer Administrative Duties	27
B.	Standing Departmental Committees	27
C.	Departmental Programmatic Assessment Plan	30
D.	Additional Departmental Policies	30
IX.	Search and Screen Procedures	36
A.	Tenure-track Faculty	36
B.	Instructional Academic Staff	37
C.	Contingency Workforce (Pool Search) Procedures.....	37
D.	Non-Instructional Academic Staff (if applicable)	37
X.	Student Rights and Obligations	37
A.	Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures	37
B.	Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct	39
C.	Advising Policy.....	39
D.	Advanced Placement	40
XI.	Other	40

Philosophy Bylaws (September 29, 2014)

A.	Work-Life Balance Statement	40
B.	Outside Employment Statement	40
XII.	Appendices.....	41
A.	Department of Philosophy - Statement on Scholarly Activity (<i>approved 4/25/2014</i>)	41
B.	Department of Philosophy–Statement of Service Activity (<i>approved 5/2/2014</i>)	43
C.	Department of Philosophy – Statement on Teaching Activity(<i>approved 5/2/2014</i>).....	44
D.	Open Meeting Rules Summary	47
E.	Philosophy SEI Form.....	49
F.	Philosophy Merit Form (<i>Adopted 2/21/2014</i>)	50
G.	Department of Philosophy Annual Teaching Evaluation for Probationary Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff	54
H.	Search & Screen Procedure-Tenure Track Positions.....	56
I.	Program Assessment.....	58
J.	Search & Screen Procedure-IAS and Pool Positions	59

I. The Philosophy Department

The Philosophy Department is an instructional unit within the College of Liberal Studies at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (UW-L).

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

The Bylaws in this document were adopted by the members of the Department of Philosophy in accordance with the University of Wisconsin System (UWS) and University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (UW-L) Faculty and Academic Staff Personnel Rules.

Adoption Date

These bylaws were most recently updated and adopted on **May 9, 2014** at a regularly scheduled department meeting.

II. Organization and Operation

Department members are governed by six interdependent sets of regulations.

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

A. Mission and History

The mission of the Philosophy Department of the University of Wisconsin- La Crosse is to nurture excellence in philosophy in thought and practice. This includes offering a broad range of classes, engaging in research that contributes to the body of philosophical knowledge, and providing service for the intellectual, ethical, cultural and professional development of students. The department offers professional expertise in meeting these important educational needs.

Thematically and historically philosophy has been and should continue to be the cornerstone of university education. Philosophy addresses questions that are basic to human experience. Hence the Philosophy Department has and will continue to provide a broad base of classes, research and service for the intellectual, ethical, cultural and professional development of students. The Philosophy is comprised

of dedicated faculty who are active both in and out of the department as well as beyond the boundaries of the UW-L campus.

B. Meeting Guidelines

1. Meetings

a. Protocol

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. Summary at (<http://www.UW-Lax.edu/HR/employment/PeopleAdmin/Tools/OpenMeetingsRules-Summary.htm>).

The department will hold regular monthly meetings and other meetings as needed. The Chair shall convene the first department meeting at the beginning of each academic year and the department members shall determine times and days for succeeding meetings. The Chair and/or other department members may add or delete meetings according to the press of business. A faculty member wishing to call a departmental or personnel meeting must do so via the Chair, who will call a meeting in a timely fashion. During the Summer Session, or when the University is not in session, meetings shall be called at the discretion of the Chair. Chairs of committees, subcommittees, and ad hoc committees shall decide the dates for their meetings.

b. Notification of meetings.

Written notifications with agenda are to be distributed at least 7 days prior to the meetings, except in extraordinary circumstances.

Chairs of committees, subcommittees, and ad hoc committees whose recommendations will be considered by the entire department must announce their meetings to all members of the department in a timely fashion. Minutes of committee meetings will be recorded and made available to the Chair of the department or other department members, upon request as appropriate.

c. Open Meetings Rule.

Departmental decisions shall be made by voting in accordance with the Wisconsin Open Meeting Law that includes the provision of posting the meeting date, time, place and agenda at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting. When the department moves to close a

meeting, they must do so by citing the proper statute (Section 19.85 in the Wisconsin Statutes).

2. Recording of Minutes

Minutes will be recorded by a voting member and distributed in a timely fashion to department members. If possible, minutes will be approved at the next department meeting. Copies of the minutes of department meetings and committee meetings shall be in a secure location. Minutes from closed meetings will be taken by the Department Chair or Chair's designee and written within one week of the proceedings. They will be available by request.

C. Definition of Membership & Voting Procedures

1. Membership

Members of the department are defined as instructional academic staff members with at least a 50% contract in Philosophy and at least 3 consecutive semesters of service, all ranked (tenure-track or tenured) faculty (including those on leave or sabbatical who are in attendance), for the purpose of conducting business at any regular meeting. Non-instructional academic staff and classified staff members are not voting members.

2. Voting

b. Unless specifically indicated otherwise, a simple majority of those voting carries the vote (50% + 1). Voting occurs with a voice vote or a hand vote and any member can call for a roll call vote. Proxy voting is not allowed. Members who join by teleconference and have heard all the deliberation are eligible to vote. "Robert's Rules indicates that abstentions do not affect the voting outcome (they are non-votes). " Paper balloting will be allowed upon request by any voting member of the department. Paper ballots must be signed and kept securely for seven (7) years.

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.

c. Instructional Academic Staff with less than a 50% appointment in the department are not eligible to participate in department governance. These individuals are not entitled to vote on matters that require a department vote, or to serve as voting members on the department's committee of the whole. Instructional Academic Staff with a 50% or more appointment are eligible to participate in department governance, may vote on matters that require a department vote, and may serve as voting members on the department's committee of the whole. For the election of the department chair, voting is limited to all ranked faculty and IAS who have been given voting privileges.

d. Voting can be conducted by email

Voting by email will be allowable under the following conditions: 1. the action item is not related to ranked faculty personnel decision; 2. a department meeting is not feasible within the time needed for a decision (e.g., outside of a regular academic session). Process: A motion can come from any voting department member. A second is needed. A call for the final vote cannot occur until 48 weekday hours from the last discussion email and 48 hours will be allowed for voting. A quorum of voting members must reply for the vote to carry. Results from an email vote will be reported in the minutes of the next department meeting.

D. Definition 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. For department meetings and committee of the whole meetings, a majority is defined as a simple majority of members attending when a quorum is present.

E. Changing By-laws.

The Bylaws in this document were adopted by the members of the Department of Philosophy in accordance with the University of Wisconsin System (UWS)

and University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (UW-L) faculty and Academic Staff Personnel Rules.

Amendments to Bylaws.

These bylaws may be amended according to the following procedures:

- e. Any proposed amendment(s) shall be presented and distributed in writing at a department meeting and voted on at the next subsequent meeting.
- f. A Two-thirds majority of the current department membership present and eligible to vote on bylaws is required to amend the bylaws.
- g. Policies pertaining to personnel issues, which are the responsibilities of the ranked-faculty or of the tenured faculty may be changed only by the voting of the appropriately responsible group.
- h. Second readings can be waived for bylaws that do not pertain to personnel decisions, provided all eligible voting members are present.
- i. Amendments to these bylaws shall become effective five days following their adoption.

III. Faculty/Staff Responsibilities

A. Faculty

1. Faculty responsibilities are referenced in section IV of the Faculty senate bylaws entitled “Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons.” A complete set of the bylaws is available from the Senate webpage under “Senate Articles and Bylaws: (<http://www.UW-Lax.edu/facultysenate/ABP/FacSenatePolicies.html>).
2. Faculty members have the responsibility of carrying out the responsibilities of the department through their contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The primary functions of the Philosophy Department are to teach courses in the discipline of philosophy to support the philosophy major and minor and to service a variety of general education and other programmatic needs. In addition, the Department’s most fundamental responsibilities include:
 - a. Promoting scholarship and other philosophical activities,
 - b. Utilizing the expertise and interest of its members to provide university and professional service,
 - c. Advising students on academic program requirements and career opportunities,

- d. Promoting the continued professional growth and development of its members by encouraging their participation in conferences, professional workshops, sabbatical leaves, developmental leaves, and other similar programs, and
 - e. Making personnel decisions.
3. The Philosophy Department also upholds the highest standards of professionalism, ethics, academic integrity and collegiality.

B. Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations

1. 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 and will outline specific duties including teaching and any additional workload. Total workload for IAS is defined as a standard minimum teaching load plus additional workload equivalency activities (<http://www.UW-Lax.edu/facultysenate/committees/ias/>). Determination of individual, departmental, college and university workload and accountability for that determination:

- a. Individual workload is a collaborative decision determined by the department/department chair/program director. Accountability for that determination shall rest with the department.
- b. Departmental workload is determined by the department and the academic dean. Accountability for that determination shall rest with the academic dean(s).
- c. College workload is determined by the college dean and the provost/vice chancellor. Accountability for that determination shall rest with the provost/vice chancellor, subject to review by the chancellor.
- d. Institutional workload is determined by the provost/vice chancellor and the chancellor. Accountability for that determination shall rest with the provost/vice chancellor and the chancellor, subject to review by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs of the UW System.

2. The expected typical workload for instructional academic staff.

- a. Full-time instructional academic staff engaged in undergraduate instruction typically have a *teaching load* of 12 contact hours of group instruction per week. Full-time instructional academic staff engaged in graduate instruction typically have a *teaching load* of 9 contact hours of group instruction per week. The *total workload* for a full-time equivalency shall not exceed 15/16 contact hours (e.g., 12 contact hours teaching load plus up to 3 contact hours additional workload equivalency). A *total workload* that exceeds the 15/16 contact hour maximum will constitute an overload for payroll purposes.
- b. Half-time instructional academic staff engaged in undergraduate instruction typically have a *teaching load* of 6 contact hours of group instruction per week. The *total workload* for a half-time equivalency shall not exceed 8

contact hours (e.g., 6 contact hours teaching load plus up to 2 contact hours additional workload equivalency). To fulfill the responsibilities of individual units and the mission of this institution, variations will occur in the composition of individual, departmental and college workloads. Composition of workload varies among individual IAS members and departments, depending upon the number of students in classes, number and nature of course preparations required, the nature of instructional patterns (e.g., lecture, discussion, laboratory, clinical and/or field activity), the nature of the students (lower division, upper division, or graduate), the extent of other assigned responsibilities in non-instructional duties (e.g., program direction, lab preparation and/or coordination), scholarly activities, and/or service activities (such as committee assignments, academic advisement, or assistance with student activities and organizations, public service, community service and professional service).

In addition to the institutional policies stated above, the following policies pertain to IAS members in Philosophy. Scholarly activity and/or service activity (beyond any duties specified in the contract) is not expected of individual IAS members, but is supported and encouraged for advancement of the individual and the institution. Summative evaluation of instructional academic staff is based primarily upon the quality of their teaching record.

C. Non-Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations

1. Not Applicable in Philosophy

D. Student Evaluation of Instruction

- 1) The department will follow the UW-L SEI policy and procedure available on the Faculty Senate webpage <http://www.UWLax.edu/facultysenate/Archived%20Documents/SEI%20Administration%20&%20Reporting.htm>.
 - a. Ranked Faculty & SEIs.
Results from the Faculty Senate approved SEI questions are required for retention, tenure, and promotion in the form of:
 1. the single motivation item and
 2. the composite SEI consisting of the 5 common questions.

These numbers will be reported using the Teaching Assignment Information (TAI) form. The department will add both the motivation item and the composite SEI fractional median for each course. In addition, the candidate's overall fractional median for the term on both the single motivation item and the composite SEI are reported. Finally, the department adds the departmental fractional median for both the single motivation item and the composite, the minimum and maximum

composite SEI for the department, and the candidate's rank in SEI scores relative to all departmental ranked faculty (tenure-track or tenured) for that term (e.g. 3 of 15).

- 2) IAS renewal and career progression. The same information as above is reported; however, no TAIs are generated for IAS.
- 3) SEIs in Philosophy will be administered electronically for each course taught each semester in face-to-face or online (excluding independent studies courses, individual research, or internships) in the last two weeks before the end of the course. In addition, SEIs will be administered for courses taught during intersessions (summer or winter session) if the course is a program requirement not offered during the traditional academic year. Otherwise, SEIs associated with intersession teaching are optional (as decided by the instructor).
- 4) In addition to the standard questions required by the Faculty Senate, the Philosophy SEI form will include the following two open-ended questions:
 - a. Please comment on what your instructor did to make the course worthwhile. Please be as specific as you can.
 - b. Please comment on what your instructor might do to improve the course, for the benefit of future students. Please be as specific as you can.
- 5) Collection of Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) information
 - a. The department collects SEI information electronically via the university student information system for all courses associated with the Philosophy Department.
- 6) The use of SEI data and student comments is limited to the department chair, the Promotion, Retention, and Tenure committee, the Post-Tenure Review committee, Dean and Provost.
- 7) Given the extensive and long-term academic scholarship on the role of gender, race, class, disability, sexual identity, national origin and age on biasing SEIS and the more limited academic scholarship and possibilities of the effect of religion, ancestry, veteran status and other protected status, these factors should be considered in assessing results of SEIs.
- 8) Given the consistent limited response rate to online SEIs and the student perception of unresolved issues about anonymity we will:
 - a. Continue to remind students by email of completing the form.
 - b. Give students assurance that we will do our best to maintain anonymity of student responses.

IV. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)

The results of merit reviews for all ranked faculty who have completed at least one academic year at UW-L are due to the Dean's Office on Dec. 15 annually. Merit reviews reflect activities during the prior academic year ending June 1. All faculty and IAS have a **June 1st** deadline for entering teaching, scholarship, and service activities into the electronic portfolio system on activities from the prior year June 1st – May 31st.

A. Evaluation Processes and Criteria

Faculty Personnel Rules UWS 3.05-3.11 and UW-L 3.08 describe the requirements for annual review of faculty. Academic Staff Policies and Procedures UWS 10.03-10.05 and UW-L 10.3 and 10.4 describe the requirements for the reappointment of academic staff. No policies of the Department of Philosophy may conflict with these rules. (See UW-L Employee Handbook, PP. L-7, L-8).

Evaluation for the purposes of merit is described in the faculty handbook on the HR webpage under “FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES”; Adopted by the Faculty Senate 04/07/2007. The first line reads “Distribution of merit compensation shall be determined by the individual departments or functional equivalents according to their bylaws and/or other departmental rules and regulations. Each department shall specify its procedures for appeals of merit decisions with a time limit set prior to the date the department reports evaluations to the dean. Bylaws should clearly address procedures for determining merit increases for all Redbook positions (such as first year hires.)

1. Faculty

a. Purpose and Rationale

The purpose and rationale for merit evaluations are

- To evaluate all full-time faculty & all others whose contract prescribe evaluation
- To provide information/criteria for assessment of the program
- To successfully satisfy the College and the University’s requirements for assessment as needed for accreditation
- To acquaint the staff with other Department members’ activities
- To encourage and celebrate excellence in teaching, service, and scholarship among Department faculty/staff and celebrate outstanding achievement.

b. Evaluation Objectives

The objectives for merit evaluations are:

- To clearly communicate uniform and attainable expectations for excellence.
- To provide the basis for and to assure fair evaluation of all faculty for retention, merit, tenure, and promotion.
- To promote goals of inclusive excellence in the Philosophy Department.

c. Procedures

1. All faculty and contractually obligated IAS have a June 15th deadline for entering teaching, scholarship, and service activities into the electronic portfolios system (Digital Measures) on activities from the prior year June 1st ending on May 31st. By October 1st each faculty interested in receiving merit or high merit shall complete a merit evaluation form (Appendix F) and a Digital Measures Report. Each faculty will send via email on or before October 1st their full documentation (i.e., merit evaluation form-appendix F, Digital Measures Report and) for collegial consideration. For purposes of merit assessment: teaching will represent 30 percent of the quantitative value of merit; scholarship 30 percent; service 30 percent, and inclusive excellence 10 percent.
2. The department as a whole will meet each October to review each faculty member's form for consistency across merit forms submitted. After reviewing the forms for consistency and making any adjustments to points, the points will be summed and merit category awarded based on the number of points earned. The department will then vote to approve placement in merit categories as determined. Any faculty/IAS who object to the merit category awarded in their particular case may appeal by calling a meeting of the department as a whole.
3. Each full-time faculty member shall be classified as high merit award, merit award, or no merit award for purposes of yearly merit, which provides the basis for evaluations about promotion, retention, and post-tenure review. The merit scores will be the results of the calculations performed using the merit evaluation form (Appendix F) and will be considered the official results when the department votes to approve the assigned merit categories unless appealed. High Merit Award requires a weighted merit assessment score exceeding 85 points of the 100 standard total; Merit Award requires a weighted merit assessment score exceeding 60 points of the 100 standard total; No merit Award shall apply to faculty whose weighted merit assessment score is 59 points or lower of the 100 standard total or who do not file the required merit materials.

2. Instructional Academic Staff (if included in merit processes, otherwise see below)

- a. 100%-time instructional academic staff will have evaluation processes built into their contract. Those eligible for merit in the department of Philosophy use the same merit/peer-review process as tenure-track/tenured faculty members in the department.

3. Non-Instructional Academic Staff (if included in merit processes, otherwise see VII) n/a

B. Distribution of Merit Funds

- a. In most years, most members of the department will fall into one of the “meritorious” categories. The chair will verify that faculty members have turned in their Merit Evaluation forms to qualify as meritorious. Distribution of merit monies shall be awarded to faculty in the High Merit Award and Merit Award categories.
- b. Faculty who are evaluated as “Highly Meritorious” shall receive \$100 more than faculty evaluated as “Meritorious”. The monies shall be established using the following formula. When the department chair has been informed of the total pool of dollars available for merit distribution, the department chair will calculate these figures and report them to department faculty and to the dean of the college.

C. Equation for Merit Distribution

$Mx + HM(x + 100) =$ pool of dollars available for merit distribution

M = number of faculty determined to be Meritorious

HM = number of faculty determined to be Highly Meritorious

X = merit dollars for each Meritorious faculty member

X + 100 = merit dollars for each Highly Meritorious faculty member

D. Appeal Procedure for Merit

If a faculty member/IAS member objects to the committee’s award in the member’s own case, or he/she believes the procedure has not been appropriately followed in his/her own case, then the member may request a reconsideration meeting within seven calendar days of the merit meeting. The appeal meeting shall be held within seven calendar days of the review request. The Chair will request that the appellant provide additional information to be presented at the meeting. The meeting may go into closed session. At this point, the awarding of the specific merit category will be decided by majority vote based on a review of the merit file. Members shall not vote on their own case and shall not be present for the vote on their own case. After the appeal meeting, the appellant may further appeal to CCGAAF.

V. Faculty Personnel Review

1. The department will follow the policies regarding retention and tenure described in the Faculty Personnel Rules (UWS 3.06 - 3.11 and UW-L 3.06 -3.08) <http://www.UW-Lax.edu/hr/rules/Ch3.htm> .
2. 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 start date after **July 1, 2014**.
3. The department will follow policies guiding part-time appointments for faculty and tenure clock stoppage available on the Human Resources website.
4. It is the intent of the members of the Philosophy Department to facilitate the professional development of non-tenured faculty members during their probationary period, while at the same time maintaining the highest possible standards of excellence in education, scholarly activity, and service. Departmental policy for reviewing the performance of probationary faculty members emphasizes:
 - a. Collaboration and open communication between non-tenured faculty members and the department's Retention Committee or designated representatives;
 - b. A constructive and formative process of setting goals, obtaining and utilizing evidence of performance, and identifying strengths and areas needing improvement using the Digital Measures Report as generated for annual review; and
 - c. Adequate record-keeping to benefit all parties.
5. *Faculty Mentoring*. During the first academic year of employment in the department, each probationary faculty member in consultation with departmental colleague is encouraged to obtain a mentor within the department. Each probationary faculty member is also encouraged to obtain a mentor from among faculty members outside the department (e.g., College of Liberal Studies faculty mentoring program). The department chair shall assist in the process of identifying possible mentors if so desired. Mentors are to serve as accurate sources of information and perspective on policies and practices in the department and university, but are not to be held responsible for the performance of the probationary faculty member(s) with whom they have a mentoring relationship.

A. Retention (procedure, criteria and appeal)

Note: Departmental criteria for retention may differ from university criteria for promotion, although the criteria are complimentary.

1. Procedure

- a. *Faculty under review provide an electronic portfolio* related to their teaching, scholarship, and service activities extracted from their date of hire to date of review. Hyperlinked syllabi are required and the candidate may choose to provide additional evidence. Additional materials may be required for departmental review and will be indicated in these by-laws.
- b. *Departments will provide the following materials to the dean:*

- 1). Department letter of recommendation with vote;
 - 2). Teaching assignment information (TAI) datasheet that summarizes the courses taught, workload data, grade distribution and SEIs by individual course and semester (which are only available after completing a full academic year) and departmental comparison SEI data; and
 - 3). Merit evaluation data (if available).
- c. The initial review of probationary faculty shall be conducted by the tenured faculty of the appropriate department in the manner outlined below.
- d. First Year Faculty Review. Starting with tenure-track faculty hired effective Fall 2008; all first-year tenure-track faculty will be 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.
- 1). The CANDIDATE PROVIDES one electronic report – saved as an HTML report and emailed to the department chair one week prior to the Retention committee meeting. 1) A “retention report” of the candidate’s activities (generated from the electronic portfolio system and representing activities since date-of-hire at UW-L as a tenure-track faculty member which should include hyperlinks to associated evidence such as: a. evidence of teaching development activities (e.g., syllabi with learning objectives stated, course assessments, peer evaluations); b. evidence of scholarship (e.g., copies of presentations, publications, creative activities); c. evidence of service (e.g., letters or projects associated with department, college, university, and/or professional service); and d. a retention narrative that describes the faculty member’s teaching, scholarship, and service, modeled after the narrative required for promotion. 2) A copy of their vita uploaded as an attachment in the electronic portfolio system.
 - 4). Prior to entertaining a motion to close the meeting, the department chair will invite the probationary faculty member to make an oral presentation, if they wish to do so, and for the department members to ask about the faculty member’s progress, if they should wish to do so.
 - 5). Within 14 calendar days after the review meeting, a written report of the results of the review shall be given to the faculty member. Results shall be reported for each of the review areas.
- e. Contract Reviews (Retention/Tenure). Subsequent to the call of the Vice Chancellor, the department shall establish a review date and inform all probationary faculty with at least 20 calendar days’ notice to prepare a set of materials describing performance in the areas of: Teaching, Scholarly and Research Activity (see Department statement on Scholarly Activity), Department, University, Community, and Professional Service. The date, time and place of the above meeting shall be conducted in compliance with the Wisconsin Open Meeting Rule. For a retention and tenure meeting to take place, attendance by a majority (50% +1) of the tenured faculty constitutes a quorum. The probationary faculty persons shall have the opportunity to make a written and/or oral presentation at the meeting.

- 1). The CANDIDATE PROVIDES two electronic reports – saved as HTML reports and emailed to the department chair one week prior to the Retention committee meeting. 1) A “retention report” of the candidate’s activities (generated from the electronic portfolio system and representing activities since date-of-hire at UW-L as a tenure-track faculty member which should include hyperlinks to associated evidence such as: a. evidence of teaching development activities (e.g., syllabi with learning objectives stated, course assessments, peer evaluations); b. evidence of scholarship (e.g., copies of presentations, publications, creative activities); c. evidence of service (e.g., letters or projects associated with department, college, university, and/or professional service); and d. a retention narrative that describes the faculty member’s teaching, scholarship, and service, modeled after the narrative required for promotion. 2) An “annual report” of the candidate’s activities (generated from the electronic portfolio system representing activities since date-of-last review). 3) A copy of their vita uploaded as an attachment in the electronic portfolio system.
- 2). The Department Chair will provide merit and SEI summary information.
- 3). Prior to the beginning of the review of the candidate(s) the meeting will go into closed session according to Section 19.85 in the Wisconsin Statutes. During the review meeting, the 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 majority (50% +1) of those present and voting. If paper ballots are used, each ballot must be signed and stored for 7 years.
- 4). The Department recommendation and decision (actual vote) shall be reported in writing with supporting documentation to the Dean. The candidate must be notified of the results of the review within 14 calendar days; according to UWS 3.07, a person denied renewal may request written reasons for the non-renewal.

2. Criteria

- f. **Scholarship**: Candidates recommended for retention will show progress in their agenda for Research/Scholarship. See **Appendix A** for the department’s Statement on Scholarship. Candidates for retention shall provide a report on research/scholarship that should detail the candidate’s progress in developing and carrying out a research agenda and state the candidate’s professional goals in this arena.
- g. **Service**: Candidates for retention shall provide a report on service that should detail the candidate’s accomplishments and professional goals in this arena. See **Appendix B** for the department’s Statement on Service.
- h. **Teaching**: For retention, candidates will need to demonstrate strong evidence of quality teaching, professional development as a teacher, and professional competence as a teacher. See **Appendix C** for the department’s Statement on Teaching.
- i. The department will review the following required materials:

- 1). A report from the candidate that addresses teaching assignment, teaching development, teaching evaluation, and professional goals for teaching.
- 2). Teaching assignment encompasses a listing of courses taught, unique expertise, approach to grading and evaluation, and duties that are different from classroom teaching.
- 3). Teaching development encompasses the development of new courses and units, innovations and improvements in teaching techniques, participation in workshops on teaching, and preparation of curriculum materials
- 4). Teaching evaluation encompasses a narrative outlining the methods used to evaluate teaching, in addition to written evaluation by peers, and SEI scores.
- 5). Peer evaluation and feedback; SEI results, and syllabi. The department is required to perform one peer review per year.
 - i. The reviewee shall schedule a meeting with the reviewer prior to the class so that the goals of the class within the curriculum can be explained.
 - ii. The reviewee should schedule the review to take place at a time when teaching effectiveness can be most appropriately observed and evaluated. The reviewer should observe a class for the entire class period. The reviewer prepares a written evaluation (see **Appendix G** for an example of the teaching review format).
 - iii. The reviewer and reviewee meet to share and discuss the evaluation.
 - iv. The reviewer submits the written evaluation in electronic format to the department chair and to the reviewee.

3. Appeal

- j. Anyone wishing to appeal a Department retention or tenure decision is required to submit a written petition to the chairperson. This appeal must be filed with the chairperson within 14 calendar days of the notification of the contested retention/tenure decision. The Department will then hold a hearing that may go into closed session to review all evidence pertinent to this petition in the presence of the appellant. Subsequent to hearing the facts, the Department will dismiss the appellant from the hearing room chambers and will render its final decision on the appeal. Within seven calendar days after the appeals meeting, a written report of the results of the meeting shall be given to the faculty member. (cf. Faculty Personnel Rules UWS 3.06-3.11 and UW-L 3.06-3.08; and UW-L Employee Handbook)

B. Tenure Review and Departmental Tenure Criteria

The basic rules regarding retention and tenure are described in the Faculty Personnel Rules (UWS 3.06 - 3.11 and UW-L 3.06 - 3.08).

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 the tenure decision and recommendations for probationary faculty parallel procedures for retention and are based on the body of work evidenced during the individual's time in rank. Tenure will be granted with a majority (50% +1) vote by tenured faculty. If paper ballots are used, each ballot must be signed and stored for 7 years

1. Procedure

- a. The decision to recommend a faculty member for tenure in the Philosophy Department is based on an appraisal of the candidate's overall contribution from their date of hire at UW-L in a tenure-track position. Tenure in the Department of Philosophy reflects:
 - 1). Evidence of a consistent program of scholarly inquiry as defined by the department's Statement on Scholarship (**Appendix A**).
 - 2). Evidence of consistent service to the department and to the college/university and/or professional service. See **Appendix B** for the department's Statement on Service.
 - 3). Consistent evidence of a strong commitment to student learning and to quality teaching. See **Appendix C** for the department's Statement on Teaching.
 - 4). The process and criteria for review are identical to that outlined above under sections V.A.1.e. *Contract Reviews (Retention/Tenure)* and V.A. 2. Criteria
 - 5). Junior faculty should pay close attention to retention letters as guides for promotion and tenure recommendation from the department.

2. Appeal

- b. Anyone wishing to appeal a Department retention or tenure decision is required to submit a written petition to the chairperson. This appeal must be filed with the chairperson within 14 calendar days of the notification of the contested retention/tenure decision. The Department will then hold a hearing that may go into closed session to review all evidence pertinent to this petition in the presence of the appellant. Subsequent to hearing the facts, the Department will dismiss the appellant from the hearing room chambers and will render its final decision on the appeal. Within seven calendar days after the appeals meeting, a written report of the results of the meeting shall be given to the faculty member. (cf. Faculty Personnel Rules UWS 3.06-3.11 and UW-L 3.06-3.08; and UW-L Employee Handbook)

C. Post-tenure Review

The requirements for post-tenure review are described in the UW-L Employee Handbook. Once every five years, each tenured faculty member's activities and performance will be reviewed in accordance with the mission of the department, college, and University. The Post-tenure Review and Development Policy of the Philosophy Department follows UW-System and UW-La Crosse policy guidelines and builds upon the mission of the university and goals of the department. UW-La Crosse policy is

detailed in the employee handbook under the section entitled “UW-L Tenured Faculty Review and Development.”

Every year, the work of every member of the Philosophy Department is reviewed via the merit review process. One purpose of this review is to determine how merit pay is to be distributed. By providing more detailed feedback, however, the same data gathering and peer review process can be used as a continuous quality improvement tool for tenured faculty. This process is already used as part of the evaluation of probationary faculty and for determining whether academic staff should be retained.

Procedure

- a. The Dean’s office, in consultation with the department, keeps a list of faculty to be reviewed under the post-tenure review policy. When the chair has been notified by the Dean’s office that faculty member(s) is/are up for post-tenure review, a departmental Post-tenure Review Committee will be constituted and charged with implementing the university's policy aimed at contributing to the continuation of faculty members' growth and development. This committee will be made up of three tenured faculty members in the department. Only tenured department members are eligible to serve on the Post-tenure Review Committees. Assignments will be made for one year by random selection, with committee membership determined for the up-coming five academic years.
- b. Tenured faculty who have received five uninterrupted years of satisfactory (“Meritorious”) or higher evaluation shall be judged to be performing satisfactorily and may initiate the formative review processes. Tenured faculty who have received one merit evaluation in the previous five years that is less than satisfactory shall be required to initiate formative evaluation.
- c. The Post-Tenure Review committee will review the past 5 years of merit review data via the UW-L electronic portfolio system for the person under review. The committee will write a letter providing general trends in the areas of teaching/scholarship and service, identifying any areas of concern as addressed below, and provide a copy to the faculty member, the department chair, and the dean’s office.
- d. Tenured faculty who are up for review and who wish to focus the evaluation on aspects of their individual development may choose to activate formative evaluation procedures previously adopted by the department. Formative evaluation is voluntary, provides for direct collegial interaction and is designed to produce a consensus. No written records of formative evaluations are kept. With the consent of the tenured faculty under review, a written request could be sent to the dean describing resources needed for that person to move forward and accomplish specified goals.

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

The department will follow the guidelines and schedules regarding faculty promotion. These are available at <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/Unclassified/openmeetings.pdf> and <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/promo-resources.htm>.

The department promotion procedures are designated to facilitate the implementation of the guidelines outlined in the UW-La Crosse Employee Handbook.

1. Composition of Promotion Committee

- a. All tenured members of the Department shall have a vote in matters of promotion. The Department Promotion Committee will consist of a minimum of seven members. In the event that at least four department members are not at or above the rank the candidate is seeking, the department chair in consultation with the Dean and the candidate shall meet to select outside members. If there is not a mutual agreement, the Dean shall have the final selection of the outside members. The faculty of the appropriate rank shall be from other UW-L Departments to ensure that at least four members are at the same or higher academic rank as the promotion rank sought by the candidate.

2. Review Process

- b. Subsequent to the Chair receiving notification from the Vice Chancellor/Human Resources of a candidate's eligibility for promotion in rank, candidates will be informed in writing by the Chair of eligibility at least 20 days prior to the scheduled and publicized promotion review meeting. The date and time for the promotion review meeting is set by the department with enough time allocated to go through the review process and any potential appeals prior to the deadline for submitting materials to the Dean.
- c. Faculty who are eligible and wish to be considered for promotion must submit a completed Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report as outlined by the Joint Promotion Committee using the electronic portfolio process.
- d. The promotion committee shall have at least two face-to-face meetings with the faculty member being reviewed. The candidate's promotion file will be available to the committee at least seven days prior to the first meeting. The requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meeting law shall apply to all meetings.
- e. During the first promotion review meeting, the committee shall discuss oral and written material, student evaluations, peer evaluations, and provide constructive feedback. The chair of the committee will be assigned the task of writing the candidate's assessment. Subsequent meeting(s) shall be determined by the candidate and committee members as needed.
- f. During the second promotion meeting, the candidate may make a presentation and address any committee questions if they so desire. The committee shall then go into closed session.
- g. The second meeting and resulting recommendation shall occur at least 21 calendar days prior to the College deadline for promotion materials to ensure enough time for potential appeals.
- h. A majority of 50% +1 is required for a positive promotion recommendation. The results of the vote will be recorded and entered in the appropriate portion of the Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report form.
- i. Immediately after the second promotion consideration meeting, the candidate will be notified in person, or if not present, by email, of the results of the deliberations. For positive recommendations, the members of the Promotion

Committee who have volunteered to write the Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report will do so within seven calendar days as required. A draft of the letter will be sent to all voting members of the promotion committee for review. The Department Chair may also include a separate letter to provide further clarification of candidate materials if they wish to do so. A copy of the promotion letter(s) will be provided to the candidate at least two calendar days prior to the submission of the promotion file to the dean.

- j. If approved by the Promotion Committee, the Department Chair will transmit the vote and the letter from the promotion committee to the Dean following the most current JPC guidelines.
- k. JPC requires that a faculty member who has had reassigned time to fulfill a position outside the expectations of a standard faculty member (e.g. department chair, director of a center or program, etc.) must provide two related documents in their promotion report:
 - 1). One or more letters from their supervisor(s) (e.g. department chair, Dean, etc.) that outlines their job description with respect to each reassigned time appointment.
 - 2). Documentation that illustrates their level of success in the role fulfilled by the appointment, such as performance reviews or other data that show how the aims of the appointment are being met. The candidate is responsible for uploading these documents in their promotion report.

3. Criteria

- l. To be considered for promotion to a higher rank, faculty must meet the minimum University criteria as stated in the current UW-L promotion guidelines. For the rank of Associate Professor a candidate must provide evidence of teaching excellence, the establishment of a program of scholarship, and be engaged in service. Documented Evidence of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service will be consistent with the Department's definitions of scholarship (see **Appendix A**), service (see **Appendix B**) and, teaching (see **Appendix C**).
- m. To be promoted to the rank of Professor, a faculty member must be well-respected within the department for excellence in teaching and as someone who has taken a leadership role in enhancing the curriculum in the department. The faculty member has a continuing scholarly program. The faculty member provides strong leadership in department service and is well respected at the school or college level for university and professional service. Evidence of teaching excellence, scholarship, and service will be consistent with the Department's definitions of scholarship (see **Appendix A**), service (see **Appendix B**) and, teaching (see **Appendix C**).

4. Reconsideration

- n. After receiving the Chair's notification, the promotion candidate will have 14 calendar days to request reconsideration by the Promotion Committee.
- o. The Department will then hold a hearing that may go into closed session to review all evidence pertinent to this petition in the presence of the appellant. Subsequent

to hearing the facts, the Department will dismiss the appellant from the hearing room chambers and will render its final decision on the appeal. Within seven calendar days after the appeals meeting, a written report of the results of the meeting shall be given to the faculty member. (cf. Faculty Personnel Rules UWS 3.06-3.11 and UW-L 3.06-3.08; and UW-L Employee Handbook

- p. Each promotion candidate will have the right to appeal the Department's reconsideration decision to the Grievance, Appeals and Academic Freedom Committee. Written notice of the reconsideration decision will be transmitted to the candidate and the Dean within seven calendar days.

VI. Instructional Academic Staff Review

A. Annual Review

1. In Accordance with Faculty Personnel Rules UWS 3.05 - 3.11 and UWL 3.08, academic staff will be evaluated annually. The Individual Development Plan (IDP) form will accompany the department's evaluation. The IDP form is found at <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/IDP/IDP.htm>.
2. Academic staff teaching reappointments are made by the Department Chair. All instructional academic staff (IAS) are required to have an observational classroom teaching visit performed by at least one member of the faculty every year with a written evaluation of this classroom observation to be filed with the chair. A copy of this evaluation will be given to the instructor being evaluated. When an Instructional Academic Staff member has reached the level of Senior Lecturer, they may choose to participate in the peer-review of teaching process that is used for tenured faculty rather than having annual in-class teaching observations.
3. Annually, during the Spring Semester, the Chair will communicate with each IAS member. Prior to this communication the IAS member will make available his/her Activity Report as generated by the university electronic portfolio system and provide a brief narrative statement relative to progress on the goals identified in the Individual Development Plan (IDP) for that Academic Year (AY) and goals for the upcoming AY (assuming reappointment is intended). The Department Chair will review the materials. The annual review will consist of a review of the position description; department/unit goals; employee career goals; supervisor position expectations; the Activity Report generated through the UW-L electronic portfolio system; summary of student comments and SEI information; and a brief narrative statement relative to progress on the goals as found on the current year's Individual Development Plan. A new individual development plan will be developed which will be used to review the outcomes of established employee career goals and position expectations. The IDP will be the guide throughout the year to ensure that employee career goals and supervisor position expectations are met.

B. IAS Promotion Procedures

Policies and procedures guiding promotion for IAS are available at <http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/committees/ias/pages/CareerProgression.html>.

1. *Promotion*

- a. IAS wishing to go through promotion will follow the guidelines and timetable as found on the following website:
<http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/PromotionGuides/IAS%20Promotion%20Guidelines.htm>
- b. The Department will adhere to the Career Progression Deadlines:

First Friday of December	Promotion Portfolio with Departmental Materials due to Deans from Department Chairs
First Friday of January	Promotion Portfolio due to the Faculty Senate Office. (Portfolios held in Senate Office for review by committee members.)
July 1 of Next Academic Year	New Title takes Effect

- c. All tenured members of the department will serve as the IAS Promotion Committee and will review and vote on the career progression request. The IAS member will be notified no less than 20 days in advance of the promotion review meeting and asked to prepare the portfolio for review using the UW-L electronic portfolio system. At least one week prior to the review the IAS member will provide the portfolio to the Department Chair. All members of the IAS Promotion Committee will review the portfolio prior to the meeting. The IAS member will be given an opportunity to provide additional oral or written support for promotion prior to the meeting going into closed session. The IAS member will be notified within seven calendar days of the results of the hearing. The Chair will be responsible for writing the letter of support and completing the departmental report that will accompany the candidate's portfolio that is sent to the Dean.
- d. ***Promotion Reconsideration***
 - 1). The candidate can appeal the decision of the IAS promotion committee by following a process similar to the policy established for Reconsideration of Promotion for ranked faculty. Specifically:
 - 2). After receiving the Chair's notification, the promotion candidate will have 14 calendar days to request reconsideration by the IAS Promotion Committee. The Chair will then convene the IAS Promotion Committee to hear all relevant evidence to support promotion. The candidate will have an opportunity to provide additional written or oral support relevant to promotion. The IAS Promotion Committee will then dismiss the appellant from the hearing room chambers and move into a closed session hearing to review all evidence pertinent to this petition. The IAS Promotion Committee will then render its final decision on the appeal.

C. Appeal Procedures

Each IAS promotion candidate will have the right to appeal the Department's reconsideration decision to the Grievance, Appeals and Academic Freedom Committee. Written notice of the reconsideration decision will be transmitted to the candidate and the Dean within seven calendar days.

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

In Accordance with Faculty Personnel rules UWS 3.05-3.11 and UWL 3.08, academic staff will be evaluated annually. The Individual Development Plan (IDP) form will accompany the department's evaluation. IDP Form: <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/idp/idp.htm>

Not Applicable in Philosophy

VIII. Governance

The Department will adhere to the selection and duties of the Chair that are delineated in the Faculty Senate Bylaws (revised 2006)

<http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/ABP/FacSenatePolicies.html> under the heading "IV. Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons" and "V. The Selection of Department Chairpersons" and "VI. Remuneration of Department Chairpersons." In addition references to chair-related duties are stated throughout the Faculty Handbook

http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/Unclassified/faculty_and_academic_staff.htm.

A. 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/facultysenate/ABP/FacSenatePolicies.html> 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 throughout the Employee Handbook http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/docs/2008_UW-L_Handbook.pdf.

1. Election of the Department Chair

The Chair is elected by the Department in February for a three-year term. All department members (as determined by Department bylaws [i.e., all ranked faculty and full-time IAS who have been on staff for at least four semesters and on contract during the semester of the vote]) are eligible to vote. Individuals in 100% administrative positions whose academic affiliation is with the department of Philosophy are not eligible. 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.

2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair

The duties of the Chair are stated in the Faculty Handbook (Bylaws revised in May 2006; refer to Faculty Senate minutes Vol. 40, No. 17.

- a. The Chair is responsible for:
 - 1). selection, supervision, merit rating and promotion of faculty for regular and summer sessions and support staff;
 - 2). for developing and implementing the curriculum, advising students and informing the administration of progress and problems;
 - 3). for drawing up and supervising a budget, reporting textbook selections, assigning offices and space and maintenance of facilities and equipment;
 - 4). for scheduling classes and registering students in regular and summer sessions;
 - 5). for convening and presiding at regular and special meetings of the Department;
 - 6). other matters outlined in the Faculty Handbook including hearing and responding to student concerns.
- b. Additionally, the handbook specifies that the Chair will assume a prominent role in creating a professional environment conducive to high morale and productivity in the Department. The Chair may delegate performance of the duties to committees or members of the department.
- c. In compensation, the Chair receives a .25 reduction in load during the academic year and a fractional administrative summer appointment determined by the Dean of the College of Liberal Studies.

3. Formative Evaluation of Chair

The Philosophy Department will follow the College of Liberal Studies Department Chair evaluation procedure.

4. Summer Administrative Duties

In the summer, the Department Chair receives a fractional appointment and is responsible for seeing to department business as it comes up. The Chair should appoint an interim chair if he/she is unable to perform duties for more than seven working days and notify the dean's office.

B. Standing Departmental Committees

During the first week of the Fall semester every year, the members of the department are polled for their interest in serving on the department's standing committees. All department members are expected to serve on committees. The Department Chair reviews these requests and then assigns individuals to serve on the various department

committees. If no one has volunteered to serve on a particular committee, the Department Chair will assign department member(s) to the committee(s). The list of the department standing committees and their principal functions and duties follow.

1. The Merit Review Committee

- a. The principal function of the Merit Review Committee is to oversee the integrity of the annual Merit Review process. All tenure-track or tenured faculty in the department comprise the Merit Review Committee.

2. The Program Assessment Committee

- a. The principal function of the Program Assessment Committee is to assess how well the academic programs that we offer meet identified programmatic student learning outcomes. The program assessment committee is responsible for coordinating the assessment of all general education courses and major/program assessment activities, including writing CLS and University assessment reports.
- b. The Program Assessment Committee consists of three members serving staggered two-year terms.
- c. All members of the Department take turns serving two-year terms on the Program Assessment Committee.

3. Retention Committee

- a. The principal function of the retention committee is to determine whether or not to recommend to the Dean of the College that a probationary faculty be retained in his or her employment. The Retention Committee consists of all tenured faculty members in the department. Voting eligibility in all retention decisions is vested with the currently tenured faculty of the Department.

4. Promotion Committee

- a. The principal function of the promotion committee is to determine whether or not to recommend promotion of candidates to the Dean of the College. All tenured members of the Department shall have a vote in matters of promotion. The Department Promotion Committee will consist of a minimum of seven members. Faculty of equal or higher rank than the rank the candidate is seeking may be chosen from other UW-L Departments (per promotion procedures outlined earlier in the bylaws document) to obtain the minimum seven members and to ensure that at least four members of the committee are at the same or higher academic rank as the promotion rank sought by the candidate.

5. Post-Tenure Review Committee

- a. The principal function of the post-tenure review committee is to review and evaluate the cumulative performance of already tenured faculty over intervals of five years beginning from the year of their first grant of tenure at UW-La Crosse. The areas of teaching, scholarship and service are all reviewed and evaluated in accordance with the specifications enumerated in the bylaws. All tenured faculty within the Department serve on the post-tenure review committee. However,

tenured faculty up for review in a current academic year may not review their own file.

6. Department Course Scheduling Committee

- a. The principle function of this committee will be to review course scheduling requests to assist in developing the master schedule. The proposed master schedule will then be reviewed by the department as a whole. The committee will also review .25 reassigned time proposals, will develop and maintain a schedule of course offerings and rotation of course offerings, will coordinate/communicate with other UW-L departments to avoid scheduling conflicts and to publicize Philosophy course offerings course rotation, will assist Philosophy faculty in advertisement of their courses. This committee will be made up of a minimum of three members.

7. Phenomenology Conference Committee

- a. The committee will select/schedule, and arrange for guest speakers within the constraints of the allocated Phenomenology lecture series budget. The committee will consist of three department members.

8. Budget Oversight/Transparency Committee

- a. The committee is responsible for reviewing departmental budget expenditures (travel, supplies, equipment and student labor only) on at least a quarterly basis. The committee will obtain a report of all expenditures and projected expenditures/encumbrances in the above mentioned categories minimally every three months for review. The committee will bring the report and any items for discussion to the next department meeting. The committee will consist of two members. The department chair will serve as an ex-officio member of the committee.

9. Murphy Library Liaison Committee

- a. This committee will consist of at least one faculty member and any other interested faculty.

10. In addition to these standing committees the Department also appoints individual representatives to serve in the following capacities:

a. Internal

- 1). Philosophy Honors Coordinator
- 2). Philosophy Club Advisor
- 3). Campus Close-Up Coordinator
- 4). Celebrations Deity
- 5). Department Webmaster
- 6). Tutoring Coordinator

- b. The Department may also form additional Ad Hoc Committees as it deems appropriate.

C. Departmental Programmatic Assessment Plan

Students in the Philosophy Program are assessed based on the Student Learning Outcomes stated below. The assessment instruments, evaluation rubrics and assessment process for the program student learning outcomes and for General Education Courses are listed in APPENDIX I.

Philosophy Program Student Learning Outcomes

1. Students will demonstrate a thorough grasp of basic philosophical concepts.
2. Students will exhibit a broad understanding of the history of philosophy.
3. Students will construct clear and well-argued philosophical essays.
4. Students will respond effectively to challenging philosophical criticisms.
5. Students will effectively apply philosophical material to complex social issues.

D. Additional Departmental Policies

1. Sick leave Policy

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

- 1). Absence Sheets. Employees access absence sheets via the “My UW System” portal available at the top of the UW-L HR website <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/>.

2. Class Absence/Change of Venue Policy

- a. Any time a faculty member is not teaching class (e.g., away at a conference), the faculty member must file a Campus Absence Form a minimum of one week prior to the absence with the department chair for review and approval.
- b. Any time a faculty member plans on teaching/meeting their class away from their assigned classroom (e.g., a library assignment or computer classroom exercise), the faculty member must email or send a written note to the department chair prior to the class. This process ensures that the whereabouts of students in the class are known in case of an emergency.

3. Vacation Policy

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

4. Leave of Absence Policy

- a. A formal leave of absence without pay is a leave that exceeds 30 calendar days. Formal leaves require written approval of Human Resources and the employing department. Leave without pay for a complete pay period or up to 30 days requires written approval from the supervisor and notification to Human Resources. Leaves without pay are granted for illness, care of a child, spouse, or parent with a serious health condition, education, military and exceptional personal reasons. Maternity/paternity leaves will be granted for birth or adoption of a child for up to, but not exceeding, six months. Upon request of the employer, maternity leave of absence may be extended for another period of time, not to exceed six months. For more information on leaves, contact Human Resources.

The Department may approve a leave of absence request that extends beyond a twelve-month period only under extraordinary circumstances and then only when the Department determines that such an extension of the leave of absence is in the Department's best interests.

- b. Administrative leaves involving service to UW-L do not have to be approved by the Department. However, the department shall be consulted about leaves involving a change in faculty residence or any other type of leave (e.g., sabbaticals and/or international teaching).

5. *Workload policies*

The standard full-time teaching workload for tenured, and tenure-track faculty members in the Department of Philosophy is twelve credits in both the Spring and Fall semesters. Faculty may choose to teach this workload as a 4/4 load, a 3/3 load with combined sections, or with permission of the Department Scheduling Committee a 5/3 (3/5) load with combined sections. Summer and interim session teaching is optional. This workload shall involve not more than three different course preparations per semester, unless the faculty member agrees to exceed this number of course preparations. Variations in this workload formula are permitted under special circumstances with the approval of the Department Chairperson. The standard full-time teaching workload for instructional academic staff members in the Department of Philosophy is fifteen credits in both the Spring and Fall semesters.

6. *Office Assignment Policy*

There is a presumption in favor of the current office arrangement; however, if an office should become vacant, the order of preference for all vacated faculty offices (except 4112 Centennial Hall, which is reserved for the acting Chair of the department) is determined by seniority. Seniority is determined by the date of the signed contract when the faculty enters the tenure-track. If two individuals have identical contract dates, then priority will be determined by random selection.

7. *Travel Allocation Policy*

The Department strongly encourages and supports faculty travel to conferences, seminars, and/or other venues for professional enrichment. Each tenure-track/tenured faculty member in the department is allocated the minimum travel allocation allotted by the CLS Dean's office (currently \$1,000) for travel purposes. In addition, if funds are available, the chairperson may allocate additional funds in support of the travel request(s) covering the total cost of the conference or up to the current CLS allocation of travel funds per faculty. Additional funds will be allocated if they are available. At some later point in the academic year, the Department chairperson in consultation with the Budget Oversight Committee, assesses how much travel money remains unallocated and awards such money to any pending travel requests as deemed appropriate. Moreover, the same process will be enacted near the end of the fiscal year. The criteria employed for allocating residual travel funds give paper presentations of original research the highest priority.

8. *Office Hours Policy*

- a. All instructors must post office hours on their doors and provide a copy to the Program Assistant. In general, instructors should strive to post approximately 60 minutes per course per week (about four hours per week). Furthermore, instructors should endeavor to have office hours that span the time between courses and that reflect the needs of student schedules (e.g., between 9 a.m. – 4 p.m. or before a night course).
- b. When teaching an online course, instructors will be available for online consultation within 24-48 hours during the work week. Instructors will notify the class if they will be away from class longer than 48 hours or if they will have limited email access for a period of time. Instructors must provide a discussion area for questions regarding course-related concerns.
- c. If all of an instructor's courses are online during the regular academic semester(s), instructors shall hold some face-to-face office hours per week unless excused in consultation with the department. However, an instructor must make all the information available in online format, including information available through office hours.

9. *Syllabus Availability and Format Policy*

The Department expects all faculty to provide students with a printable course syllabus within the first week of classes. At a minimum, the syllabus should outline the class requirements, course objectives or learning outcomes, due dates, instructor contact information, office hours, and other relevant department information. General education classes should include information regarding the general education category and specific general education learning outcomes. Instructors are also encouraged to include the following: grading scales, , detailed content and exam schedules, academic dishonesty/cheating policies, return of papers policy, students with disability statement, absence policy, etc. Syllabi are legally seen as a form of a contract with the students. Instructors shall submit an electronic copy of each syllabus to the departmental administrative assistant by the end of the first week of classes to be kept in the permanent departmental records.

10. *Final Examination Policy (Per Provost/Faculty Senate Guidelines)*

- a. *A final examination will be given in each course within a special examination period* except for one-credit courses, which will have exams scheduled at the last regular meeting of the class. The examination periods, dates, and times are included in each semester's Timetable. Final exams for online courses will be administered by the published end date of the course. The relative importance assigned to the final examination is determined by the instructor in charge of each course.
- b. Any exceptions to the policy must be requested in writing to the Provost in advance of the final examination period.

11. *Salary Equity Policy*

The Salary Equity Policy of the Department of Philosophy is intended to be consistent with and implement the salary equity policy of the university, which states that:

- 1). 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).
- 2). Requests for equity adjustments may be initiated by individuals or as a result of departmental review. If a department does not support an individual request the individual may appeal directly to their Dean.
- 3). Departments will be provided with salary data for their units which allows them to make comparisons and judgments about equity adjustments.

12. *Peer Review of Teaching Policy*

- a. All probationary faculty are required to undergo a minimum of one “peer classroom evaluation of instruction” per academic year. These peer classroom evaluators will be assigned by the department chair from a list of all tenured faculty within the department. The class period to be attended and peer-evaluated will be decided by mutual consent between the probationary and the tenured faculty members involved. All peer evaluations will be written using the teaching evaluation review topics as an indication of things to consider listed in **Appendix G**. A copy of this peer classroom evaluation will be provided to the College Dean in the retention portfolio. This peer classroom evaluation will become part of the probationary faculty’s permanent file and will be consulted, as appropriate, for retention and promotion considerations.
- b. All tenured faculty are also required to conduct annual peer evaluations of classroom teaching. However, tenured faculty may select from the two different classroom evaluation formats described below. All members of the Department will be responsible for selecting and organizing their own Peer Review Panel. Which of these formats is employed in a given year is at the discretion of the tenured faculty member. All tenured faculty are responsible for uploading their peer teaching evaluations to the UW-L electronic portfolio system prior to June 1. Peer assessments are intended to be formative and are intended for the purpose of course enrichment.
 - 1). The faculty member being assessed will select a two-member faculty review panel, and present successful and unsuccessful pedagogical techniques utilized in the range of courses offered. The presentation will be followed by a peer panel discussion and a written summary submitted to the faculty being evaluated.
 - 2). The reviewer will meet with faculty member to discuss aims, student learning outcomes, and pedagogical choices with reviewer. After the class meeting the reviewer will provide a written analysis of the class to share with the faculty and to be placed in Digital Measures Portfolio for annual merit review.

13. *Intersession Teaching Policy*

Recognizing that intersession teaching appointments are not guaranteed, the Philosophy Department endeavors to provide its faculty with fair access to the opportunity to teach intersession. UW-L's policy for undergraduate courses requires a minimum of 18 student credit hours (SCH) for minimum remuneration, and 12 SCH for graduate courses. The department will follow the process below:

- 1). Faculty members interested in teaching either Summer Session or Winter Session should notify the Department Course Scheduling Committee when proposing Fall or Spring Courses. (e.g. if Spring 2016 course selections are due Spring 2015, the summer 2016 are due at the same time.) Faculty will include in the notification the particular session and time of day for proposed course. Faculty are limited to teaching what would ordinarily be their course. (e.g. only professors currently teaching logic will be able to sign up to teach it in Winter or Summer Session) Faculty will be selected to teach either Logic or Introduction to Philosophy in a rotating order with those who have taught the course most recently in the end of the queue. The Department Chair will keep two rotation lists (one for Winter and Summer Sessions) based on an initial random selection. Each queue will then rotate with faculty who have taught (or selected to teach and the course was cancelled) moving to the bottom of the queue. If not selected to teach and Introduction to Philosophy or a Logic class, all remaining faculty will be allowed to teach one of their upper division courses provided it meets the enrollment numbers outlined in in 13 a. Summer and Winter Session may be taught in either online or face-to-face settings.
- 2). UW-L intersession policy indicates that course size is determined by traditional course section size during the academic year. Online course enrollments will be set at a maximum of 30 (to allow courses to reach the maximum enrollment for the current payment schedule (25 students x 3 credits)).
- 3). The department will review intersession course enrollments annually to determine if the number of course offerings should be reduced or increased.
- 4). All ranked faculty are eligible to teach.

14. *Faculty Teaching Internal Reassigned Time Policy*

Each spring, the department of Philosophy will endeavor to support faculty development through a .25 reassignment from teaching for one faculty member to engage in additional scholarship, professional development, or an extraordinary professional or departmental service activity. The Philosophy department Scheduling Committee will evaluate proposals and make recommendations using the following criteria:

- 1). **Deadlines:** Requests for reassigned time are due to the department chair on the first Tuesday in April in the year PRIOR to the semester proposed. Deadlines are set to allow for appropriate scheduling of required courses and meeting departmental course demand.

- 2). Faculty who are awarded the .25 reassignment will work with the department chair in determining their teaching workload/courses for the semester of reassigned time to ensure appropriate coverage of core/required courses.
- 3). The Department Course Scheduling Committee will consider the needs of the department regarding course/academic program needs in making decisions to implement the reassigned time policy.
- 4). Proposal guidelines. Requests for reassigned time should be submitted electronically to the chair of the Course Scheduling Committee by 4:30 p.m. on the due date. Proposals should be brief, a maximum one page in length and include the following: A) A brief statement of the proposed project and how it will enhance faculty development. B) A statement of the specific outcomes/products/results that will be achieved during the semester with .25 reassigned time.
- 5). Examples of projects include research in preparation for presentation at a professional conference, submission of a book proposal or manuscript for submission to a peer-reviewed journal, an extraordinary service project such as organization of a conference or workshop, or a departmental service project such as a major revision to program assessment or curriculum development.

15. *Procedures for Scheduling Classes*

Scheduling of classes will occur in the last two weeks of the semester two semesters ahead of the schedule being developed (e.g. in Spring 2015 for Spring 2016). The department ADA places a call for requests from faculty for large lecture classrooms/computer labs as early as is necessary.

16. *Emeritus Policy for Faculty*

The Philosophy Department calls a Department meeting to determine whether or not a retiring faculty member shall be designated as Emeriti. A majority vote of those present is required to allow for the designation. In making this determination, the Department follows the University policy as outlined below.

- 1). Members of the faculty may be nominated and designated as emeriti only at the time of retirement and must be recognized by their distinguished records of service at institutions of higher education. The department will vote on Emeritus status for the nominated faculty member. Nomination for and official designation as emeritus is dependent on the following measures of distinguished service:
 - i. Those members of the faculty having a record of 25 or more years of service at accredited institutions of higher education, including ten or more years of service at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse may be designated by their rank and the title of emeritus. Thus, a faculty member may be designated as Faculty Emeritus with the appropriate rank held at the time of retirement.
 - ii. Those members of the faculty not meeting the criteria under (a) above, having a record of 15 or more years of service at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, regardless of rank, and having attained the age of 55 or more, may be designated as Faculty Emeritus.

- iii. Departments and their functional equivalents may nominate qualified members of the faculty to the Chancellor for designation as emeriti. These nominations shall be forwarded to the appropriate Dean for endorsement prior to their submission to the Chancellor.

17. *Online and Hybrid Course Teaching Policy*

- a. As the delivery of courses online and in hybrid format becomes more prevalent, the Department encourages the development and delivery of our courses online when it meets departmental, pedagogical and student needs.
- b. The Department Course Scheduling Committee will determine if a course is eligible for online delivery via review at the departmental level. No faculty member will be required to teach online. Final determination for course assignments and delivery method is held by the Department Chair.
- c. Faculty wishing to teach online or in hybrid format must present evidence that they have the skills to teach online or in hybrid format. For example, evidence such as successful completion of UW-L's or another online course preparation and development course may be presented.
- d. Approval to teach a course online must be made prior to entry of the semester schedule into WINGS by the departmental ADA.
- e. Online or hybrid courses taught during the standard fall and spring semesters must be subject to the same review processes as face-to-face courses.
- f. If core or required courses are being proposed as online or hybrid courses to be taught during the standard fall and spring semesters, an additional section of the course must be available in face-to-face format unless a waiver is approved by the department. Courses offered during the standard fall and spring semesters must be offered in face-to-face format every-other time the course is taught by the same instructor format unless a waiver is approved by the department.
- g. Faculty teaching online who are physically present at UW-L must maintain some face-to-face office hours in addition to any online office hours they may hold except during Intersessions.

IX. Search and Screen Procedures

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

A. Tenure-track Faculty

- 1. The approved UW-L tenure track faculty recruitment and hiring policy and procedures are found at <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin/Forms/S&S-Planning&Procedures-Faculty.doc> . The department of Philosophy will follow these procedures.

2. Additionally, UW-L's spousal/partner hiring policy can be found at <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/Policy/Spouse-HirePOL.pdf>
3. Searches are conducted electronically via the current UW-L search program/software. All search and screen (SS) committees will need to meet with the Affirmative Action Officer prior to obtaining access and/or creating a posting for the search. During this charging meeting, committees will be provided with resources and tips to:
 - a. Assist you with your search.
 - b. Maximize the success of the search.
 - c. Attract a large and diverse pool of highly qualified candidates.
 - d. Hire the very best person in the pool.

B. Instructional Academic Staff

1. Hiring policy and procedures are found at http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin/PA_forms_templates.htm. The department of Philosophy will follow current UW-L IAS hiring procedures.
2. As with all searches, the Department Chair makes the recommendation to the Dean who is ultimately the hiring authority.

C. Contingency Workforce (Pool Search) Procedures

1. Hiring policy and procedures are found at http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin/PA_forms_templates.htm. The department of Philosophy will follow current UW-L pool search hiring procedures.
2. As with all searches, the Department Chair makes the recommendation to the Dean who is ultimately the hiring authority.

D. Non-Instructional Academic Staff (if applicable)

1. Hiring policy and procedures are found at <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin/Forms/S&S-Planning&Procedures-IAS-NIAS-Admin.doc> (same for IAS & NIAS)
2. Not Applicable in Philosophy

X. Student Rights and Obligations

A. Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures

1. Course grade appeals

A student who strongly feels his or her semester grade in a course taught by the department is demonstrably improper or that the grading was prejudicial or capricious, should first confer promptly with the instructor[s] of the course. If the student and the instructor[s] are unable to arrive at a mutually agreeable solution, the

student may appeal the case, within one month after the start of the next semester¹, according to the following procedure:

- 1). The student will submit a written statement to the department Chairperson, setting forth his/her reasons for seeking an appeal and presenting any supporting evidence he/she may have. The Chair will then give a copy of this grade grievance to the instructor who is the object of this complaint. The Chair will request that the instructor make a written reply to these allegations. The student's written grievance along with the instructor's written reply to that grievance will then be forwarded to the grade Appeals Committee after it has been constituted.
- 2). The Chairperson will then appoint a three-member ad hoc Appeals Committee to review this appeal. The members of this committee will be randomly selected from the Department excluding the instructor[s] teaching the course in which the appeal has been made.
- 3). This committee will meet to review the student's appeal within one week of its selection. If the committee feels that further review is warranted it is strongly encouraged to meet with the student and, if necessary, to also meet separately with the instructor.
- 4). A written decision will be sent to the student by the Appeals Committee. Reasons for the decision will be included in this letter.
- 5). **Stipulations:**
 - i. The decision of the Appeals Committee is held to be advisory.
 - ii. The Appeals Committee may report a faculty member who has failed to comply with its recommendation to the full faculty and request a review.
 - iii. Any faculty member who feels that her/his Appeals Committee has made an unfounded or biased decision may make such a charge before the full faculty. In the event of such a charge the committee in question will be required to defend its recommendation before the full faculty. The department as a whole will then make its recommendation.
 - iv. A student may appeal either an Appeals Committee decision or an instructor's refusal to abide by the Committee decision to the full department, should he/she elect to do so. In such an eventuality the Department may elect to hold the hearing in a closed session at its discretion. The student will be invited to present his/her case before the department at the department's discretion. Any review must be based solely upon material supplied by the student to the original Appeals Committee.
 - v. The decision of the faculty of the Department of Philosophy will constitute the final level of grade appeals within the Departmental jurisdiction. This decision, not unlike the decision of the Appeals Committee, is also held to be advisory to the faculty member whose grade is being appealed.

2. Incomplete Grades

¹ For the purposes of student appeal the 'next semester' applies to Fall, Spring, and Summer Sessions, whichever follows immediately the semester for which the student grade was received.

As a matter of University policy, grades of “Incomplete” are issued to students strictly on the basis of illness or other unusual causes beyond the student’s control, which have rendered the student unable to take the course final exam or to complete some limited amount of coursework.

3. Philosophy Honors Program

See the current university catalog for the requirements for Philosophy Honors.

4. Non-grade appeals

Non-grade appeals may be lodged by students regarding faculty and staff. Such complaints should be lodged either orally or in writing with the Department Chair or College Dean. The hearing procedure for these non-grade concerns are detailed in the Student Handbook, Eagle Eye (available on-line).

5. Student Complaints to the Chair

Students who present themselves to the Chair with complaints regarding an instructor or his/her class will be presented with a variety of options starting with a strong urging by the Chair for the student to speak directly with the instructor. If the student is resistant to this suggestion the following options may be offered: speak with the instructor with a third person in the room (such as the Chair of the Department), meet with the Chair, write a letter to the instructor, and/or Chair and/or Dean, meet with the Affirmative Action and Diversity Officer or Office of Student Life (for special concerns). If the student endorses the action, the Chair will discuss concerns raised with the individual faculty member.

B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct

1. Academic and nonacademic misconduct policy referenced:

http://www.uwlax.edu/studentlife/academic_misconduct.htm

<http://www.uwlax.edu/studentlife/nonacademic-misconduct.htm>

2. Academic dishonesty, sometimes known as “cheating”, is subject to appropriate punishment as a matter of UW System policy. This is not something to be taken lightly or ignored as such action works to demean the integrity of the hard-earned grades of all students, the vast majority of whom never cheat. To ignore “cheating” is to foster it and thereby constitutes a dereliction of professional obligation. The Department follows the UW System policy on “academic misconduct” as it specifically applied to this campus.

C. Advising Policy

Each student majoring in Philosophy will be assigned a faculty advisor appropriate to that student’s major preference. Student requests for a particular faculty member advisor will generally be honored whenever it is feasible to do so. Students are expected to meet with their faculty advisor at least once each semester to discuss their academic progress, career interests, and course schedule. Faculty are expected to keep their posted office hours throughout the academic semester and are recommended to

expand these hours during the times that students are scheduled for course registration.

D. Advanced Placement

Opportunity is available for student advanced placement for Philosophy 101: Introduction to Logic. Efforts will be made to encourage students to take advantage of this opportunity. (cf. UW-L Undergraduate Catalog)

XI. Other

A. Work-Life Balance Statement

In an attempt to help staff and faculty balance their work and personal lives, the Department will endeavor to schedule all meetings within the hours of 8:30 am and 4:00 p.m. Additionally, childcare and family care duties will be considered when setting class schedules if requested by the instructor.

B. Outside Employment Statement

Outside professional employment for faculty in the Philosophy Department is acceptable and encouraged when it does not infringe upon the faculty member's primary obligation to the Department and the University. These responsibilities are outlined in the Department's bylaws. Outside work is defined as any work outside the parameters of the faculty member's job description within the Department. In the Philosophy Department, outside work is likely to include consulting, paid scholarship, teaching activities and/or professionally unrelated activities.

- a. For outside employment to be acceptable it may not:
 - 1). *Involve such hours or such jobs that conflict with current position description.*
 - 2). *Involve the use of Department personnel and/or resources.*
 - 3). *Infringe on the reputation of the UW-L Philosophy Department.*
- b. Concerns regarding the above are under the purview of the Department Chair and the Dean. Ongoing outside employment of 10+ hours per week during the academic semesters (within normal business hours) needs to be approved by the Department Chair and Dean.

XII. Appendices

A. Department of Philosophy - Statement on Scholarly Activity (approved 4/25/2014)

The Department of Philosophy supports a broad view of scholarship that emphasizes keeping current in the discipline, acquiring and advancing knowledge, and incorporating new knowledge into teaching on a regular basis. The Department of Philosophy generally accepts the characterization of scholarly activity offered by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) in document entitled *The Core of Academe: Teaching, Scholarly Activity and Service*. While faculty may pursue research that leads to publication, there is an expectation that research and scholarship will be embedded in a commitment to translate and integrate new knowledge into effective teaching. Research has shown that such a broad definition is among the factors that characterize colleges where faculty are deeply committed to their work and enthusiastically support their institutions' distinctive missions (Rice & Austin, 1988).

The Department of Philosophy defines scholarship as any creative endeavor that results in significant contributions to the stores of knowledge of philosophy (broadly construed to include applied philosophy as well as interdisciplinary work and the scholarship of teaching and learning.) Furthermore, in conjunction with the views of the University's Joint Promotion Committee, scholarly activities are further characterized as those having value to the humanities and, in most cases, having been subjected to external peer review.

Scholarly activity may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Basic and applied research
- New applications of existing knowledge
- Integration of knowledge
- Development and/or analysis of pedagogical methods

Expectations: The Department of Philosophy expects that successful candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion as well as for meritorious performance evaluations have a record of ongoing scholarly activity. Quality, rather than quantity, of scholarly activity shall be the major criteria for assessing a faculty member's record of scholarly activity. For promotion to both Associate Professor and Full Professor, it is expected that candidates shall have published, or have accepted for publication, a minimum of two peer-reviewed publications. The department generally categorizes scholarship into two areas.

Primary Areas of Scholarship are those that are competitive and subject to peer- review by individuals or organizations. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- Publication of research manuscripts or articles in scholarly, peer-reviewed journals. Blind peer-review is held in higher regard than other types of peer-review; impact factors and acceptance rates are relevant in the assessment of the scholarly achievement.
- Publication of research monographs or books by recognized academic publishers or recognized popular press publishing house presses (e.g. Random House, Vintage, Open Court, Blackwell/Wiley or in short, not vanity presses).

- Publication of single- authored textbook by recognized academic publishers.
- Publication of edited or co-edited textbook or chapters in textbook by recognized academic publishers.
- Publication of edited collections or chapters in edited collections by recognized academic publishers or popular press on philosophical topics (broadly construed.)
- Editing/Co-editing of academic journal or newsletter.
- National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Seminars/Institutes or similar professional institutes requiring competitive application.
- Publication of book review or discussion note in an academic journal or newsletter.
- Peer-Reviewed conference presentations or invited presentations at philosophy department colloquia or conference keynote addresses.
- External Research Grant or UW-L or UW System Research Grant for Research, Professional Development or Sabbatical.
- Sabbatical placement requiring competitive application.

Secondary Areas of Scholarship are those that are those that are not subject to peer review. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- Non peer-reviewed presentations at professional meetings, conventions, conferences or other colleges and universities.
- Monographs published at the author's expense.
- Attendance/Participation in institutes, short courses, seminars, workshops, and professional meetings not requiring peer-reviewed application process.
- Refereeing and reviewing original manuscripts.
- Recognition in footnotes or new impact of research as measured by citations.
- Presentations to on-campus or general audiences that require original preparation.
- Serving as discussant at conferences.
- Drafts of papers, book chapters or monographs not yet submitted or under review.

When evaluating the work of faculty, the Department considers examples of scholarly activity such as those listed above as one aspect of the work of a faculty member at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse. As part of the University of Wisconsin System, the Philosophy Department recognizes the importance of philosophy as an integral component to the examined life, and as such recognizes a broad range of contributions as legitimate forms of research. Moreover, the Wisconsin Idea values the role philosophy may have in the broader communities throughout the region and the State. We recognize that different individuals have different talents, and we encourage faculty to make the most of their talents, both individually and in cooperation with other faculty as well as members of the larger community of their own discipline and of scholars generally. We agree with the American Philosophical Association statement on Research <http://www.apaonline.org/?research>

B. Department of Philosophy–Statement of Service Activity **(approved 5/2/2014)**

In defining service, the department considers the three traditional categories within service:

1. Professional service: involves the use of one's professional expertise in a service activity that may be internal or external to the University. This may include sharing professional expertise with one's professional organizations.
2. Campus service: involves work on committees, task forces, and special projects for the University, college and/or department.
3. Community service: involves volunteer or civic work in the community.

Examples of service including but not limited to (in alphabetical order):

- Attendance at Philosophy Department Capstone presentations or other department capstones
- Attendance at university sponsored student events
- Chair of session at conferences
- Chairperson, director and/or leadership activities in the department, college, university or professional associations
- Club advisor
- Community education on Philosophy/-related topics
- Development of new scholarly areas in the discipline
- Development of professional journals
- Editorial service to professional journals
- Engage in peer review for retention, tenure, and post tenure review process.
- Evaluating manuscripts for professional publications
- Involvement in activities that increase participation by underrepresented groups in the profession and in the Philosophy program
- Membership on boards, commissions, task forces, projects and/or special assignments in the college, university or university system
- Membership on departmental, college, university or professional association committees
- Office holding in professional associations
- Organization and or administration or administration of conferences and events
- Organizing or leading a faculty-led study tour
- Professional consultant or advisor to boards, committees, commissions, task forces, community organizations and governmental agencies, businesses
- Public speaking
- Social service to boards, committees, commissions, institutes, task forces, community agencies and organizations related to the faculty members' area(s) of expertise
- Writing guest editorials and granting media interviews in areas related to the faculty members' area(s) of expertise
- Other contributions of clear value to the university, community and/or profession

We agree with the APA statement on service: <http://www.apaonline.org/?service>

C. Department of Philosophy – Statement on Teaching Activity*(approved 5/2/2014)*

The UW-L Strategic Plan, Forward Together, contains a Vision Statement for the University, supported by four broad values and goals statements:

1. Students as learners will be the primary focus of the University,
2. UW-L will be dedicated to developing dynamic curricula, programs and services, nurturing scholarship and pursuing effective public and private resource development to meet the needs of the 21st Century;
3. UW-L will continually nurture a climate which fosters understanding of diverse cultures and values systems, which promotes excellence and which results in high faculty, staff, student morale and a strong sense of community and;
4. UW-L will continue to serve as one of Wisconsin's major assets.

In addition, when discussing the role of education in students' lives, seven areas of emphasis are encouraged:

1. Place emphasis on academic rigor and scholarship/research/creative activity, and not solely career preparation.
2. Place emphasis on developing student communication, problem solving, and critical thinking skills.
3. Maintain a goal of student self-understanding in a world of others through emphasis on cultural and gender diversity, the humanities, and international education.
4. Place emphasis on a focus on literature, the arts, and leisure in order to enhance students' ability to balance their lives.
5. Place emphasis on the importance of science and sustainability so that students can better understand, and function, within society.
6. Use interdisciplinary and interdepartmental curricular approaches, where appropriate.
7. Focus on ways to enhance instruction and increase student and faculty competencies.

The Department of Philosophy acknowledges these goals and attempts to emphasize them in individual courses and our overall curricular plan. Additionally, the Department of Philosophy recognizes advising of students as a critical component to faculty's role as teachers. The Department of Philosophy considers student learning to be its primary goal.

When evaluating the work of faculty, the Department considers examples of teaching activity such as those enumerated below as the fundamental aspect of the work of a faculty member at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse. While we recognize that different individuals have different talents and objectives within the classroom, we want our faculty to strive to articulate and achieve student learning outcomes. Furthermore, we see this process as ongoing and expect our faculty to continually examine their teaching objectives and strategies in this light.

Research has identified several components that make up effective teaching – five of which tend to be primary, overlapping and interrelated: enthusiasm, preparation & organization, ability to stimulate student thought and interest, clarity, and knowledge and love of the content (Gmelch & Miskin, 1995). The department recognizes that student evaluations of teachers may tap many of the above characteristics. However, student evaluations may or may not tap other important

aspects of teaching -- namely, student learning. As Weimer (1993) stated “a good teacher entails more than a decision to be enthusiastic, organized, clear, stimulating, and knowledgeable, it involves translating those abstract ingredients into tangible behaviors, policies and practices.” Consequently, the Philosophy department encourages our faculty to provide a broad portfolio of teaching materials in order to convey as many aspects of his/her courses as possible.

The Philosophy Department's review process (for retention, promotion and merit) requires syllabi, SEIs and student comment summaries (#1, #2 and #3) but we encourage additional material as detailed below*. In the parentheses following each major category examples are given for the “type” of materials that faculty may wish to gather; however, they are not required by the department.

1. Student evaluations: (with weight given to issues such as department averages, whether the course is required, the rigor of the course requirements, grading curves, etc.). Given the extensive and long-term academic scholarship on the role of gender, race, class, disability, sexual identity, national origin and age on biasing SEIS and the more limited academic scholarship and possibilities of the effect of religion, ancestry, veteran status and other protected status, these factors should be considered in assessing results of SEIs.
2. Student commentary: (We expect faculty to monitor persistent themes from these commentaries).
3. Syllabi (most effective when clearly linked to course objectives and goals – syllabi should be detail fully enough such that an outside reader could get good sense of the course content and process).
4. Class materials: examples of class activities, examinations, essays, projects, etc. (Material that might also be included in a teaching portfolio includes: Statement of teaching responsibilities, including specific courses, and a brief description of the way each course was taught. A reflective statement by the professor describing personal teaching philosophy, strategies, and objectives. A personal statement by the professor describing teaching goals for the next five years. Self-evaluation by the professor. This would include not only a personal assessment of teaching-related activities but also an explanation of any contradictory or unclear documents or materials in the teaching materials.).
5. Additional descriptions of teaching involvement (e.g., Information about direction/supervision of honors, graduate theses, and research group activities. Contributing to, or editing, a professional journal on teaching the professor's discipline.).
6. Description of steps taken to evaluate and improve one's teaching (e.g., changes resulting from self-evaluation, time spent reading journals on improving teaching, participation in seminars, workshops and professional meetings on improving teaching, and obtaining instructional development grants).
7. Description of curricular revisions or new course development (e.g. new course projects, materials, assignments or other activities).
8. Evidence of student learning (e.g., Student scores on professor-made or standardized tests, possibly before and after a course, as evidence of student learning. Student essays, creative work, field-work reports, laboratory workbooks or logs and student publications on course-related work. Information about the effect of the professor's

- courses on student career choices or help given by the professor to secure student employment. A record of students who succeed in advanced courses of study in the field. Statements by alumni on the quality of instruction. Student publications or conference presentations on course-related work. Examples of graded student essays showing excellent, average, and poor work along with the professor's comments as to why they were so graded.) This evidence is particularly important when clearly linked to stated course goals and objectives.
9. Outside validation (solicited and unsolicited letters of support, classroom visitations, videotape analysis, awards or recognitions, classroom group interviews, senior exit interviews).

Finally, as aforementioned, we expect each of our faculty to be active in advising which entails availability to students, knowledge of university policies and curricula and ongoing training in this arena.

*Material culled from Seldin (1991), Braskamp & Ory (1994), Centra (1993), and Boyer (1990).

We agree with the American Philosophical Association statement on Teaching:
<http://www.apaonline.org/?teaching>

D. Open Meeting Rules Summary

For consistency, all faculty, academic staff and administrative recruitments will follow the [Open Meetings rules of the State of Wisconsin](#).

Any committee meetings, or gatherings of one-half or more of the committee membership to discuss the matters of this committee, constitute a meeting under the Open Meetings rules. Telephone conference calls that fit this description are also subject to the Open Meetings rules.

Advance notice of the meetings must be given to: 1) the public, 2) any members of the news media who have submitted a written request for notice, and 3) the official newspaper/medium in the area. The executive director for human resources assumes this responsibility for the first organizational meeting for administrative searches. Thereafter this responsibility is vested in the committee chair. For all other searches, the convener or chair has this responsibility.

Until Fall 2009, the primary method of notice was generally been an announcement in the Campus Connection. In Fall 2009, UW-L began [online posting](#). Your notice should contain the time, date, place, and subject matter of the meeting, including what will be discussed in a closed session. Keeping titles similar will make it easier for people to find the ones they're looking for. If you plan to go into a closed session to consider personal history relevant to hiring, for example, then you must include notice that you will go into a closed session and cite the exemptions under which you are invoking the closed session. The intent is to inform interested parties and your notice should do so. (see Sample Notice below).

Notice must be given at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting, unless for good cause such notice was impossible or impractical. Under these conditions at least two hours' notice must be given.

All meetings of this committee must begin in an open session. It must be held in a location reasonably accessible to the public and open to all citizens. Open sessions can be audio taped or videotaped by anyone as long as doing so does not disrupt the meeting.

Nonmembers can observe open meetings, but do not have the right to participate in the meetings.

Committee minutes should record motions, roll call votes, and decisions at both open and closed sessions.

Open sessions go into closed sessions by invoking the exemption under law that allows the committee to go into a closed session. This can be made in the form of a motion by a committee member, seconded, a roll call vote held, which if positive will result in the committee going into a closed session. The motion for a Search and Screen committee would read, "I move we convene in a closed session to consider personal history information about applicants for the position of [insert title] as provided in section 19.85 (1) (c) of Wisconsin Statutes." A majority vote is required to go into a closed session. The vote and nature of the discussion should be part of the official minutes.

The committee may not reconvene in an open session, after going into a closed session, for 12 hours unless public notice of the subsequent open session is given in the initial public notice.

Any committee member who knowingly attends a meeting held in violation of the Open Meetings rules is subject to a penalty of \$25-\$300 per violation.

Please consult with the Executive Director for Human Resources on any questions related to Open Meetings Rules.

SAMPLE OPEN MEETING NOTICE

FACULTY & ACADEMIC STAFF RECRUITMENT

Philosophy Department Search & Screen Meeting - Date

SUBJECT: First Meeting of the Search & Screen Committee for the (Position)

PLACE: xxx Wimberly Hall

DATE: XXX

TIME: 11:00 a.m.

AGENDA:

- Introduction of Committee Members
- Committee Charge
- Recruitment Process Information
- Affirmative Action Information

(If applicable, indicate meeting may go into closed session, such as "Meeting will go into closed session to consider possible employment and personal history of candidates as provided in section 19.85 (1) (c) of Wisconsin Statutes.")

For more specific information on closed session exemptions in section 19.85 of the Statutes see

<http://nxt.legis.state.wi.us/nxt/gateway.dll?f=templates&fn=default.htm&d=stats&jd=19.85>

E. Philosophy SEI Form

*Order	*Question ID	Question Type	Question Text
1	UWL_MOTIVE	Rating Scale (Agree/Disagree)	I was looking forward to taking this course.
2	UWL_HELPFL	Rating Scale (Agree/Disagree)	The instructor was helpful to students.
3	UWL_PREP	Rating Scale (Agree/Disagree)	The instructor was well prepared.
4	UWL_COMM	Rating Scale (Agree/Disagree)	The instructor communicated the subject matter clearly.
5	UWL_LEARN	Rating Scale (Agree/Disagree)	I learned a great deal from this instructor.
6	UWL_EXCEL	Rating Scale (Agree/Disagree)	Overall, this instructor was excellent.
7	PHL 7	Open ended	What did you especially like about this class?
8	PHL 8	Open ended	What did you learn from the class?
9	PHL 9	Open ended	In what ways did the instructor help you learn?
10	PHL 10	Open ended	What suggestions would you make about improving the class or its instruction?

F. Philosophy Merit Form (Adopted 2/21/2014)

Merit Point System Form- Due to the Department Chair on or before June 15th each year.

Name _____ **Date** _____

Merit for June 1-May 31 _____

Teaching: 30 points max per merit year, from both categories (A) and (B)

Purpose: Merit points for teaching are awarded to faculty on an annual basis in order to document student reactions to teaching as indicated by SEI scores, to reward pedagogical excellence, innovation and the development of new course materials, and to encourage faculty to pursue professional development in the area of teaching

A. Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) 10 points maximum

SEI Scale (Higher of average or median score from all courses taught during merit year)

- ≥ 4.3 = 10
- ≥ 4.0 = 7.5
- ≥ 3.5 = 5
- ≥ 3.0 = 2.5
- < 3.0 = 0

The awarding of SEI points is contingent on faculty members meeting the following minimum performance standards:

- a. Meet and teach all regularly scheduled classes
- b. Provide syllabi for all courses (excepting independent studies)
- c. Attend scheduled office hours, advise majors/minors

SEI POINTS	Points	Points Earned
	Per guidelines above (MAX 10)	

B. Instructional Activities 20 points maximum

Type of Instructional Activity	Points	Points Earned
Documented assessment of Student Learning Outcomes that is reported in Department Assessment Report	1 per class max of 5	
General Education assessment compliance that is reported on GEAC site	5	
Successful Department Peer Review [must provide documentation]	2.5 per review max of 5	
New Course Preparation	5 points	
Major Course Revision [must provide documentation]	2.5 per class max of 5	
Independent Studies	2.5 per independent study max of 5	
Internship Supervision	1per student max of 4	
Teaching more than the standard load	2.5 per class max of 5	
Writing emphasis course- per course	2	
Undergraduate Research supervised	2.5 per student max of 5	
Construction of Workbooks	10	

Philosophy Bylaws (September 29, 2014)

Major Revision of Workbooks	2.5 per workbook max of 5	
New use of significantly revised or new teaching materials [Documentation of what and how used must be provided]	2.5 per revised per new max of 5	
Other Pedagogical Innovations introduced [documented]	2significant innovation max of 5	
Teaching Development Activities	5	
Wisconsin Teaching Fellows/Scholars	5	
Online Teaching Certification	10	
Blended Classroom Teaching Certification	10	
Learning by Design Workshop	10	
CATL Workshops & Other Teaching Development Activities	2.5 each max of 5	
Teaching Grant: Internal Funded	5	
Teaching Grant: External Submitted	5	
Teaching Grant: External Funded	10	
Other [documented]		
INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY POINTS TOTAL (20 MAXIMUM)		

Research 30 points maximum

Purpose: Merit points for research are awarded to faculty on an annual basis in order to document faculty research and creative projects in philosophy or other recognized scholarship and creative activities to celebrate excellence in scholarship and to encourage faculty to participate in conferences and submit their work for publication.

Type of Research	Points Awarded	Points Earned
Journal Article Accepted for publication	15	
Journal Article submitted for review	5	
Discussion note accepted for publication	5	
Book Review accepted for publication	10	
NEH Summer Seminars/Institutes & Other Professional Institutes	10	
Editor/ Co-editor of Journal	10-30	
Articles/Commentary in Professional Newsletters, etc.	2-5	
Conference Presentations	5 each max of 20	
Invited Presentations	5-15 each max of 20	
Presenting Paper Comments	2.5 each max of 10	
Attending Conference (must have conference program in Digital Measures)	2.5 /conference max 5	
Books (author or co-author) Accepted Manuscript Proposal	10	
Books (author or co-author) Manuscript to External Review	15	
Books (author or co-author) Substantial Revision	10	
Books (author or co-author) In Print or on-line	30	
Book editor or co-editor- Accepted Manuscript Proposal	10	
Book editor or co-editor-In Print (or e-book)	20	

Philosophy Bylaws (September 29, 2014)

Book Chapter accepted for publication	15	
Research Grant Internal	5	
Research Grant External Submitted	10	
Research Grant External Funded	20	
New Paper drafts, book chapter drafts	2.5 /draft max of 5	
New Impact of Research	1 per citation max of 5	
Recognition in Footnote	1 per recognition max of 5	
Other (must be accompanied by narrative and point proposal to justify why it should count for the value proposed)		
SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY POINTS TOTAL (30 MAXIMUM)		

Service 30 points maximum

Purpose: Merit points for service are awarded to faculty on an annual basis in order to document faculty service, as is part of our mission inherent in the Wisconsin Idea. The Philosophy Department encourages dedicated service to the university, college, department, profession, and community.

		POINTS EARNED
Department (attend department meetings; submit requested materials, etc.)	5 per academic year	
Department Chair	5 per semester max of 10 per academic year	
Club Advisor [if single advisor, otherwise shared]	5-10 per academic year	
Conducting Department Peer Review	2.5 per review max 5	
Academic Program Director	5 per semester max 10 per academic year	
Standing College Committee Member	2.5 per semester max 5per academic year	
Chair College Committee	5 per semester 10 max	
Membership (Active) as co-departmental/institute member (e.g., WGSS, ERS)	2-5	
Faculty Senate Member	10	
Senate Executive Committee Member	15	
Faculty Senate Chair	30	
University Search Committee Member	5	
University Search Committee Chair	10 max	
Standing University committee member	5 max	
Standing University Committee Full Time Secretary	5 max	
Standing University committee Chair	10 chair max	
Advisor of Official Student Group	1-2	
Attend Graduation	2.5 per attendance max of 5	
Campus Close-Up	2.5 per attendance max of 5	
Board member of National/Regional Organization Committee (APA. WPA. SWIP, IEAP SAGP, APS, etc.)	10	
Organize (or Co-Organize) National/International Conference	30	

Philosophy Bylaws (September 29, 2014)

Organize Regional Conference	20	
Organize State Conference	15	
Referee conference submissions	1per submission max 5	
Referee Journal Article	2.5 per review max 5	
Referee book proposal	2.5 per review max of 5	
Referee book manuscript	10-15	
Service Presentation	2.5 per presentation max 5	
Community Service (grant writing)	2-5per grant max of 10	
Profession-related community service/membership (e.g., medical ethics board)	2	
Service Award	10	
Other [Must Provide Documentation]		
SERVICE ACTIVITY POINTS TOTAL (30 MAXIMUM)		

Inclusive Excellence 10 points maximum

Inclusive Excellence Infusion in the Curriculum	4 per course	POINTS EARNED
Teaching for Diversity	3	
Inclusive Excellence Mentoring Activities (e.g., Upward Bound, Self-Sufficiency Program, Eagle Mentoring)	2-10 Max	
Attendance at Activities with Inclusive Excellence Theme (e.g., ATP, Pow Wow, Hmong New Year)	1-5 Max	
Being part of a Difficult Dialogues Group	5	
Presentation at a Difficult Dialogues Group	10	
INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE POINTS TOTAL (10 maximum)		
SEI POINTS (10 maximum)		
INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY TOTAL (20 maximum)		
SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY TOTAL (30 maximum)		
SERVICE ACTIVITY TOTAL (30 maximum)		
SABBATICAL (40 per semester)		
	GRAND TOTAL	

Sabbatical

One Semester Sabbatical	40 points	Points Earned
Two Semester Sabbatical	80 points	

Yearly Merit Categories

High Merit Award	85 points or higher
Merit Award	60-84 points
No Merit Award	59 points or less

G. Department of Philosophy Annual Teaching Evaluation for Probationary Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff

1. Classroom Observation:

- Review syllabus, course materials (including reading materials, laboratory materials, assessment etc.). Comment on these as applicable.
- Discuss with the instructor the objective(s) of this course and of the specific class to be observed, and how these will be met.
- Summarize your observations, taking into account, where relevant, the points listed below (items A-D). Clearly, certain criteria will be more relevant to some classes than others. Address relevant criteria where appropriate. Be sure to include in your observation report: the name of the instructor being observed, the name and number of the course being observed, the date of the observation, and the name of the reviewer.
- Pay particular attention to what the instructor has done to enhance student learning (based on syllabus, discussions, and/or classroom performance).
- Make any specific suggestions for improving the class and/or the instructor's teaching (this is important as it will provide guidance for further growth and improvement in the instructor's teaching development).
- In your discussion of the above points, consider the following:

A. Clarity and Content: Comment on the instructor's knowledge of the material, intellectual challenge to students, explanation of relevant terms and concepts, points covered in relation to class and course objectives.

- Are the instructor's statements accurate according to the standards of the field?
- Does the instructor incorporate current research in the field?
- Does the instructor identify sources, perspectives and authorities in the field?
- Does the instructor communicate the reasoning behind concepts?
- Does the instructor define new terms or concepts?
- Does the instructor elaborate or repeat complex information?
- Does the instructor use relevant examples to explain content?
- Does the instructor pause during explanation to allow students to ask questions?
- Is the instructor's content culturally sensitive and/or diverse?

B. Organization: Comment on preparedness for class and presentation of material in an understandable way.

- Does the instructor arrive to class on time?
- Does the instructor state the relation of the class to the previous one?
- Does the instructor know how to use the educational technology needed for the class?
- Does the instructor make transitional statements between class segments?
- Does the instructor convey the purpose of each class activity?
- Does the instructor summarize periodically and at the end of class?
- Is the class structured to meet its objectives?

C. *Variety and Pace:* Comment on the instructor's clarity and audibility of presentation, use of technology, use of active learning activities (such as demonstrations, student presentations, group activities/discussion).

- Does the instructor vary the volume, tone and pitch of voice for emphasis and interest?
- Does the instructor avoid extended reading from notes or text?
- Does the instructor speak at a pace that allows students to take notes?
- Is more than one form of instruction used?
- Does the instructor pause after asking questions?
- Does the instructor encourage student responses?
- Does the instructor draw non-participating students into the discussion?
- Does the instructor prevent particular students from dominating the discussion?
- Does the instructor help students extend their responses?
- Does the instructor mediate conflict or differences of opinion?
- Does the instructor demonstrate active listening techniques?
- Does the instructor provide explicit directions for active learning tasks?
- Does the instructor allow sufficient time to complete active learning tasks?

D. *Rapport with Students:* Comment on students' involvement/interaction, opportunities to ask and answer questions, the instructor's openness to students' comments and ideas, and the instructor's recognition of students' failure to understand course materials.

- Does the instructor address students by name?
- Does the instructor address student comprehension or questions?
- Does the instructor provide feedback at given intervals?
- Does the instructor use positive reinforcement?
- Does the instructor incorporate students' ideas within the class?

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

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

3. Write-Up and Dissemination

- The written report should provide feedback for the instructor and appropriate contextual analysis that will be useful in retention, tenure, and promotion review.
- The report should be shared with the instructor, and an electronic copy should be sent to the Department Chair within one week of completion of the letter (shortly after the results from the Student Evaluations have been compiled at the end of the semester).

H. Search & Screen Procedure-Tenure Track Positions

The CLS Dean's Office reimburses departments for the following expenses. State Rates apply for all meal, lodging and transportation expenses.

1. Candidate travel expenses: three candidates per search unless more or less are approved.
2. Ads, up to a limit of \$800 per search unless pre-approved for more.
3. Meals for one faculty member to serve as "host" for each meal with the candidates. (Departments may use their departmental funds to reimburse additional faculty).
4. Two \$500 allotments for faculty to interview candidates at national conferences.

The Department of Philosophy will follow the current UW-L Search and Screen Planning and Procedures document (Faculty) available at:

http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin/PA_forms_templates.htm

until STEP 4: SCREENING APPLICANTS AND INTERVIEWING APPLICANTS

At this point, Department of Philosophy guidelines call for the following:

1. A simple majority (50% +1) majority vote is required to recommend a campus interview with a job applicant. If paper ballots are used, each ballot must be signed and stored for 7 years.
2. After the interviews, the College of Liberal Studies Dean's Office outlines the in the process under THE HIRING PROCESS section of the UW-L Search and Screen Procedures.
 - a. At the S&S Committee meeting to discuss the candidates after the final on-campus interview, the S&S Committee will compile a list of strengths and weaknesses of each candidate to present to the CLS Dean. The S&S Committee will determine which candidates are "acceptable for hire" and which candidates are "not acceptable for hire." The Search and Screen committee is not to take a formal vote for ranking the candidates.
 - b. The S&S Committee Chair and Department Chair will schedule a meeting with the CLS Dean to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate.
 - c. The CLS Dean will determine at this meeting, after consultation with the S&S Committee Chair and Department Chair, the order of candidates to offer the position to and any candidates who will be removed from further consideration. If a decision regarding the order for a hiring offer cannot be made at this meeting, then the CLS Dean will make the decision at a later time after further consultation with the department.
 - d. When the hiring offer order has been determined, the S&S Committee Chair or the Department Chair goes to PeopleAdmin and sends the candidates forward for electronic approval by the administration, taking care to ensure that this step has been fully completed.
 - e. The CLS Dean will consult with the Department Chair on the appropriate probationary period for tenure, years of experience to be granted for promotion, and release time allocation for the first year for each candidate deemed "acceptable for hire."
 - f. The CLS Dean will seek permission from the Provost and the Affirmative Action Officer to make a hiring offer.
 - g. The CLS Dean will make the hiring offer to the candidates in the order determined. The hiring offer will include information on salary, years of prior

experience granted for promotion, probationary period for tenure, moving allocation, and start-up package. The CLS Dean will request that the Department Chair contact the candidate to discuss teaching –related items. Each candidate will be given a week to respond to the hiring offer. If negotiated with the CLS Dean, the candidate may extend this to a second week.

- h. After an offer has been accepted, the department follows the current university guidelines under: THE CLOSING OF A SEARCH.

I. Program Assessment

1. Process

- a. The Philosophy Assessment Committee is responsible for overseeing the assessment process for the department in both program assessment and general education assessment to ensure that assessment is completed each year and that the assessment data is used to “close the loop” in the assessment process.
 - 1). September of each year- Assessment committee meets to identify and review which program learning outcomes are being assessed that year and to fill out the CLS assessment plan form. The Committee will review data for each general education course and with the assistance of the instructor(s) in the course, complete form C and submit it to the General Education Assessment Committee. All GE forms A (assessments were identified in spring of the previous year) are submitted for courses being assessed in the current year.
 - 2). February of each year- Assessment committee reviews data collected for program assessment, analyzes the data and prepares the annual departmental report for review at the first department meeting in April.
 - 3). April/May of each year- All instructors teaching a general education course in the following year meet to identify the SLO being assessed and agree upon the assessment, evaluation rubric, and when the assessment will occur. Assessment Committee completes and submits GE Form B.

2. Assessment Rotation for 2014-2020

3. Direct Measure 1

- a. Here you need the specific assessment tools and the rubrics you use to assess them

4. Direct Measure 2

5. Indirect Measure 1

6. General Education Assessment

- a. Take the process directly from GE- rotation schedule and SLOs for each and then identify each assessment tool and the rubric used to assess the tool.
- b. **PHL 100**
- c. **PHL 101**
- d. **PHL**
- e. **PHL**
- f.

J. Search & Screen Procedure-IAS and Pool Positions

Academic staff teaching appointments may be either part-time or full-time in nature. The need for such appointments is generally the result of faculty sabbaticals, leaves of absence, or special workload releases. On occasion, at the request of the Dean of CLS the Department may agree to appoint an academic staff instructor to provide some additional sections of General Education courses as well.

The Department of Philosophy will follow the current UW-L Search and Screen Planning and Procedures document for (IAS-NIAS-ADMIN) available at:

http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin/PA_forms_templates.htm