

Appendices

APPENDIX A

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

COLLEGE MATERIALS

➤ **College of Business**

➤ **College of Education and Human Services**

➤ **College of Letters and Science**

➤ **College of Nursing**

This page is intentionally blank.

1 **College of Business**
 2 **Policies and Procedures for**
 3 **Appointment, Renewal, Promotion, Tenure and Merit**

4 *Initial Date Approved by COBA Faculty: May 30, 1989*
 5 *Initial Effective Date: July 1, 1989*
 6 *Revisions Approved by COBA Faculty: February 6, 1992*
 7 *Effective Date of Revisions: January 1, 1992*
 8 *Revisions Approved by COBA Faculty: February 18 and April 8, 1994*
 9 *Revisions Approved by COBA Faculty: December 5, 1997*
 10 *Revisions Approved by COBA Faculty: April 6, 2001*
 11 *Revisions Approved by COBA Faculty: June 2, 2004*
 12 *Revisions approved by COBA Faculty: April 7, 2007*
 13 *Revisions approved by COBA Faculty: May 2, 2008*

14 **INTRODUCTION**

15 The primary purpose of this document is to assist the College in accomplishing its mission, goals and
 16 objectives. A second purpose is to place in writing the College's guidelines and criteria, which should
 17 be applied in a judicious and professional manner, for personnel decisions concerning appointment,
 18 renewal, promotion, tenure, merit and assignment of professional responsibilities. The third purpose of
 19 this document is to outline the actions needed, timelines for those actions, and the needs of the
 20 College of Business (COBA) in the areas of teaching, research and service to accomplish its mission
 21 and to maintain AACSB accreditation.

22 **PRODUCTIVITY GUIDELINES**

23 TEACHING: Teaching is the primary duty and responsibility of a faculty member. Teaching
 24 assignments must meet the needs of our students and the needs of the College to generate Student
 25 Credit Hours (SCH) and Full-time Equivalents (FTE). In calculating the average SCH per FTE in the
 26 College, undergraduate SCH will be added to 1.33 times graduate SCH. In addition to meeting the
 27 workload requirements, faculty are expected to continuously improve the quality of instruction.

28
 29 INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS: Research and scholarly activity, hereinafter referred to as
 30 research, is a significant part of the faculty's workload. For a given four-year period, the College's
 31 Intellectual Contributions Productivity Profile should approach the goal profile below.

32
 33 **College of Business**
 34 **Four Year Intellectual Contribution Productivity Goal Profile**

Aggregate goal cumulative percent of faculty	Scholarship Activity Level
25	6 scholarly works, at least 4 of which are articles
50	5 scholarly works, at least 3 of which are articles
80	4 scholarly works, at least 2 of which are articles
100	3 scholarly works, at least 1 of which is an article

35 AACSB categorizes Intellectual Contributions as Learning and Pedagogical Scholarship (works that
 36 focus on teaching and learning), Contributions to Practice (works that focus on applications) and
 37 Discipline-Based Scholarship (traditional scholarship furthering the academic discipline). When
 38 evaluating the Intellectual Contributions of our faculty and staff, AACSB expects a report that divides
 39 our contributions into Peer Reviewed Journal Articles (PRJ) and Other Intellectual Contributions (OIC)
 40 within each of the three categories.

Intellectual Contributions					
<i>Learning & Pedagogical Scholarship</i>		<i>Contributions to Practice</i>		<i>Discipline-Based Scholarship</i>	
Peer Reviewed Journal Articles	Other Intellectual Contributions	Peer Reviewed Journal Articles	Other Intellectual Contributions	Peer Reviewed Journal Articles	Other Intellectual Contributions

1 **Peer Reviewed Journal Articles** appear in a journal where the referee process consists of a review
2 by at least two individuals. These can either be from the journal's editorial board or from outside
3 reviewers. Journals listed in *Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities*, whose review process
4 meets the above requirements, will qualify. For journals not listed in Cabell's, the author(s) is
5 responsible for providing evidence that the journal's review process meets the above requirements.

6 **The following are generally not considered refereed journal articles:**

- 7 1. Paper presentations which later appear as proceedings.
- 8 2. Conference paper presentations that later appear in a journal but are not subject to a second
9 review process.
- 10 3. Articles where the journal charges a fee to publish, except if pre-approved by the Faculty
11 Review and Development team.

12 Final judgments regarding the classification or value of a journal article or paper will be made by the
13 Faculty Review and Development team.

14 **Other Intellectual Contributions** includes but is not limited to the following:

- 15 • monographs,
- 16 • scholarly books,
- 17 • textbooks,
- 18 • papers accepted for presentation at academic or professional meetings and/or proceedings from
19 scholarly meetings,
- 20 • publicly available research working papers,
- 21 • papers presented at faculty research seminars,
- 22 • publications in trade journals,
- 23 • publications in in-house journals,
- 24 • published and disseminated book reviews,
- 25 • written cases with instructional materials,
- 26 • instructional software, other publicly available materials describing the design and
27 implementation of new curricula or courses including instructors' manuals, test banks, slide sets,
28 cases and/or PowerPoint presentations that are attributed to the faculty member as author,
- 29 • a significant consulting project whose results are publicly available,
- 30 • a significant research grant (at least \$15,000) from which articles or professional presentations
31 are anticipated.

32 Intellectual Contributions must be publicly available, (i.e., proprietary and confidential research and
33 consulting reports do not qualify as Intellectual Contributions).

34 The presumption that other Intellectual Contributions are not equivalent to peer reviewed journal
35 articles can be rebutted by additional evidence provided by the faculty member.

36 **SERVICE:** Faculty are expected to participate on Team, College, and University committees that are
37 important to faculty governance and achieving the goals and mission of the Team, College and
38 University. Service includes participating in committees, student organizations, professional and
39 academic organizations; conducting seminars or workshops; being a reviewer of articles, papers or
40 books; coordinating classes; and providing service to the community.

41
42 **I. PERSONNEL GUIDELINES**

43 The following guidelines are designed to provide a general framework for personnel decisions. These
44 criteria will be applied in a judicious and professional manner.

45 **APPOINTMENT:** The recruiting of faculty is the responsibility of the Team. All appointments are
46 made consistent with University and College Policies and Procedures.

47 **DEGREE COMPLETION:** Individuals without an appropriate terminal degree, or who are not near
48 completion of an appropriate terminal degree, will not be hired for a tenure track position. Individuals
49 without the appropriate credentials, if employed, are employed in a temporary position as academic
50 staff. Individuals pursuing the terminal degree may be renewed to the third year (renewal early in the
51 second year) without having completed the terminal degree. However, an individual may not be
52 renewed to the fourth year (renewal late in the second year) unless all requirements have been
53 completed for the degree by the time of the renewal decision. To assist tenure track faculty to

1 complete the terminal degree, Teams are encouraged, as appropriate to the individual and the
2 availability of resources, to:

- 3 a. reduce the teaching load for at least one semester of the first year;
- 4 b. reduce or eliminate service assignments for the first year;
- 5 c. discourage summer teaching; and
- 6 d. discourage outreach activities unless activities are applicable to degree completion.

7 **RENEWAL:** Teaching, research, and service are considered in the renewal process. In February of
8 their third year, probationary faculty are almost one-half way to the time at which the tenure decision is
9 normally made. By February of the third year, a faculty member should have begun to establish a
10 clear research track record or serious consideration will be given to non-renewal. In addition, faculty
11 are expected to have a satisfactory performance in the classroom and contribute to the service
12 requirements of the Team, College and University. Clear signals about progress and performance will
13 be given by the Team Personnel Committee and subsequent College level reviewers in their
14 recommendations for renewal. These signals should guide the faculty member toward the upcoming
15 tenure decision.

16
17 **TENURE:** At the time of the tenure decision, a candidate should have at least six (6) works (as
18 defined in the Intellectual Contributions section), at least three (3) of which are refereed journal
19 articles. Under exceptional circumstances, one article may be under review at the time a faculty
20 member submits tenure/promotion documents. Articles must be peer-reviewed.

21 Meeting Expectations in each of the three areas (Teaching, Intellectual Contributions and Service) is
22 necessary, but may not be sufficient to receive tenure. College expectations are in addition to the
23 University criteria for tenure as specified in the most recent *University of Wisconsin Oshkosh Faculty
24 and Academic Staff Handbook*. It is also to be noted that faculty may apply for "early" tenure in
25 accordance with the *University of Wisconsin Oshkosh Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook*.

26 Consistent with University policy, faculty that have signed a contract prior to July 1, 2000, are
27 "grandfathered" under the criteria minimums of five (5) scholarly works, at least two (2) of which are
28 articles. Faculty who signed a contract after June 30, 2000 are subject to criteria of six (6) scholarly
29 works, at least three (3) of which are articles.

30 31 II. PROMOTION

32 The University's Promotion Policy, in its entirety, can be found in the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh
33 Handbook. The University's criteria for degree, experience, and time in rank for promotion to each
34 academic rank are restated below. The additional College of Business minimum requirements for
35 teaching, research and service are indicated by **bold** type print.

36 1. **Instructor**

37 Degree: Master's
38 Experience: No minimum
39 Time in Rank: No minimum
40 **Teaching: Potential for classroom proficiency.**
41 **Research: None**
42 **Service: None**

43 Note: The COBA usually does not appoint individuals at the instructor rank. Appointments
44 below the rank of Assistant Professor are designated as instructional academic staff.
45 Instructional academic staff appointments are temporary, non-tenure track appointments, with
46 an annual review for renewal.

47 2. **Assistant Professor**

48 Degree: Doctorate or ABD if an initial appointment.
49 Faculty who acquire the doctorate will be automatically promoted to
50 this rank if official notice that the degree has been granted is
51 submitted to the Vice Chancellor's office by January 1. Rank will be
52 effective as of the following July 1.
53 Other Degree Options: **No exceptions in the COBA.**
54 Experience: No minimum.
55 Time in Rank: No minimum.
56 **Teaching: Potential for classroom proficiency.**

- 1 **Research: None**
 2 **Service: None**
 3 **3. Associate Professor**
 4 Degree: Doctorate
 5 Experience: A minimum of five years of college teaching.
 6 Time in Rank: A minimum of two years as an Assistant Professor at this university.
 7 **Teaching: Demonstrated teaching proficiency as evidenced by peer and**
 8 **student evaluations.**
 9 **Research: At least six (6) scholarly works (as defined in the Intellectual**
 10 **Contributions section), at least three (3) of which are refereed**
 11 **journal articles. Under exceptional circumstances, one (1) article**
 12 **may be under review at the time a faculty member submits**
 13 **promotion documents.**
 14 **Service: Satisfactory**
 15 **4. Professor**
 16 Degree: Doctorate
 17 Experience: A minimum of ten years of college teaching or relevant experience.
 18 Time in Rank: A minimum of four years as an Associate Professor at this university.
 19 **Teaching: Demonstrated teaching proficiency as evidenced by peer and**
 20 **student evaluations.**
 21 **Research: At least six works (as defined in the Intellectual Contributions**
 22 **section), three or more of which are refereed journal articles,**
 23 **since last promotion.**
 24 **Service: Satisfactory**

25 Evidence: The faculty member shall document that all data are consistent with university records and
 26 that evidence of degree completion, years of experience, and other factual information is on file in the
 27 Vice Chancellor's office.

28 **III. MERIT GUIDELINES**

29 All faculty are evaluated once every two years. Across-the-board or cost-of-living adjustments are
 30 given only if such adjustments are mandated by the University. Although teaching, research, and
 31 service are considered in the biennial review process, it is recognized that quality research and
 32 scholarly activity can often take longer than two years. Thus, a four-year time frame is used for
 33 research, while two-year time frames are used for teaching and service.

34 Expectations: It is recognized that not all faculty will contribute in the same manner or at the same
 35 level of performance. Expectations for teaching, research and service in each of the College's merit
 36 classifications are outlined below:

37 **Teaching:**

38 Multiple factors will be considered in evaluating teaching. Examples of these factors include:

- 39 1. **WHAT IS TAUGHT:** currency, relevance, meets ultimate customers' needs, depth and
 40 breadth, theory and application, creation of new course.
 41 2. **HOW IT IS TAUGHT:** effective use of teaching methods, appropriate pedagogy for course
 42 material, use of innovative teaching techniques, development of new pedagogy:
 43 a) Lecture and discussions - organization, clear presentation, stimulates thinking.
 44 b) Assignments - effective in evaluating students' learning, stimulates thinking, helps
 45 students to learn and communicate.
 46 c) Examinations - appropriate for course.

47 For the biennial review of teaching, each member of the faculty will submit documentation which best
 48 describes the quality of their teaching outcomes during the period under review. In so doing, each
 49 faculty member will specify his/her own judgment of what level of achievement has been attained (A,
 50 B, C, or D).

51 Meets Expectations (C). To justify a rating of Meets Expectations, the faculty member must submit:

- 52 • Student Opinion Surveys. Using the New Business Form (NBU), Student Opinion Survey data
 53 including associated grade distribution (for 50% of classes taught in the biennium) should
 54 demonstrate average ratings above 3.0 in all of the following:

- 1 1) Amount Learned (SOS 6, 17)
2 2) Professor Behaviors (SOS 9, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20)
3 • Syllabi from each course taught over the past biennium. All syllabi must contain each of the
4 following: course objectives, grading policy, multiple assessment criteria, and a timeline/schedule;
5 and be evaluated by the Faculty Review and Development Committee as satisfactory.

6 **Merit Rating:**

7 Faculty meeting the criteria for Meets Expectations (C) will be given a base Merit Rating of 100.
8 Additional Merit Rating Points can be earned as follows; however, no more than 60 Merit Rating
9 Points can be earned in any single category. Merit Rating Points cannot exceed 200.

10 *Category 1 (30 pts each)*

- 11 • Publish an article on teaching or curriculum improvement
12 • Complete requirements for UW System Teaching Scholar
13 • Present a paper on teaching/pedagogy at an academic or professional meeting and/or have such a
14 paper published in the proceedings from such meetings
15 • Conduct a teaching/pedagogical workshop at an academic or professional meeting
16 • Provide Student Opinion Surveys demonstrating average ratings above 4.0 in each of the two
17 groupings described above, for 80% or more of the surveys submitted.

18 *Category 2 (20 pts each)*

- 19 • Write and implement a substantive Teaching Development Plan that includes evaluation of teaching
20 effectiveness by self and external colleagues/sources, teaching philosophy, identification of
21 strengths and weaknesses, a plan to address weaknesses, and specific measurable outcomes.
22 Collection and evaluation of data must be provided.
23 • Develop and implement a comprehensive Classroom Assessment Plan that includes a blend of
24 evaluation techniques regarding important classroom outcomes [i.e., student reactions,
25 measurement of learning, changes in behavior (transfer of training) and improved effectiveness of
26 the major and/or College]
27 • Document success with mentoring another faculty member's teaching
28 • Present a Faculty College or COBA workshop on teaching pedagogy
29 • Administer pre/post test of student performance demonstrating statistically significant changes in
30 student knowledge on course. (20 pts max)

31 *Category 3 (15 pts each)*

- 32 • Attend a seminar on teaching improvement and demonstrate how it impacted your teaching
33 • Supervise an Independent Study
34 • Supervise funded student research
35 • Supervise or substantially participate in supervising a Masters' Thesis or Honor's Thesis
36 • Develop and teach a NEW course
37 • Document an innovative approach to teaching
38 • Receive 2 peer reviews (2 sections) (15 pts max)
39 • Perform 2 peer reviews (1 inside and 1 outside department) (15 pts max)

40 Exceeds Expectations (B). To justify a rating of Exceeds Expectations, the faculty member must attain
41 a Merit Weighting of at least 135.

42 Exceptional (A). To justify a rating of Exceptional, the faculty member must attain a Merit Weighting of
43 at least 170.

44

45 If faculty members do not provide the information required under "Meets Expectations" or if it is
46 evaluated by the Faculty Review and Development Committee as unsatisfactory, they will be
47 evaluated as (D) or (E).

48 Meets Most Expectations (D). 50 Merit Weighting Points. Faculty will not meet expectations if any of
49 the following occurs:

- 50 • Faculty fail to provide all the documentation required for Meets Expectations
51 • Faculty fail to meet the evaluation criteria for Meets Expectations
52 • Student comments, peer reviews, or other data demonstrate that the faculty member is not
53 performing at the Meets Expectations level.

1 Merit Not Justified (E). 0 Merit Weighting Points. Merit will not be justified if any of the following
2 occurs:

- 3 • Faculty member fails to submit more than 50% of the documentation required for Meets
4 Expectations
- 5 • There is significant evidence that the faculty member is not performing teaching at a satisfactory
6 level.

7 The presumption of Meets Expectations can be negated by evidence that indicates a faculty member
8 is not performing at the Meets Expectations level. The presumption of Does Not Meet Expectations
9 can be rebutted by additional evidence presented by the faculty member.

10 **Intellectual contributions:**

11 Faculty will qualify for one of five categories in the area of Intellectual Contributions. Qualifying for
12 placement in each of the performance categories will depend upon meeting specific criteria as
13 presented below. The requirements are expressed for a four-year time frame.

14 **Four Year Merit Table**
15 **Intellectual Contributions**

Merit Rating	Merit Weighting	Scholarship Activity Level
A. Exceptional	200	6 scholarly works, at least 4 of which are articles
B. Exceeds Expectations	150	5 scholarly works, at least 3 of which are articles
C. Meets Expectations	100	4 scholarly works, at least 2 of which are articles
D. Meets Most Expectations	50	3 scholarly works, at least 1 of which is an article
E. Merit Not Justified	0	

16
17
18

Merit Table
For Faculty with Three Years or Less In COBA

Merit Rating	Merit Weighting	Earliest Year Candidate Begins COBA Service		
		Less than 3 years*	Less than 2 years**	Less than 1 year ***
A. Exceptional	200	5 scholarly works, at least 3 of which are articles	4 scholarly works, at least 2 of which are articles	2 scholarly works
B. Exceeds Expectations	150	4 scholarly works, at least 2 of which are articles	3 scholarly works, at least 1 of which is an article	1 scholarly work
C. Meets Expectations	100	3 scholarly works, at least 1 of which is an article	2 scholarly works, at least 1 of which is an article	Evidence of scholarly work in progress
D. Meets Most Expectations	50	3 scholarly works	1 scholarly work	
E. Merit Not Justified	0			

19 * January 1st of year of merit review with more than 2 years but less than 3 years in COBA

20 ** January 1st of year of merit review with more than 1 year but less than 2 years in COBA

21 *** January 1st of year of merit review with less than 1 year in COBA

22

23 New Faculty: For faculty with three years or less in COBA, each faculty member will qualify for one of
24 five categories in the area of Professional & Scholarly Development by using the highest rating
25 developed from evaluating the individual based on each of two tables: (1) the Four Year Merit Table
26 (based on four years experience that can include experience prior to coming to UW Oshkosh); (2) the
27 Merit Table for Faculty with Three Years or Less in COBA (based on the appropriate column in which
28 the individual fits).

29 **Service:**

30 A faculty member is expected to attend Team and College meetings and make other value-added
31 contributions. Faculty will be evaluated for service activities, as previously defined, that require a

1 significant commitment of time and that are important to the reputation and functioning of the Team,
2 College and University. Service will be evaluated using information provided by faculty members
3 about their contributions to the Service mission of the College of Business. Information should include
4 description of leadership roles, effort level in terms of hours expended, and contribution in terms of
5 identifiable product(s). Team Leaders and Program Directors will be evaluated by the Dean (with input
6 from the relevant constituencies) for their contributions in those roles; the evaluation by the Faculty
7 Review and Development Committee will be based upon their contributions beyond those listed in the
8 position descriptions. If there is a difference in ratings for Team Leaders or Program Directors
9 between the Dean and the Faculty Review and Development Committee, they will meet to jointly
10 determine the final it rating for service.

11 The service categories include the following:

- 12 1. University level,
- 13 2. College of Business,
- 14 3. Team,
- 15 4. Student Services [student advising including career counseling, club advisor, participation in
16 club activities, commencement exercises, etc.],
- 17 5. Professional Services [e.g., professional speeches, consulting activities, seminars/workshops,
18 review of papers/articles/books, offices held in academic/professional organizations or
19 conferences, and community services related to your field of academic/professional expertise
20 that advance the service mission of the university],
- 21 6. Other Services [Any other significant service-related activities that were not addressed above.]

22 The faculty member will be placed in one of four performance categories based upon information
23 provided about the above service.

24 For the biennial review of service, each member of the faculty will submit documentation which best
25 describes the quality of their service contributions during the period under review. In so doing, each
26 faculty member will specify his/her own judgment of what level of achievement has been attained (A,
27 B, C or D).

28 Because there is a lack of consensus on what constitutes effective service, ratings will necessarily be
29 based on the professional judgment of the evaluators. It is the individual faculty member's
30 responsibility to put forward the best possible case for evaluation. Faculty will be placed in one of the
31 following groups:

32

33

Merit Rating	Merit Weighting
A. Exceeds Expectations	150
B. Meets Expectations	100
C. Meets Most Expectations	50
D. Merit Not Justified	0

34

35

36

37

38

39 Faculty who do not anticipate qualifying for the top rating in service (A. Exceeds Expectations) but do
40 feel qualified to receive the second rating (B. Meets Expectations) may elect to submit a set of
41 service-related documentation including only a list of the service activities in which he/she was
42 involved during the biennium. A statement from the faculty member should be provided indicating
43 his/her election to submit only the minimum documentation for evaluation.

44 Faculty who feel qualified to receive the top rating (A. Exceeds Expectations) must clearly describe
45 their rationale for this conclusion, supported by evidence. A more extensive set of documentation is
46 likely to be needed to support the case for the top rating.

47 New Faculty: During the first year, new faculty will "Meet Expectations" if they have limited or no
48 service that year. During the second year, new faculty will "Meet Expectations" if they have at least
49 Team or College committee service.

50 Division of Merit Pool: To address individual faculty strengths and interests, each College of Business
51 faculty member will select a set of three weights. These weights must comply with the ranges
52 indicated below and all weights will be expressed in integer multiples of 5%. The selected weights will
53 be provided confidentially to the Faculty Program Director at the beginning of the biennium. The
54 weights will remain confidential throughout the biennium and during the FRED Team's evaluation

1 process. After evaluation has been completed, the weights will be used in calculating individual faculty
2 merit increases. Allowable ranges are:

3	Teaching	35% to 45%
4	Scholarly & Professional Development	35% to 45%
5	Service	10% to 25%

6 Merit Review Process: Biennial evaluations are based on performance. The Faculty Review and
7 Development Team (FRED) is responsible for developing a uniform procedure for reporting
8 accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research, and service. This procedure shall be
9 communicated to the faculty prior to January 1 of the evaluation period. After the evaluation is
10 complete, each faculty member will be provided a written summary of his/her ratings in each of the
11 three performance categories. Within 20 working days of the date of this written feedback two
12 representatives of the FRED Team, and possibly the Dean, will meet with the faculty member for face
13 to face feedback on his/her performance and to discuss future professional development. For faculty
14 members receiving an overall evaluation that is below expectations the two FRED Team
15 representatives, the Dean and the faculty member will jointly create a development plan to improve
16 performance. This plan will specify dates on or before the next two-year merit/post tenure review to
17 assess improvement.

18
19 **REVISION AND UPDATING**
20 **COLLEGE OF BUSINESS POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

21
22 Every four years these Policies and Procedures for Appointment, Renewal, Promotion, Tenure and
23 Merit will be re-evaluated and any revisions will be recommended to the faculty for their action.
24

1 **College of Education and Human Services**
2 **Guidelines for Renewal and Tenure of Faculty**
3

4 The purpose of this document is to establish uniform criteria for renewal and tenure in the College of
5 Education and Human Services (COEHS). All COEHS departments are required to utilize these
6 guidelines for renewal and tenure. If departments wish to add to or further define these guidelines,
7 they are required to do so in writing, and to furnish those additional guidelines to the candidate.
8

9 Candidates for renewal and tenure are expected to contribute to the college and university through
10 their efforts in the three areas of (A) Teaching, (B) Professional and Scholarly Growth, and (C)
11 Service. Candidates are required to summarize data on Teaching, Professional and Scholarly
12 Growth, and Service in the renewal/tenure papers with evidence to support this summary to be
13 provided in separate folders. These summary data should be cumulative, providing information for all
14 the years the candidate has been a member of the COEHS staff. The accompanying documentation
15 should adequately support the summary and should follow the summary papers through the
16 department and college levels of review. Candidates will be evaluated as Superior, Above Average,
17 Average, Below Average, or Poor in each area by the department personnel committee, the
18 department chair, college personnel committee, and COEHS Dean. These evaluations represent
19 professional judgments of the candidates' performance. The rationale supporting these evaluations
20 will be specified at all review levels, and will be provided to the candidates in writing for all three areas
21 of review.
22

23 When a candidate for renewal has been credited with years of experience toward tenure prior to
24 joining the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh staff, the candidate will provide, within the renewal and
25 tenure papers, information and supportive documentation on Teaching, Professional and Scholarly
26 Growth Activities, and Service for those prior service years.
27

28 The kinds of evidence supplied by candidates in the Teaching, Professional and Scholarly Growth,
29 and Service areas will vary. Some evidence is required, while some is optional, with each being
30 labeled as such in the sections of this document in which the specific categories of evidence are
31 described. Evidence identified as "required" denotes information that is expected to be included in the
32 candidate's renewal and tenure papers.
33

34 While it is the responsibility of the candidate to provide documentation of progress in Teaching,
35 Professional and Scholarly Growth, and Service, it is the responsibility of the department and college
36 reviewers to evaluate this progress and communicate their conclusions and recommendations to the
37 candidate. When progress in any year is judged as being below what is expected for developing a
38 record which supports a positive tenure decision, the probationary faculty member will be given
39 explicit counsel and advice about expectations for the next renewal cycle by the level(s) of review
40 which found the progress to be below expectations. A written summary of this counsel and advice will
41 also be given to the candidate. It is not in the best interest of the faculty member, the department, or
42 college to continue to reappoint a probationary faculty member if it is clear that the person's record is
43 not adequate to support a positive tenure decision.
44

45 **STATEMENT OF EXPECTATIONS**
46

47 Expectations of what types of evidence are indicative of progress toward tenure vary with the
48 candidate's length of time at University of Wisconsin Oshkosh. A discussion of renewal and tenure
49 expectations will be held among the department chair, the chair of the department personnel
50 committee, and the candidate. A statement of expectations will be written after this meeting which
51 conforms to the College and department guidelines. This statement of expectations will cover the pre-
52 tenure period, with specific expectations listed. This statement will be submitted for approval to the
53 department personnel committee and the department chair within 90 days of a candidate's date of
54 hire. Approved copies of this statement will be provided to the new faculty member, the chair of the
55 department personnel committee, the department chair, the COEHS Dean, the Provost and the
56 Chancellor by the department chair.
57

1 The new faculty member is to utilize the statement of expectations to determine what s/he needs to
2 accomplish to achieve renewal and tenure. The statement of expectations is to accompany the
3 renewal papers each year and will be addressed by the candidate and the department in their renewal
4 documentation and evaluation. Should a candidate not meet the expectations stated in this pre-tenure
5 written statement of expectations, s/he may be non-renewed. Should the candidate be renewed
6 having not met the written expectations or should either the initial level of review or the Chancellor
7 desire modification in the written statement of expectations, a new written statement of expectations
8 will be provided to the candidate by the department chair.

9
10 To guide departments in developing specific written statements of expectations, the following general
11 expectations are provided.

12 13 GENERAL EXPECTATIONS

14
15 In general, during the first three years it is expected that the candidate will focus upon becoming an
16 effective teacher and upon establishing an on-going record of professional development, with a
17 gradual but increasing involvement in service activities. To support this emphasis, candidates
18 applying for renewal in the first three years will be evaluated as making satisfactory progress in
19 Teaching if they receive Average ratings by the department and college personnel committees. While
20 teaching is of primary importance, during the first three years candidates should be developing an
21 active professional and scholarly record that will provide evidence of at least three (3) publications
22 prior to the tenure decision which normally occurs during the candidate's sixth year of service.
23 Professional publications shall include juried journal articles, books, book chapters, professional
24 organization monographs, and other scholarly products that the departmental committees recognize
25 as appropriate substitutes. If a department personnel committee makes such a substitution, this
26 decision should be documented in writing in the candidate's "Statement of Expectations for
27 Probationary COEHS Faculty." During the first three years, candidates may submit evidence of
28 scholarly work that is "in progress" as an example of their professional growth and development over
29 the past year.

30
31 After three years of probationary service at University of Wisconsin Oshkosh, Teaching will be
32 weighted 50% and Professional and Scholarly Growth and Service each weighted 25% in the renewal
33 and tenure decision process. A candidate must have an Above Average rating in Teaching and an
34 Above Average rating in at least one of the other categories to be evaluated as making satisfactory
35 progress for renewal/tenure after three years of credited time on the tenure track.

36
37 After three years at University of Wisconsin Oshkosh, continued service at the department and college
38 levels with increasing involvement at the University level is expected.

39
40 Probationary faculty members who receive an appointment before they complete the appropriate
41 terminal degree will be expected to make satisfactory progress toward obtaining the degree. Progress
42 shall be monitored through a written plan and timeline developed by the candidate and approved by
43 the department personnel committee. Progress as specified in the plan and timeline will be described
44 by the candidate in the renewal/tenure papers. Failure to make satisfactory progress as specified in
45 the plan and timeline can be considered adequate cause for nonrenewal and non-tenure.

46
47 A specific description of the types of data to be submitted as evidence in the Teaching, Professional
48 and Scholarly Growth and Service areas is provided in the following sections of this document.

49 50 TEACHING

51
52 The College of Education and Human Services historically has had a strong commitment to effective
53 instruction. For this reason it is desirable that the renewal papers, both in the summary and the
54 supporting evidence, reflect in a comprehensive manner the teaching ability and the teaching growth
55 of the probationary faculty member. The teaching growth is identified by the cumulative nature of the
56 summary statement and evidence folders. A list of required and suggested optional items for inclusion
57 in this section are identified below to aid the probationary faculty member in the completion of this
58 section.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

A. Required Items.

- 1. Load Assignments (see "C. Load Assignments" below) - In the comment section, the faculty member may include statements pertinent to the assignments, such as new preparations, courses being taught outside of the department, off-campus site teaching, etc.
- 2. Student Evaluations - A summary of student evaluations should be included for 50% of classroom teaching assignments for the renewal period. Student comments should be included.
- 3. Peer Evaluations - Two evaluations from department and/or other college faculty members should be included for each renewal period. In general these would be tenured faculty members.

B. Optional Items. (Include all items appropriate to you.)

- 1. New courses developed, course revisions (documented).
- 2. Advisement: number of undergraduates; number of graduates; number of advisement encounters in the past year.
- 3. Theses, Independent Studies, Other.
 Thesis: Chair _____ Reader _____
 Title: _____
 Independent Study Contracts: _____
 Other: (Please specify.) _____
- 4. Teaching Awards and Grants.
- 5. Course Syllabi: At least one syllabus should be included for each renewal period.

PROBATIONARY FACULTY LOAD ASSIGNMENTS

Annual Renewal Period _____ to _____

C. Load Assignment.

1. Courses Taught:

Semester	Course No.	Course Title	Enrollment	Load Credit
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

- 2. Other: Non-teaching responsibilities assigned as part of load.
- 3. Comments:

PROFESSIONAL AND SCHOLARLY GROWTH

It is expected that candidates shall demonstrate a continuing consistent involvement in a variety of professional and scholarly growth activities listed in Level I and Level II. However, professional activities in Level I are required and evidence of at least three (3) professional publications or

1 appropriate substitutions as determined by the departmental or college personnel committees must be
2 provided prior to the tenure decision.

3

4 Level I

5 A. Publications (indicate if juried)

6 1. National distribution

7 2. Regional or local distributions

8 3. Article submissions

9 B. Presentations

10 1. Papers read at major conferences

11 2. National presentations

12 3. Regional or state presentations

13 4. Local presentations

14 C. Grants

15 1. Funded, national level

16 2. Other funded grants

17 3. Grant proposals submitted

18 D. Research Activities

19 1. Completed

20 2. In progress

21 E. Other

22 Level II

23 F. Professional Development Activities

24 1. Attendance at faculty colleges

25 2. Workshops

26 3. Courses

27 4. Other (Give dates and descriptions)

28 a. Retraining

29 b. Intense, specific, hands-on conferences

30 c. Working with nationally known colleagues

31 d. Observing colleagues' classes

32 G. Memberships in Professional Organizations (Give dates.)

33 1. National

34 2. Regional

35 3. State

36 4. Local

37 H. Attendance at Professional Meetings (Give dates and responsibilities.)

38 I. Other

39 SERVICE

40 A candidate for renewal/tenure should show a gradual but increasing involvement in service activities
41 in all of the five categories listed below. During the first three years at University of Wisconsin
42 Oshkosh no specific service activities are required, but it is expected that the candidate begin to
43 establish a service record at the department, the college and the university levels during this period.

44 After three years at University of Wisconsin Oshkosh, a record of continued service at the department,
45 the college and the university levels is required. Although some service in each category is expected,
46 extraordinary service in any one category can compensate for limited service in another of the areas.

47

1 Additional services to professional organizations and/or to the greater university community are
2 optional but highly recommended. An optimum record of service will show a record of continued
3 service activities with a balance of activities across all five categories.

4

5 Service

6 A. To Department

7 1. Committees

8 2. Supporting and cooperating with department goals - examples: works cooperatively with
9 others, attends convocations, graduations, guest lectures, professor-for-a-day activities, to
10 specifically include governance roles.

11 3. Mentor to colleagues

12 4. Other

13 B. To College

14 1. Committees

15 2. Supporting and cooperating with the work of the college--especially governance activities

16 3. Advisor to student groups

17 4. Other

18 C. To University

19 1. Committees

20 2. Assuming leadership and governance roles

21 3. Other

22 D. To International, National, State, and Community

23 1. That directly relate to one's professional expertise

24 2. Service provided to community in terms of leadership roles

25 E. To Professional Organizations

26 1. To professional organizations of which you are a member

27 2. To professional organizations of which you are not a member - examples: task forces,
28 S.E.C. teams

College of Letters and Science

Policy on Reappointment and Tenure

Approved by L&S Faculty: February 22, 1991
Approved by Vice Chancellor: March 11, 1991
Approved by the Chancellor: March 12, 1991

INTRODUCTION

This document establishes the general policy for reappointment and tenure for the College of Letters and Science. It will serve as a guide for the development of policy specific to the particular discipline(s) by each academic department or unit. The activities in the areas of evaluation enumerated below are intended to preserve and enhance the excellence of the College of Letters and Science by encouraging faculty members to develop their full potential as teachers and scholars.

RELATIONSHIP TO UNIVERSITY MISSION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT POLICIES

The select mission calls for this University "to acquire, preserve, and disseminate knowledge," to intellectually "challenge students," and "to expect scholarly activity, including research, scholarship and creative endeavor." The University guidelines require that candidates for tenure demonstrate (1) "quality performance in teaching," (2) "scholarly achievement and institutional and extra institutional related professional services and activities at a level sufficient to ensure continued professional and intellectual growth," and (3) "a significant contribution to the growth and development of the institution."

AREAS OF EVALUATION

1. Teaching - Effective teaching requires mastery of the subject coupled with organizational and communication skills necessary to share this knowledge with students in a manner that encourages them to learn. Effective teaching requires continual updating of course subject matter and instructional techniques. Effective teaching may involve diverse pedagogical approaches and may take place in many settings, some removed from the classroom. Effective teaching may require collective as well as individual efforts in developing or revising a curriculum or carrying out cooperative instructional activities.

2. Professional and Scholarly Activity - Professional and scholarly activity implies active engagement with one's discipline or field. It includes the search for new knowledge, the expression of creative talent, and the application of existing knowledge to issues and problems within our society.

Professional and scholarly activity enables faculty members to acquire and maintain expertise within their disciplines and, where appropriate, across disciplines. It enhances their abilities to engage students both in gaining knowledge of their disciplines and in developing the skills by which that knowledge is acquired.

Professional and scholarly activity takes diverse forms depending upon each faculty member and upon each discipline. For the purpose of reappointment and tenure, the common criterion for all faculty members is that professional and scholarly activity must be demonstrated in such a manner that it can be observed and evaluated by appropriate peers.

3. Service - Service activities fall into three general categories: University, public, and professional. University service is work for the department, College, University and UW-System. Faculty members have an obligation to accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of the institution. Public service relates to the non-academic community, especially that public directly related to one's professional expertise. Service to the profession includes such activities as serving as an officer in a professional organization, acting as a peer reviewer for a journal, conducting on-site evaluations and visits for purposes of academic review or reviewing grant applications.

1 4. Relative Importance of Areas - Teaching effectiveness and professional and scholarly activity are
2 the two most important elements in reappointment and tenure decisions.
3

4 PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE

5
6 Each year probationary faculty members should show satisfactory progress in developing a record in
7 teaching and in professional and scholarly activity which will result in the granting of tenure. The
8 annual process of positive renewal should lead to the granting of tenure. It is expected that
9 probationary faculty will concentrate on effective teaching and on establishing a record of professional
10 and scholarly activity in their first years on the faculty. By the time of the tenure decision, a clear
11 record of accomplishment in both areas should be established. Although major service roles for
12 institutional governance are normally the responsibility of tenured faculty, probationary faculty will be
13 expected to participate in general department responsibilities in the latter half of their probationary
14 period.
15

16 RELATIONSHIP TO DEPARTMENT POLICIES

17
18 This document serves as the framework for policies to be prepared and adopted by each department
19 within the College. Department policies shall define more precisely what activities constitute
20 professional and scholarly activities for their faculty members, and what levels of performance are
21 necessary conditions for reappointment and tenure. Department policies also shall recognize the
22 various contexts and methods of instruction appropriate to specific disciplines as they define what
23 constitutes effective teaching. Departments shall identify appropriate types and levels of service.
24 Finally, department documents shall describe the kinds of evidence that must be presented for
25 evaluation in all three areas.
26

27 **Policy on Promotion Documentation**

28
29 **Policy:** In the College of Letters and Science, candidates for promotion must provide peer
30 evaluations as part of their documentation of Teaching Effectiveness.
31

32 **Rationale:** The procedures for promotion should be consistent with other personnel procedures in the
33 College of Letters and Science. In University guidelines peer evaluation is already one of the
34 permissible types of evidence that may be used to demonstrate teaching effectiveness.
35

36 Approved by Faculty Committee, Minutes of 28 February 2002
37 Also approved in a College-wide referendum 8 May 2003
38

39 **Policy:** Candidates for promotion shall submit comments and votes by all levels of review from the
40 most recent promotion consideration to the same rank if such a consideration took place in the
41 previous five years.
42

43 **Rationale:** The Promotion Committee should be provided with the same documentation that is
44 submitted to the Tenure and Renewal Committee. Reviewing previous comments and votes will help
45 clarify for the Committee whether the candidate has addressed any concerns expressed previously by
46 all levels of Review.
47

48 Policy Approved by the Faculty Committee, Minutes of 06 March 2002
49 Also approved in a College-wide referendum 8 May 2003
50

1 **College of Nursing**
2 **TARPS Renewal/Tenure/Post Tenure Review/Merit Document**
3

4 Introduction

5 The College of Nursing is committed to quality programs and services that prepare undergraduate
6 and graduate students to practice nursing in a progressive, dynamic health care delivery system. The
7 faculty contributes to the overall advancement of these programs through teaching excellence, a
8 commitment to professional and scholarly activities and research, as well as engaging in College,
9 University, and community service.

10
11 This document outlines the processes used to carry out Chapter 6 FACULTY PERFORMANCE
12 REVIEW, from the current *University of Wisconsin Oshkosh Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook*. It
13 includes faculty evaluation, performance and merit distribution process, and the post-tenure review
14 process. The primary purpose of this document is to assist the faculty in accomplishing the mission,
15 goals and objectives of the university. The guidelines and criteria facilitate the process of consistent
16 judgment in personnel decisions. Criteria for appointment, renewal, tenure and promotion are found in
17 the *UW Oshkosh Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook* Fac. Chapters 3, 4, 5: Appointment (Fac.
18 Chapter 3); Renewal and Tenure (Fac. Chapter 4); and Promotion (Fac. Chapter 5, Parts A, B, C).

19
20 A. Faculty Evaluation

21 Renewal, tenure, merit and post-tenure reviews will be based on faculty's ability to demonstrate
22 meeting the College of Nursing standards and criteria in the areas of teaching, professional and
23 scholarly growth and service. For teaching, evaluation and merit will be based on documentation
24 submitted as it relates to a variety of teaching performance categories: (1) course planning and
25 preparation; (2) actual teaching; (3) evaluation of student learning and providing feedback; and (4)
26 keeping up with the professional field in areas related to teaching performance.

27
28 Faculty evaluation for tenure is consistent with criteria outlined in Faculty Chapter 4, Part B of the
29 current *University of Wisconsin Oshkosh Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook*. The same
30 review process as listed for renewal shall be followed. In addition, for tenure, the *University of*
31 *Wisconsin Oshkosh Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook* (2001), indicates that a statement
32 shall be included from each reviewing level indicating addressing the following factors [stated in
33 Faculty Chapter 4.E.2.(2)]. For tenure decisions faculty need to meet the criteria stated in Faculty
34 Chapter 4.B.5.(5) except for those individuals for whom Faculty 4.B.5.(6) applies.

- 35 1. Teaching: Based on the review of the candidate's performance as documented in the
36 credentials under review, that the candidate has established a record of teaching
37 effectiveness that enables the reviewer to believe the candidate will make a significant
38 contribution to the future growth and development of the University.
- 39 2. Scholarly Activities: Based on the review of the candidate's performance as documented in
40 the credentials under review, that the candidate has established a record of appropriately
41 scholarly activities that enable the reviewer to believe the candidate will make a significant
42 contribution to the future growth and development of the University.
- 43 3. Service: Based on the review of the candidate's performance as documented in the
44 credentials under review, that the candidate has established a record of appropriate service
45 that enables the reviewer to believe the candidate will make a significant contribution to the
46 future growth and development of the University.

47
48 Weight of the Professorial Role Components

49 The standard weighting of the professorial roles will be as follows:

50

51 Teaching	50%
52 Professional & Scholarly Growth	25%
53 Service	25%

54

1 The above weighting of teaching (50%), professional and scholarly growth (25%), and service
2 (25%) is applied to all decisions of reappointment, tenure, merit and promotion.
3

4 The evidence as submitted by the faculty member will be considered according to the above
5 weighting unless documentation of a prior written agreement exists among the faculty member,
6 the TARPS Committee, and the Dean. The negotiated weighting should not hinder the faculty
7 members' progression through the professorial ranks or the achievement of the mission and work
8 on the College of Nursing.
9

10 B. Merit Distribution Process and Definition of Solid Performance

11 Merit evaluations can occur in two-year cycles for faculty. Based on faculty-determined weighting
12 of teaching, scholarly growth and service, a point system is used to reflect this weighting. Each
13 applicant is evaluated and points are assigned reflecting performance level in each of the three
14 areas using the faculty-approved merit criteria. The criteria are intended to describe the array of
15 possible options; faculty are not expected to meet all criteria listed. Points earned in each area
16 are summed for each person and forwarded to the Dean, who can modify the amount awarded
17 based on additional evidence and rationale, which the Dean will provide to the TARPS Committee.
18 When merit dollars are known, the dollar amounts are awarded based on the merit points earned
19 by each individual.
20

21 Criteria for the academic ranks of instructor through professor, outlined in the *College of Nursing*
22 *Faculty Handbook*, are considered in the evaluation of solid and meritorious performance. The
23 definition of solid and meritorious performance is provided in the document, "Criteria for Solid and
24 Meritorious Performance (pp. 89-91).
25

26 The College of Nursing TARPS Committee provides written feedback to individual faculty
27 regarding the rating given, along with suggestions, if any, for improvement. Both face-to-face
28 meeting and written feedback will be provided to the faculty member.
29

30 C. Post-Tenure Review

31 All tenured faculty who have not been promoted in rank or who have not received tenure within
32 the past four years will participate in a performance appraisal. Post-Tenure Review must include
33 the following:

- 34 1. Evidence of quality teaching, professional and scholarly growth, and service. These
35 guidelines are consistent with the merit process and the promotion process.
- 36 2. Written feedback will be given to the faculty member being evaluated. A face-to-face
37 feedback meeting with the Chair of the College of Nursing TARPS Committee will also take
38 place.
- 39 3. For faculty whose performance does not meet professional expectations in either the area of
40 teaching or professional and scholarly growth, or service, a faculty development plan will be
41 developed by the faculty member with input from the TARPS Committee and program
42 director. The plan should outline major goals to be attained in order to improve performance.
43 Progress will be evaluated on an annual basis by the faculty member and the TARPS
44 Committee with input from the respective program director and Dean until expectations are
45 met.
- 46 4. Results of the Post-Tenure Review can be used to determine merit pay adjustments without
47 conducting a separate merit review.
48

49 D. Faculty preparing material for TARPS consideration need to comply with University of Wisconsin
50 Oshkosh policies and procedures as well as those of the College of Nursing. Faculty should refer
51 to the appropriate section(s) of both the current *CON Faculty Handbook* and the *UW Oshkosh*
52 *Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook*.

PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

Faculty/Academic Staff

A clear, concise and organized presentation is recommended for all folders. The current UW Oshkosh *Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook (FASH)* outlines documentation guidelines for tenure, renewal, promotion, post-tenure review, and merit in the Faculty Personnel Materials chapters under Faculty Renewal & Tenure (Chapter 4); Faculty Promotion (Chapter 5); Faculty Performance Review (Chapter 6); and in the College Materials Appendix A for the College of Nursing. For academic staff, the *FASH* Academic Staff Personnel material in the chapters on Evaluation (Chapter 6), Contract Renewal (Chapter 7), Career Progression (Chapter 9), and Changes of Title (Chapter 11) outlines general University information. In addition, the *College of Nursing Handbook* gives guidelines for preparation of a folder.

Reappointment and Tenure Folders: Tenure track faculty applying for reappointment or tenure need to submit full documentation including physical evidence of teaching, professional and scholarly activities, and service. Copies of reappointment recommendations at all levels from prior years should also be included. Academic staff applying for reappointment need to submit documentation including physical evidence of teaching, professional and scholarly growth, and service.

Promotion Folders: Tenured faculty applying for promotion need to submit full documentation including physical evidence of teaching, professional and scholarly activities, and service.

Merit—for 2-year period

Three SOS's are required, plus a current vitae and brief discussion that addresses the following:

- A. Teaching:
Include documentation of (1) course planning and preparation (note your individual role related to group/team planning and/or course teaching; (2) actual teaching (SOS, peer evaluation, etc.); (3) evaluating student learning and providing feedback; and (4) keeping up in the professional field in areas related to teaching (See *UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN OSHKOSH FASH*, Chapter 6: Faculty Performance Review), and *College of Nursing Faculty Handbook*.
- B. Professional and Scholarly Growth:
List in vitae and provide first page only of any publications, presentation, grant proposals, etc. Clearly indicate status of any submitted manuscripts, grants, etc. List professional conferences attended and other professional activities; do not include conference brochures, etc.
- C. Service:
List service activities. Further evidence not required.
- D. Self-Evaluation:
Provide a self-evaluation related to the above three areas and identify goals for the future.

Post-Tenure Review

For post-tenure review, faculty ranked as solid or meritorious performers in the last merit review need only submit the summaries from one or two previous merit reviews for the applicable 4-year period. These summaries would provide evidence of the three required SOSs in addition to summaries of professional and scholarly growth and service. Post-tenure faculty who did not submit a folder for merit review, or did not achieve a ranking of solid or meritorious performer during the 4-year period, are required to submit a vitae and evidence related to teaching, professional and scholarly activities, and service (see *FASH*).

CRITERIA FOR PERSONNEL DECISIONS

The following criteria will serve as a framework for personnel decisions involving faculty in the College of Nursing. This includes appointment, reappointment (renewal), tenure and promotion.

I. APPOINTMENT

The appointments are made consistent with University Policies and Procedures (*UW Oshkosh Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook*, Fac. Ch. 3 & 5).

A. Assistant Professor

- | | | |
|-----------|-------------|--|
| Option 1: | Degree: | Doctorate preferred in nursing or relevant field |
| | Experience: | No minimum teaching experience |
| Option 2: | Degree: | 30 semester credits beyond masters in nursing in a planned program of study |
| | Experience: | Four years of experience including relevant clinical practice and at least one year full-time college teaching |

B. Associate Professor:

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| Degree: | Doctorate in nursing or relevant field |
| Experience: | Minimum of five years full-time college teaching and/or relevant experience. Evidence of scholarship including publication. |

C. Professor:

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| Degree: | Doctorate |
| Experience: | Minimum of ten years full-time college teaching and/or relevant experience. Evidence of scholarship including publication. |

II. CRITERIA FOR RENEWAL AND TENURE

INTRODUCTION:

The following represent the criteria for renewal and tenure in the College of Nursing. The activities and expectations as enumerated are intended to preserve and enhance the excellence of the College of Nursing by encouraging faculty members to develop their full potential as teachers, scholars and members of the University community. No candidate is expected to meet all the criteria listed. However, recognition will be given to faculty who meet criteria or are involved in activities that may be listed at higher ranks. Performance at meritorious level as defined in the College of Nursing criteria for solid and meritorious performance document is required for renewal and tenure. Tenure decisions require that the faculty member meet the criteria for promotion to associate professor (see *FASH*).

A. TEACHING

1. Assistant Professor

- Self-evaluation identifying strengths and area(s) for improvement.
- Peer evaluation of teaching attesting to quality of teaching.
- Teaching evaluations, one of which should be the University SOS tool in accordance with the *UW Oshkosh Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook* guidelines.
- Evidence of consistent quality in teaching as provided by data from students, faculty peers and clinical agency person(s).
- With a doctorate, directs students in independent study or thesis/clinical research paper.

2. Associate Professor
 - a. Same as Assistant Professor (a-e above) plus,
 - b. Development of course materials of quality (course proposals, syllabi and supplement, AV materials, etc.)
 - c. Development of research, teaching or other UW Oshkosh faculty development grant proposals.
 - d. Evidence of using a variety of teaching methods and/or experimenting with new method(s).
3. Professor
 - a. Same as Associate Professor (a-i above) plus
 - b. Evidence of increasing responsibility for chairing committees for thesis/clinical paper.
 - c. Recognition, citations or awards for excellence or high quality of teaching and/or new course development.

B. PROFESSIONAL AND SCHOLARLY GROWTH

1. Assistant Professor
 - a. For continued reappointment, evidence of doctoral course work.
 - b. Participates in scholarly continuing education programs.
 - c. Membership in at least one professional organization.
 - d. Evidence of regular participation in professional meetings and activities, for example, WNA, etc.
 - e. Achievement(s) as demonstrated through significant scholarly (including clinical) contributions to the profession.
 - f. Evidence of scholarship (publications or presentations).
2. Associate Professor
 - a. Same as a-f above, plus
 - b. Evidence of a continuing publication record required. Publishes in relevant, juried, or peer-reviewed professional journals, or book chapters, monographs, which make a contribution to nursing and nursing education.
 - c. Presents scholarly papers at regional or national meetings.
 - d. Active membership in professional organizations, i.e., serves on committees and holds office, etc.
 - e. Submits/obtains grants for intramural funding, etc.
 - f. Serves as mentor for junior faculty.
 - g. Serves as consultant to health agencies or organizations.
 - h. Achievement(s) as demonstrated through significant scholarly (including clinical) contributions to the profession.
3. Professor
 - a. Same as a-m above, plus
 - b. Presentation of scholarly papers at national and/or international professional meetings.
 - c. Evidence of a continuing publication record required. Publishes in relevant refereed professional journals of national and international significance; published books (texts/workbooks) which make a contribution to nursing and nursing education, and published multimedia packages.
 - d. Serves as editor/reviewer for publications in the field.

C. SERVICE

1. Assistant Professor
 - a. Actively participates and provides leadership on College of Nursing committees.
 - b. Serves as speaker and/or provides leadership at community events.
 - c. Serves on at least one University committee.
 - d. Provides leadership to community organizations.

2. Associate Professor
 - a. Assumes a leadership role in implementing the CON mission and goals.
 - b. Actively and consistently participates in College of Nursing committees.
 - c. Chairs College of Nursing committees or serves in a leadership role on committees.
 - d. Actively participates on University and/or UW System committees.
 - e. Serves as speaker and provides leadership at community events.
 - f. Serves on community organizations

3. Professor
 - a. Assumes a leadership role in implementing CON mission and goals.
 - b. Chairs and serves in leadership roles on College and University committees.
 - c. Actively participates in UW System committees.
 - d. Serves on state, regional or national projects.
 - e. Serves as speaker and provides leadership at community events.
 - f. Consistent, sustained record of service at all levels.

III.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

The normal minimum requirements for promotion and Appendix A (as outlined in the current University of Wisconsin Oshkosh *FASH* (5B.2-5B.5) include four categories: 1) degree, experience, and time in rank; 2) teaching effectiveness; 3) professional and scholarly growth, and 4) institutional and extra-institutional service. The CON follows University guidelines for promotion.

Evidence: The Dean shall document that data is consistent with University records and that evidence on degree completion is on file in the Provost/Vice Chancellor's Office.

REFERENCES

American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). (1987). *The core of academe: Teaching; scholarly activity, and service*. Washington, DC: Author.

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook

Chap. 1, 2 and 3	Personnel Materials
Chap. 4	Faculty Renewal & Tenure
Chap. 5	Faculty Promotion
Chap. 6	Faculty Performance Review

1/04 Approved CON Personnel Committee
12/03 Approved CON Personnel Committee
12/11/97 Approved CON TARPS Committee
1/11/99 Revisions approved CON TARPS Committee

1 **Guidelines and Criteria: Appointment and Progression**
2 **Instructional Academic Staff (IAS)**

3 **Introduction**

4 Instructional academic staff are expected to provide teaching and student guidance in clinical
5 settings as well as to coordinate clinical learning experiences. Instructional Academic Staff
6 may also teach theory courses if doctorally prepared faculty are not available. Instructional
7 Academic Staff assignments are fluid based on CON needs. Instructional Academic Staff
8 have input into the curriculum and are retained for their clinical expertise, role modeling, and
9 skill in supervision of students.

10 This document outlines guidelines and criteria for appointment and progression for
11 instructional academic staff within the College of Nursing.

12 **I. General Guidelines**

- 13 A. Instructional academic staff are appointed full-time, part-time (50% or more), or on a
14 per-course or per-cohort basis.
- 15 B. All appointments will be based upon criteria and needs established by the College of
16 Nursing.
- 17 C. The initial period of appointment varies on an individual basis and is based on the
18 needs of the CON in accordance with University policy.
- 19 D. The CON Dean hires IAS upon recommendation of the appropriate program
20 director(s).
- 21 E. The Personnel Committee reviews candidates for reappointment, progression, and
22 merit, and makes recommendations to the Dean of the CON (See II and III, and Merit
23 Criteria that follow).
- 24 F. Transfer to tenure track requires that the applicant apply for a declared open position
25 and be considered through the normal hiring process with recommendation of the
26 College Personnel Committee to the Dean of the CON.
- 27 G. Instructional academic staff will have voting rights in accordance with the CON Bylaws
28 and Faculty Senate policy.
- 29 H. Not more than 20% of the faculty of the College of Nursing may consist of IAS ranked
30 as clinical instructor, clinical assistant professor, and clinical associate professor.
- 31 I. Workload will be consistent with the CON workload policy.

32 **II. Criteria: Titles, Credentials, Experience and Responsibilities**

33 Please see the University Faculty and IAS Handbook, Academic Staff Personnel Matters
34 (Chapters 2-9) for full explanation of titles, contracts, and progression policies as they relate to
35 IAS.

- 36 A. Clinical Instructor/Lecturer
- 37 Degree: Master's Degree in Nursing or in progress with exception
38 from the Wisconsin State Board of Nursing
- 39 Experience: One year clinical practice within the past three years
40 in area of assigned teaching.
- 41 Responsibilities: Instructs students in the clinical setting within
42 guidelines and course objectives and with guidance
43 from mentor or level facilitator.
- 44 B. Clinical Assistant Professor/Lecturer

1 Degree: Master's in Nursing with specialty advanced certification
 2 and/or formal study beyond a masters in nursing.
 3 This could be course work for doctoral studies,
 4 course work toward or completion of a second
 5 master's degree, etc.

6 Experience: Minimum of three years clinical practice.
 7 One (1) year full-time college teaching.

8 Responsibilities: Sustained evidence of effective teaching and clinical
 9 competence. Independent selection, organization
 10 and development of course content and instructional
 11 materials and approaches are expected.

12 C. Clinical Associate Professor

13 Degree: Doctorate in Nursing or related field.

14 Experience: Minimum of five (5) years full-time college teaching
 15 and five (5) years clinical practice in area of clinical
 16 specialty.

17 Responsibilities: Required evidence of outstanding contributions to
 18 teaching, clinical practice, and service, including
 19 recognition by others in the profession for
 20 demonstrably sustained superior contributions.

21 **III. Reappointment Review/Merit Review**

22 Reviews are conducted to determine reappointment and merit for all instructional academic
 23 staff. Reviews are the responsibility of the College of Nursing Personnel Committee which
 24 submits recommendations to the Dean of the CON. Criteria for reappointment and merit are
 25 developed by the Personnel Committee with input from IAS. Feedback is provided in
 26 accordance with the College of Nursing and University expectations. Only IAS with continuing
 27 contracts are considered for merit recommendations.

28 2/26/99 Approved by TARPS
 29 12/03 Approved by Personnel Committee
 30 6/04/09 Reviewed, Revised and Approved by the Personnel Committee

This page is intentionally blank.

APPENDIX B

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

➤ **Academic Program Policies and Procedures**

➤ **Academic Program Review Process**

This page is intentionally blank.

Academic Program Policies and Procedures

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh Curriculum Policies and Academic Approval Procedures

(NOTE: Curriculum approval forms are available from chairpersons or the Provost and Vice Chancellor's Office.)

GENERAL

This document constitutes university curriculum policies and procedures. It provides the framework for changes in existing courses, additions or deletions of courses, and additions to or changes in academic programs. These guidelines reflect the UW System "Academic Program and Planning Guidelines," Academic Informational Series I (ACIS-I.0), Revised July 2003.

In general undergraduate curriculum changes need approval from each of the following: department, division (L&S), college committee, the Dean, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor. Approval of the College Dean indicates no duplication of courses within the department or outside the department or college, and consultation with other Deans as appropriate. If any other Dean raises an objection to a proposal the two colleges will work together to resolve the issue. The approval process is summarized in the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh ACADEMIC COURSE CHANGE MATRIX included at the end of this section.

If a course is interdisciplinary, involving more than one department or program, a separate forms A should be approved by each department (program) and then forwarded to the next level of review. A similar procedure should be followed in the case of inter-college course proposals.

If a course proposal involves a request to meet General Education or Non-Western requirements, the proposal must be approved by the General Education Committee before it is forwarded to the Provost and Vice Chancellor.

Changes in the graduate curriculum follow the same procedures as above except that approval of the Graduate Council Course Approval Committee and the Office of Graduate Studies are required along with the college deans.

COURSE NUMBERING

There are five course levels at University of Wisconsin Oshkosh and each is recognized by the number assigned. Each level has a specific and differentiated educational expectation and purpose.

Non-credit Courses - Courses with the primary purpose of meeting special interests of clientele without formally holding the student accountable for subject matter learned during or at the end of the course. These courses may be structured to accommodate all subject matter.

Lower-level Undergraduate Courses (100-299) - Normally freshman and sophomore courses which provide basic skills, general understanding, and a fundamental foundation for advanced courses. Some lower-level courses have prerequisites.

Upper-level Undergraduate Courses (300-499) - Normally junior and senior courses which require a student to have sufficient academic preparation in the subject before being allowed to enroll in the course. Usually, this level course requires prerequisite courses.

"Dual-level" Undergraduate/Graduate Courses (300/500-400/699) - Junior, senior, and graduate courses which require that the course syllabus differentiate educational objectives and evaluation criteria required for students taking the course for undergraduate credit from students taking the course for graduate credit.

1 Graduate-only-level Courses (700) - Graduate-only courses which generally require substantial
2 subject content background on the part of the student. Courses are structured so that a significant
3 level of scholarship in the subject matter is attained by the student.
4

5 COURSE VALUATION

6 University of Wisconsin Oshkosh offers courses for academic credit, courses for non-credit, and
7 courses that award Continuing Education Units. (Faculty expertise is a primary source for determining
8 course valuation.)
9

10 Credit Courses - Academic activities which require a student to study and/or participate in an
11 instructional setting (classroom, internships, field experience, career service, testing laboratory,
12 etc.) and which require a formal assessment of learning outcomes.
13

14 Non-credit Courses - The primary intent of non-credit courses is to meet the special interests and
15 needs of citizens in the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh service area.
16

17 Continuing Education Units (CEU) - These units of instruction and activities are also non-credit;
18 however, a time requirement is connected with each CEU. For each ten hours of instruction
19 and/or contact with an instructor, one (1) CEU is awarded.
20

21 Any non-credit instructional program which meets the following six criteria may be submitted to the
22 Division of Continuing Education & Extension for CEU approval:

- 23 1. The activity is a continuing education learning experience.
- 24
- 25 2. There are instructional goals/objectives and a description of the program content and
26 instructional methodology.
27
- 28 3. Content is organized and presented in a sequential manner.
29
- 30 4. The program planning and development includes input from the Division of Continuing
31 Education & Extension personnel and University of Wisconsin Oshkosh faculty with expertise
32 in the program area.
33
- 34 5. There is a provision for registration and certification for individual participants.
35
- 36 6. Minimum attendance, participation requirements, and appropriate evaluation criteria and
37 procedures are specified for each program.
38

39 TYPES OF COURSES AND COURSE APPROVAL PROCESS

40 Four types of credit courses are recognized at this university: regular courses, trial courses, and
41 contractual courses.
42

43 Regular Courses - A segment of educational activities formally organized into a common theme
44 which in total constitutes a central core of knowledge about a given discipline (or disciplines in
45 interdisciplinary courses). Also included within this category are certain "experiential" courses,
46 such as internships and field experiences, where the student's primary educational activities are
47 "practical applications" of previously learned principles and theories.
48

49 The approval processes for new courses, course revisions, and course deletions, with
50 identification of the proper forms for approval of each action, are listed in the ACADEMIC
51 COURSE CHANGE MATRIX.
52

53 Trial Courses - The purpose is to experiment with new academic thrusts which the faculty want to
54 investigate in the enlargement and/or integration of a discipline.
55

56 The approval process for a trial course is listed in the ACADEMIC COURSE CHANGE MATRIX.
57 A trial course may be offered no more than twice. If it appears worthy of further offering, the
58 course should be resubmitted as a "regular course."

1 Contractual Courses - Two types of contractual courses are recognized:

- 2
- 3 1. Independent Study - intended to allow a student to explore in-depth topics of scholarly interest
- 4 which are not attainable through a "regular" or "trial" course. A contract designating the
- 5 specific area of study and the required learning activities must be agreed upon by the
- 6 instructor and student and approved by the college and Office of Graduate Studies, where
- 7 applicable. Students then pursue the indicated topic of study independently with
- 8 individualized guidance from the instructor.
- 9
- 10 2. Related Readings - intended to have an instructor become directly involved in probing
- 11 assigned readings with the student in a tutorial relationship. The student pursues research
- 12 usually well beyond that required in "regular" or "trial" courses. Before beginning the course,
- 13 the student presents a bibliography of readings that he/she and the instructor have agreed
- 14 upon and which are to be reviewed and discussed. The outcome is a formal paper evaluated
- 15 by the instructor.

16

17 After a unit has a course approved as Independent Study or Related Readings, the decision to

18 offer such a course to a particular student is made at the department or unit level and approved by

19 the college and Office of Graduate Studies where applicable.

20

21 An undergraduate student may earn up to 12 credits in a combination of Independent Study and

22 Related Reading credits toward the 120 credits bachelor's degree. A graduate student may apply

23 up to 6 credits of Independent Study and Related Reading credits toward the master's degree.

24

25 EXISTING COURSES - CHANGES AND DELETIONS

26

27 Changes - The approval process for changes in existing courses such as title, cross listing, level,

28 revision, or credit value, is listed in the ACADEMIC COURSE APPROVAL MATRIX.

29

30 Deletions - The approval process for a department or college to follow in deleting a course from

31 their curriculum is listed in the ACADEMIC COURSE APPROVAL MATRIX.

32

33 A deleted course is one which is eliminated from a particular program curriculum. This means that

34 it is removed from the *Bulletin* and the *Timetable*. A deleted course cannot be "resurrected." Any

35 deleted course must go through the regular course approval process before it can be offered

36 again. It must be noted on Form C when the course was previously deleted and the reason for

37 that action.

38

39 The departments and college are expected to have a procedure for monitoring the frequency of

40 existing courses, and the latitude to make decisions regarding future offerings.

41

42 ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND APPROVAL PROCESSES

43

44 Following are definitions, criteria, and procedures for all academic programs within the university.

45 Procedures for approval of new programs or changes in existing programs, with identification of

46 appropriate forms for each action, are listed in the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh ACADEMIC

47 PROGRAM CHANGE MATRIX. Additional information will be found in the Academic Information

48 Series 1 (ACIS-1) GUIDELINES FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW (Revised July 2003). This

49 document is available in the Provost and Vice Chancellor's Office.

50

51 Major Program - An academic program which normally requires a minimum of 33 credits toward a

52 bachelor's degree or 12 credits toward a master's degree; it culminates in the awarding of a

53 degree to which the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents has authorized entitlement.

54

55 Minor Program - (NOT APPLICABLE AT THE GRADUATE LEVEL) An identifiable sequence of

56 courses with a minimum of 21 credits required in a subject field(s) which has been formally

57 authorized by the UW System Administration.

1 Emphasis Program - A program series of courses consisting of a minimum of 9 credits designed
2 to meet a "specialized focus" within an existing Board of Regents approved degree program and
3 for which the UW System Administration has given formal approval.
4

5 A specialized focus is defined by either the need of a clientele or an additional area of
6 specialization recently developed by the discipline.
7

8 An emphasis is a curricular offering which is listed by title or caption in catalogs, timetables, etc.
9 The term "emphasis" replaces all existing terms of track, option, concentration, collateral, and
10 other variously used academic program terms, except for major and minor programs and
11 certification programs.
12

13 Certification Programs - An identifiable sequence of courses approved by either a state licensing
14 agency, such as the Department of Public Instruction, or a professional organization, such as an
15 accreditation association. Credit hour minima are specifically set by each agency and/or
16 organization.
17

18 Program Discontinuance - Action to eliminate a minor or emphasis within a major shall, in
19 consultation with the Dean, be initiated at the department/unit level. Upon approval by a majority
20 of the academic department/unit a memorandum of justification for the recommendation of
21 program discontinuance and Form C shall be forwarded to the next level of review. The statement
22 in support of program discontinuance must contain sufficient detail and rationale. Among items
23 that the statement should address are enrollment trends, existing and projected faculty resources
24 and expertise, present and future job opportunities for graduates, relevancy of the program in light
25 of changing foci of the academic discipline, and recent program evaluations. The statement must
26 include a plan by which students already admitted shall be provided the opportunity to complete
27 the program. Key provisions of the plan shall specify the conditions and the timelines for
28 completion of all requirements.
29

30 The process and forms to eliminate a certification program are the same as for a minor with the
31 exception that the UW System Administration is informed of the action.
32

33 UNIVERSITY HONORS PROGRAM PROPOSED COURSE

34 Instruction to the Proposing Department

35 The Department should forward the following information to the University Honors Committee.
36
37

- 38 1. Description of Proposed Course
 - 39 a. Course goals and objectives
 - 40 b. Is this a special section of a general education course? (Yes or No)
 - 41 c. Is this a special honors course which can be taken by students as an elective? (Yes or No)
 - 42 d. How does this course emphasize research and independent thinking?
 - 43 e. How is the content of this course developed to a deeper and more enriched level?
 - 44 f. Special activities associated with this course (e.g., field trips, projects, reading, artistic
45 performances, seminars)
 - 46 g. Testing and evaluation procedures for the course
 - 47 h. Enrollment restrictions, if any
 - 48 i. Staffing and resource implications
 - 49
- 50 2. Course Syllabus and Bibliography
51
- 52 3. Evidence of Teaching Excellence - Attach evidence of the teaching excellence of the faculty
53 member(s) proposed to teach the course. A resume and list of publications should also be made
54 available to the committee.
55

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN OSHKOSH ACADEMIC COURSE CHANGE MATRIX APPROVAL AND REVIEW LEVELS

<u>Course Proposals</u>	Academic Department/Unit									
	Division (L & S)		Relevant College Committee			College Dean		Other Deans (if affected)		Faculty Senate**** (After APGES and APC)
	Office of Graduate Studies and Graduate Council**			Provost and Vice Chancellor		Chancellor		<i>Forms to be completed</i>		
1. Title Change	Y	N	N	N	IO	Y	Y	Y	IO	A
2. New Course	Y	Y	Y	Y	R	Y	Y	Y	IO	A
3. Deletion*	Y	Y	Y	Y	R	Y	R	Y	IO	A
4. Revision	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	IO	A
5. Level Change	Y	Y	Y	Y	IO	Y	Y	Y	IO	A
6. Credit Value Change	Y	Y	Y	Y	IO	Y	R	Y	IO	A
7. Trial Course	Y	Y	Y	Y	IO	Y	IO	Y	IO	A
NO. OF COPIES REQUIRED:										
Undergraduate	***	***	***	1	1	***	---	1	1	
Graduate	***	***	***	1	1	***	1	1	1	

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

NOTATION:

- Y = Yes—requires approval/disapproval action
 - N = No—requires no approval action or information
 - IO = Information only—requires no approval action
 - R = Review only—requires objection/no objection notification
 - * = Review only—requires objection/no objection notification
 - ** = Only on items relating to Graduate Curriculum
 - *** = Depends on unit size
 - **** = Only on items relating to changes in General Education
- Appropriate forms are available in the Provost and Vice Chancellor's Office.

(Updated August 2008)

1
2

**UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN OSHKOSH ACADEMIC PROGRAM CHANGE MATRIX
APPROVAL AND REVIEW LEVELS**

	Academic Department/Unit	Division (L & S)	Relevant College Committee	College Dean	Other Deans (if affected)	Office of Graduate Studies and Graduate Council ^❶	Faculty Senate (After APC)	Provost and Vice Chancellor	Chancellor	UW System Administration	UW Regents	
PROGRAM PROPOSALS												
1.	New Major or Degree ^❷											Information Needed
	Stage 1. Preliminary Entitlement ^❸	Y	Y	Y	R	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	IO	Form C
	Stage 2. Authorization to Implement ^❸	Y	Y	Y	R	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Form C
	Stage 3. Implementation ^❸	Y	Y	Y	R	Y	IO	Y	Y	IO	--	Form C
	Stage 4. Joint Review ^❸	Y	Y	Y	R	Y	IO	Y	Y	Y	IO	Form C
2.	Degree Program Extended to a Second Institution	Y	Y	Y	IO	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	IO	Form C ^❹
3.	Substantive Redirection of Major/Degree	Y	Y	Y	IO	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	IO	Form C ^❹
4.	Eliminate Degree/Major/Minor (Submajor) /Emphasis	Y	Y	Y	IO	Y	Y	Y	Y	IO	IO	Form C ^❹
5.	Rename Degree/Major/Minor (Submajor)/Emphasis	Y	Y	Y	IO	Y	Y	Y	Y	IO	IO	Form C ^❹
6.	Establishing a Submajor or Certification Program	Y	Y	Y	R	Y	Y	Y	Y	IO	IO	Form C
7.	Establish, Rename, or Eliminate Department	Y	Y	Y	IO	IO	IO	Y	Y	IO	IO	Form C
<hr/>												
NO. OF COPIES REQUIRED:												
	Undergraduate	❸	❸	❸	1	1	--	1	1	1	1	--
	Graduate	❸	❸	❸	1	1	7	1	1	1	1	--
<hr/>												

- 3 NOTATION:
 4 ❶ = Only on items relating to Graduate Curriculum.
 5 ❷ = See UW System ACIS-1.0 guidelines for proper UW System formats & detailed explanations.
 6 ❸ = See entitlement in UW System ACIS-1.0.
 7 ❹ = No format specified by UW System; see Form C.
 8 ❺ = Depends on unit size.
 9 IO = Information only—requires no approval action.
 10 R = Review Only—requires objection/no objection notification.
 11 Y = Yes—requires approval/disapproval action.
 12 Form C and ACIS-1.0 guidelines are available in the Provost and Vice Chancellor's Office
 13 (Updated August 2008)

1
2
3
4

Nontraditional Academic Programs* Approval and Review Levels

Program Proposals	Faculty Comm.**	Affected Department Chairs***	Deans	CNL Academic Council	LLCE AVC	Faculty Senate (after APC)	Provost	Chancellor	UWSA	UW Regents
1. New major or degree:										
Stage 1: Preliminary Entitlement	Y	IO	R	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	IO
Stage 2: Authorization to Implement	Y	IO	R	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Stage 3: Implementation	Y	IO	R	Y	Y	IO	Y	Y	IO	--
Stage 4: Joint Review	Y	IO	R	Y	Y	IO	Y	Y	Y	IO
2. Degree program extended to second institution	IO	IO	IO	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	IO
3. Substantive redirection of Major/Degree	Y	IO	IO	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	IO
4. Eliminate Degree/Major/Minor	Y	IO	IO	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	IO	IO
5. Rename Degree/Major/Minor	Y	IO	IO	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	IO	IO
6. Establish a Submajor or Certification Program	Y	IO	R	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	IO	IO
7. Establish, Rename, or Eliminate Department	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

5 Approved 04-14-06; updated August 2008.

6 * Interdisciplinary programs administered and delivered through the Center for New Learning
7 within the Division of Lifelong Learning and Community Engagement

8 ** Program Development Faculty Committee as defined in the Recommended Curricular
9 Approval Process for Nontraditional Degree Programs. (Contact Provost and Vice Chancellor's
10 office for copy.)

11 *** Chairs of departments with courses included in the proposed program curriculum.

Academic Program Review Process

Academic program review will occur every seven years except for new programs which must undergo a joint System and institution review after five years as specified in ACIS-1. Every effort will be made to schedule reviews to coincide with scheduled accreditation visits. (Sections of an accreditation report with content comparable to any of the information requested below may be inserted unchanged in the appropriate location.) Also, opportunity will be provided for Deans and/or program faculty to identify programs that, for any reason should be evaluated out of their usual seven-year cycle.

Program faculty and Deans should seek evaluation by external consultants as a supplement to the internal self-study. Consultants will be selected by program faculty in consultation with the Dean and Provost and Vice Chancellor. Consultant honoraria will be funded by the Provost's Office; other expenses will be funded by the Department/College.

The program self-study document should not exceed 25 pages in length (excluding appendices), using a 1 ½" left margin and 1" right, top, and bottom margins, 12 pt font size, and double spacing. Both the document and appendices are to be as brief as possible.

GOALS OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

The program review process shall serve as a basis for program evaluation and for long-range curriculum and resource planning. Its goals are to:

- I. Identify program goals, objectives and performance trends and relate them to College and University missions, goals, and societal needs
- II. Document quality and adequacy of staffing
- III. Analyze resource availability and utilization
- IV. Evaluate strengths, weaknesses and needs
- V. Recommend future directions

SELF-STUDY GUIDE FOR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW

The following serves as a guide for academic program reviews. Individual colleges may establish additional qualitative or quantitative criteria.

- I. Description of program (Major, Minor, and Service Functions)
 - A. Statement of goals and objectives and their relationship to College and University missions and goals and to societal needs.
 1. How does the program support the mission of the College and University?
 2. How does the program serve to strengthen the Department, College, and University?
 - B. Description of the major/minor and emphases.
Insert copy from current Undergraduate Bulletin, excluding course descriptions. If Bulletin is not current, add approved changes to current Bulletin copy. Nothing else is to be inserted here.
 - C. Describe major changes in the program since the last review and list courses added or dropped since that time. Have these changes kept the curriculum current?
 - D. Program Performance
 1. Trends relating to program performance for the past seven years. *Insert the following tables which will be provided by Office of Institutional Research. Nothing else is to be inserted here.*
 - a. Number of majors (head count)
 - b. Number of minors (head count)

- 1 c. Number of degrees granted
- 2 d. SCH production by department
- 3 e. SCH per FTE (if available)
- 4 f. Credits to Degree
- 5 g. Semesters to Graduation
- 6 2. Course Scheduling Patterns/Enrollment
- 7 a. *Insert course scheduling patterns table provided by Office of Institutional Research.*
- 8 b. List all department courses in the current Bulletin which have not been offered within
- 9 the last three years and briefly explain why each was not offered.
- 10 c. Provide enrollment projections for the next five years (for the numbers of majors and
- 11 minors only). Indicate data source/basis for projections.
- 12 E. Relationship to Other Academic Programs
- 13 1. Briefly discuss the program's service mission. What accommodations are made for
- 14 course needs of non-majors? *Insert credit consumption by other undergraduate majors*
- 15 *enrolled in courses offered by the department; table provided by Office of Institutional*
- 16 *Research.*
- 17 2. Identify any current or potential cooperative efforts between the program being reviewed
- 18 and other programs.
- 19
- 20 II. Staffing
- 21
- 22 A. Faculty. *Insert table of ranked faculty and continuing academic staff provided by Office of*
- 23 *Institutional Research and fill in specialty column.* Append a brief CV for each person listed
- 24 above, to include at a minimum:
- 25 1. Credentials
- 26 2. Juried publications, papers, and posters; creative accomplishments; and funded grants for
- 27 the past seven years
- 28 3. Sabbaticals during the past seven years
- 29 4. Involvement with field-based professional and/or clinical activities and service over the
- 30 past seven years
- 31 B. Adequacy of Staffing
- 32 1. *Insert table from Office of Institutional Research indicating changes in faculty by*
- 33 *resignation, retirement, non-retention, etc. since the last program review (supplement*
- 34 *table as necessary).*
- 35 2. Describe problems, if any, in recruiting and/or retaining faculty. How have these problems
- 36 been addressed?
- 37 3. Describe departmental teaching load policy.
- 38 4. List activities in which faculty currently engage without credit against teaching load, e.g.,
- 39 small sections taught as overload and independent study.
- 40 C. Describe clerical and administrative support staff and needs
- 41
- 42 III. Resources
- 43
- 44 A. Address the adequacy and quality of support services which are critical to the major/minor.
- 45 1. Library collections and/or services
- 46 2. Non-print media collection
- 47 3. Computing services
- 48 4. Testing services
- 49 5. Availability of appropriate physical facilities, equipment, etc.
- 50 6. Other (please specify)
- 51 B. Extramural programmatic funding
- 52
- 53 IV. Evaluation
- 54
- 55 A. Append any assessment of the program by external consultants or accreditation groups and
- 56 your response to the assessment.
- 57 B. Describe results of assessment of student learning outcomes and how these results have
- 58 affected the program, curriculum, and assessment procedures.

- 1 C. Describe evidence of student satisfaction with the program. Provide results of surveys of
- 2 alumni and students.
- 3 D. Cite the placement and/or graduate program admissions experience of graduates.
- 4 E. Cite employer evaluation of graduates (where applicable).
- 5 F. Summarize areas of strength and weakness for the program.

7 V. Recommendations

- 9 A. List the recommendations of the Dean and Provost from the last program review and indicate
- 10 actions taken in response to those recommendations.
- 11 B. Have any changes been made or proposed as a result of this program review? Please
- 12 explain.
- 13 C. Indicate any additional recommendations regarding the future of the program, including
- 14 support and resources needed. These recommendations should be based on the information
- 15 presented and discussed in this program review.

17 SELF-STUDY GUIDE FOR GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW

18 The following serves as a guide for the review of graduate academic programs. The Graduate
 19 Council and/or individual colleges, in consultation with the Graduate Council, may establish whatever
 20 additional qualitative or quantitative criteria they deem appropriate for use in their evaluation efforts.
 21 Qualitative factors are considered of prime concern in the academic review process.

23 I. Overview of the program

- 24 A. Goals and Objectives
 - 25 1. Program
 - 26 2. Relationship to mission for Graduate Studies on this campus
- 27 B. Description
 - 28 1. Emphases, number of credits, and requirements for each emphasis
 - 29 2. Admission requirements unique to the program
 - 30 3. Process used for Admission to candidacy
 - 31 4. Culminating experience requirement(s)

33 II. Program Performance/Quality/Evaluation

- 34 A. Data relating to program performance (use tables)
 - 35 1. Number of students enrolled in program over a period of seven years (year-by-year data)
 - 36 2. Degrees awarded (year-by-year data)
 - 37 3. Average length of time to complete degree
- 38 B. Indicate changes and modification that have occurred since the previous program review.
- 39 C. Use standards of professional associations, accreditation bodies, and certification
- 40 requirements when applicable for program review.
- 41 D. Provide the evaluation report of the program by external consultants or accrediting bodies and
- 42 include a response to such reports. External consultants will be selected by program faculty
- 43 in consultation with the Graduate Council, Dean, chief officer of the Office of Graduate Studies
- 44 and Provost and Vice Chancellor.
- 45 E. Provide evidence of student satisfaction with the program
 - 46 1. Evaluation of the program by graduates
 - 47 2. Surveys or other comments
 - 48 3. Employer evaluations
 - 49 4. Placement and/or achievement of graduates
 - 50 5. Student evaluation of program
 - 51 6. What have students identified as a major issue in the program?
- 52 F. Trends influencing the program
 - 53 1. Describe the continuing needs for the program in terms of local, regional, and national
 - 54 trends.
 - 55 2. Indicate the immediate and projected employment and career opportunities available to
 - 56 program graduates.
 - 57 3. Identify key factors that may influence the future direction of the program.

1 G. Identify the primary strengths and weaknesses of the program relative to professional
2 standards and quality.
3

4 III. Curriculum Management

5
6 A. Indicate dual and graduate level courses by number and enrollment by section in each course
7 offered during the past seven years (use table).
8

9

<u>Total Courses</u>	<u># Sections Taught</u>		
	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Summer</u>
Dual level courses	_____	_____	_____
Graduate level courses	_____	_____	_____

10
11
12
13

14 B. Describe any special scheduling for part-time students.
15 C. Describe resources needed for the graduate program, and explain how they will contribute to
16 the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the program.
17 D. Indicate activities which faculty must engage in without credit against teaching load, e.g.,
18 small sections taught as overload, independent study, thesis advising.
19

20 IV. External Activities

21
22 A. Describe community outreach and/or in-service efforts.
23 B. Describe extramural or grant activities which have been developed for graduate program
24 support.
25

26 V. Faculty

27
28 A. Describe faculty qualifications to teach graduate level courses--list courses and faculty
29 expertise in those areas.
30 B. Describe the strengths, growth and development of graduate faculty.
31 C. Describe any changes in graduate faculty that have directly affected the program. How have
32 these problems been addressed?
33 D. State the FTE (as part of load) that are assigned to the graduate program.
34

35 VI. Support Staff and Services

36
37 A. Describe support staff and needs that are related to the graduate program.
38 B. Address the adequacy and quality of support services which are critical to the graduate
39 program.
40 C. Describe how Graduate Assistant workload is apportioned.
41

42 VII. Recommendations and Evaluation

43
44 A. Identify the strengths, weaknesses, and problem areas of the program as related to
45 curriculum, productivity, faculty, support staff and services.
46 B. Make specific recommendations regarding the future needs of the program.
47 C. Establish timeline for implementation of recommendations.
48 D. Report progress toward the implementation of recommendations as part of annual program
49 report.

1 **University of Wisconsin Oshkosh**
2 **Academic Program Review Process**
3

4 Unit/Department identifies self-study committee.



7 Self-study committee identifies external consultant(s)
8 to be approved by the Dean and Provost.



11 Office of Institutional Research prepares quantitative data for
12 program under review.



15 Program faculty completes self-study.



18 External consultant visits campus and completes report.



21 Program faculty committee(s) and chair complete program review assessment
22 including response to consultant's report.



25 College Program Review Committee reviews program assessments and makes
26 recommendations with copies to the dean and department chair.



29 Dean reviews program assessment and college committee recommendations and makes
30 recommendations with copies to the college committee and department chair.



33 If a graduate program, Graduate Council reviews program assessment and recommendations of
34 college committee and college dean, and makes own recommendations with copies to the
35 college dean, college committee, and department chair.



38 Academic Policies Committee reviews program assessment and recommendations of previous levels
39 and makes own recommendations with copies to the college dean, college committee,
40 and department chair.



43 Faculty Senate reviews program assessment and recommendations for information.



46 Provost and Vice Chancellor reviews all materials, recommendations, etc.,
47 and makes recommendations to the department with copies to the dean, college committee,
48 APC, and Graduate Council (if graduate program).



50 Provost and Vice Chancellor prepares summary report for System Administration.
51
52

Revised August 2005

Academic Program Review Process for Certification Programs

The program self-study document should not exceed 25 pages in length (excluding appendices), using a 1 ½" left margin and 1" right, top, and bottom margins, 12 pt font size, and double spacing. Both the document and appendices are to be as brief as possible.

GOALS OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW OF CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS

The program review process shall serve as a basis for program evaluation and for long-range curriculum and resource planning. Its goals are to:

- I. Identify program goals, objectives and performance trends and relate them to College and University missions, goals, and societal needs
- II. Document quality and adequacy of staffing
- III. Analyze resource availability and utilization
- IV. Evaluate strengths, weaknesses and needs
- V. Recommend future directions

SELF-STUDY GUIDE FOR PROGRAM REVIEW OF CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS

The following serves as a guide for academic program reviews of certificate. Individual colleges may establish additional qualitative or quantitative criteria.

- I. Description of certificate program
 - A. Statement of goals and objectives and their relationship to College and University missions and goals and to societal needs.
 1. How does the program support the mission of the College and University?
 2. How does the program serve to strengthen the Department, College, and University?
 - B. Description of the courses in the certificate program.

Insert copy from current Undergraduate Bulletin, excluding course descriptions. If Bulletin is not current, add approved changes to current Bulletin copy. Nothing else is to be inserted here.
 - C. Describe major changes in the certificate program since the last review and list courses added or dropped since that time. Have these changes kept the curriculum current?
 - D. Program Performance
 1. Trends relating to program performance for the past four years. *Insert the following tables which will be provided by Office of Institutional Research. Nothing else is to be inserted here.*
 - a. Number of program certificates granted
 - b. SCH production by certificate program
 2. Course Scheduling Patterns/Enrollment
 - a. *Insert course scheduling patterns table provided by Office of Institutional Research.*
 - b. List all department courses in the current Bulletin which have not been offered within the last three years and briefly explain why each was not offered.
 - c. Provide enrollment projections for the next three years. (Indicate data source/basis for projections.
- II. Staffing
 - A. Faculty. *Insert table of ranked faculty and continuing academic staff provided by Office of Institutional Research and fill in specialty column. Append a brief CV for each person listed*

- 1 above only if they are not faculty or academic staff at UW Oshkosh. Information should
2 include:
- 3 1. Credentials
 - 4 2. Juried publications, papers, and posters; creative accomplishments; and funded grants for
5 the past four years
 - 6 3. Sabbaticals during the past four years
 - 7 4. Involvement with field-based professional and/or clinical activities and service over the
8 past seven years
- 9 B. Adequacy of Staffing
- 10 1. *Insert table from Office of Institutional Research indicating changes in faculty by*
11 *resignation, retirement, non-retention, etc. since the last program review (supplement*
12 *table as necessary).*
 - 13 2. Describe problems, if any, in recruiting and/or retaining faculty. How have these problems
14 been addressed?
- 15 C. Describe clerical and administrative support staff and needs
- 16
- 17 III. Resources
- 18
- 19 A. Address the adequacy and quality of support services which are critical to the major/minor.
 - 20 1. Library collections and/or services
 - 21 2. Non-print media collection
 - 22 3. Computing services
 - 23 4. Testing services
 - 24 5. Availability of appropriate physical facilities, equipment, etc.
 - 25 6. Other (please specify)
 - 26 B. Extramural programmatic funding
- 27
- 28 IV. Evaluation
- 29
- 30 A. Describe results of assessment of student learning outcomes and how these results have
31 affected the program, curriculum, and assessment procedures.
 - 32 B. Describe evidence of student satisfaction with the program. Provide results of surveys of
33 alumni and students.
 - 34 C. Cite employer evaluation of program completers (where applicable).
 - 35 D. Summarize areas of strength and weakness for the program.
- 36
- 37 V. Recommendations
- 38
- 39 A. List the recommendations of the Dean and Provost from the last program review and indicate
40 actions taken in response to those recommendations.
 - 41 B. Have any changes been made or proposed as a result of this program review? Please
42 explain.
 - 43 C. Indicate any additional recommendations regarding the future of the program, including
44 support and resources needed. These recommendations should be based on the information
45 presented and discussed in this program review.
 - 46 1. Describe the continuing needs for the program in terms of local, regional, and national
47 trends.
 - 48 2. Indicate the immediate and projected employment and career opportunities available to
49 program graduates.
 - 50 3. Identify key factors that may influence the future direction of the program.
 - 51 D. Identify the primary strengths and weaknesses of the program relative to professional
52 standards and quality.
- 53
- 54

**University of Wisconsin Oshkosh
Academic Program Review Process**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

Unit/Department identifies self-study committee.



Office of Institutional Research prepares quantitative data for program under review.



Certification Program faculty/Director completes self-study.



Program faculty committee(s) and chair complete program review assessment including response to consultant's report.



College Program Review Committee reviews program assessments and makes recommendations with copies to the dean and department chair.



Dean reviews program assessment and college committee recommendations and makes recommendations with copies to the college committee and department chair.



If a graduate program, Graduate Council reviews program assessment and recommendations of college committee and college dean, and makes own recommendations with copies to the college dean, college committee, and department chair.



Academic Policies Committee reviews program assessment and recommendations of previous levels and makes own recommendations with copies to the college dean, college committee, and department chair.



Faculty Senate reviews program assessment and recommendations for information.



Provost and Vice Chancellor reviews all materials, recommendations, etc., and makes recommendations to the department with copies to the dean, college committee, APC, and Graduate Council (if graduate program).



Provost and Vice Chancellor prepares summary report for System Administration.

Faculty Senate Approved: 04-28-09

This page is intentionally blank.