

DEPARTMENT EVALUATION PLAN

Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders

PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF FACULTY AND INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF

2014-2015

This Department Evaluation Plan (DEP) describes procedures to be used in the periodic performance review of faculty and instructional academic staff in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders. Reviews are conducted with individual faculty and staff for the purposes of personnel decisions and professional development. All tenure line faculty and academic staff with renewable contracts are reviewed according to this DEP.

The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) of the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders is charged with the responsibility of overseeing Departmental personnel policies and procedures. Subsequent sections of this Plan address the Committee's philosophy underlying performance reviews, the composition of the Committee and its role in reviews, performance review categories and criteria, specific review procedures, and procedures for modifying the Department Evaluation Plan.

PHILOSOPHY UNDERLYING PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

Performance reviews are driven by both institutional and individual goals. On an institutional level, reviews are intended to ensure high quality educational programs by retaining and rewarding excellence of professional staff. On an individual level, performance reviews are intended to facilitate each faculty member's professional development. The DPC views these review goals as inter-related. Reviews that enhance individual professional personnel development contribute to positive personnel decisions, which, in turn, maintain and improve the quality of educational programs.

While performance reviews are mandated by the University, it is left to departments to specify the ways in which reviews will be conducted and the procedures that will be used to gauge progress toward institutional and individual goals. In the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, the DPC affirms the belief that performance reviews should serve both institutional and individual goals. Toward that end, the Committee endorses the philosophy that both summative and formative procedures should be used. Although both types of procedures involve an evaluative element, each serves different goals. Summative procedures primarily address institutional goals in that they lead to specific personnel decisions regarding re-appointment, promotion, and/or tenure. Formative procedures primarily address individual goals in that they focus on the professional development of individual faculty.

Departmental performance review procedures are consistent with the rules and criteria articulated in the University of Wisconsin—Eau Claire *Faculty and Academic Staff Rules and Procedures (6th Edition, July 2013)*. However, regardless of the procedures used, the DPC considers all performance reviews to be "peer reviews," because all review activities are conducted by and/or with professional peers and colleagues of the person being reviewed.

THE DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

All recommendations related to personnel policy and actions originate at the Department level and are reviewed at appropriate administrative levels. Recommendations made by the DPC are submitted to the Department Chair who, in turn, submits his or her recommendations together with the DPC recommendations to the Dean of the College of Education and Human Sciences. Following review by the Dean, recommendations are submitted to the Provost and Vice Chancellor, the Chancellor, and the Board of Regents, if Regent approval is required.

The DPC consists of all tenured faculty, excluding the Department Chair, with an appointment of 50% or more in the Department. The DPC will select a Chair and Secretary at the end of each academic year for the coming year. In the event that fewer than three tenured faculty members, excluding the Chair, are employed in the Department, no DPC will exist; the Department Chair will perform all activities normally assigned to the Committee. In the absence of a DPC, all tenured faculty will serve the Department Chair in an advisory or assistive capacity with respect to personnel matters. See Chapter 5 of the *Faculty and Academic Staff Rules and Procedures (6th Edition, July 2013)* for the responsibilities of the DPC.

Tenured faculty who have participated in activities of the DPC for at least two years prior to going on leave (e.g., sabbatical leave) may participate in performance review activities if they choose to do so. Collaborative planning by the DPC, the Department Chair, and the tenured faculty member on leave will lead to specification of that faculty member's participation in performance review activities during the leave. See Chapter 5 of the *Faculty and Academic Staff Rules and Procedures (6th Edition, July 2013)* for the responsibilities of tenured faculty on leave.

The DPC, in consultation with the entire Departmental faculty and instructional academic staff, make policy recommendations, such as the formulation of the Department Evaluation Plan (DEP). However, the Committee's role in performance reviews varies as a function of the type of review being conducted.

Summative reviews are conducted for re-appointment, rehire, and tenure recommendations according to the University schedule with the DPC working as a committee-of-the-whole. A sub-committee of the DPC comprised of all tenured faculty members, excluding the Department Chair, above the rank to which promotion is sought, considers recommendations for promotions. In the absence of three eligible faculty members, the Department Chair will conduct the review in consultation with all eligible faculty.

Formative reviews are conducted in both the pre- and post-tenure periods. In the pre-tenure period, formative reviews may be conducted, at the discretion of the faculty member, at the time of regularly scheduled performance reviews. In the post-tenure period, formative and summative strategies comprise the procedures used in all post-tenure peer reviews. For formative reviews, the faculty or instructional academic staff member being reviewed will invite individual members of the DPC to work on the review committee. The DPC, working as a committee-of-the-whole, acknowledges completion of post-tenure formative reviews. The summative elements should include: Qualtrics summaries for all courses taught during the period under review for which the faculty member was responsible for the majority of the course; student written remarks for these same courses; observation summaries from a DPC member for each course taught in the semester of review for which the faculty member was responsible for the majority of the course; any evidence or documentation the faculty member wishes to submit to support the decision at hand.

All meetings of the DPC are to be announced in accord with Wisconsin open meetings and open records laws. The person being reviewed may request, and will be granted, an opportunity to meet with the DPC during the review process, or the DPC may request that the individual being reviewed meet with the Committee.

All votes pertaining to a personnel action will be conducted by voice, by show of hands, by signed ballot, or by roll call. If any member of the voting body requests a roll call or signed ballot vote, then the vote must be conducted in that manner. In the case of signed ballot or roll call, the name and specific vote cast by each voting member must be recorded, preserved, and be available for public inspection. **The minutes of each DPC meeting will record the actions taken by the committee along with the vote and when appropriate, the individual votes of all members present.**

In reporting the results of any personnel action requiring a vote, the vote count (votes for, votes against, votes abstaining) will be recorded on the appropriate official personnel form. That form will be provided to the individual under consideration in the personnel action at the same time that it is forwarded to the next appropriate administrative level (Chair, Dean, etc.). **When an official personnel form has not been specified, the actions of the DPC will be communicated to the individual under consideration and the next appropriate administrator through a narrative letter composed by the Chair and the Secretary of the DPC.**

PERFORMANCE REVIEW CATEGORIES AND PROCEDURES: FACULTY

Review Categories

The University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire personnel rules provide that the review of faculty performance shall include, but not be limited to, consideration of the following categories: Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly Activity, Academic Advising, and Service.

- **Teaching Effectiveness** is defined as “the success of the instructor in securing interest, effort, and progress on the part of students. The primary consideration is that students are stimulated to better standards of scholarship, to keener interest in learning, to greater professional understanding, and to more effective effort toward self-improvement” (University of Wisconsin--Eau Claire *Faculty and Academic Staff Rules and Procedures (6th Edition, July 2013)*, Part III, Article 4, Section B, p. 54).
- **Scholarly Activity** is defined as “scholarship of a live and progressive character, manifested by continued study, scholarly interests, research, productive and creative work, and professional participation and performance” (University of Wisconsin--Eau Claire *Faculty and Academic Staff Rules and Procedures (6th Edition, July 2013)*, Part III, Article 4, Section B, p. 54).
- **Academic Advising Ability** is defined as “the effectiveness of the instructor in providing ongoing consultation for the student; in referring students to appropriate sources of assistance when necessary; in assisting the student in the development of a comprehensive long-range academic and career plan and the selection of each semester’s courses; and in monitoring the student’s progress toward the fulfillment of all applicable requirements” (University of Wisconsin--Eau Claire *Faculty and Academic Staff Rules and Procedures (6th Edition, July 2013)*, Part III, Article 4, Section B, p. 54). All full-time faculty will be assigned advisees starting in the second year of employment in the Department.
- **Service to the University, the Profession, and the Public** is defined as “the acceptance and fulfillment of the responsibility to serve the University, the professions, and the public through various activities which take place outside the classroom” (University of Wisconsin--Eau Claire *Faculty and Academic Staff Rules and Procedures (6th Edition, July 2013)*, Part III, Article 4, Section B, p. 55).

Priority Ranking of Categories

The Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders considers Teaching Effectiveness to be the highest priority among the review categories. Although Scholarly Activity, Academic Advising, and Service are considered to be of significant importance, these categories are viewed as secondary to and supportive of Teaching Effectiveness. Priority rankings are not assigned for categories other than Teaching Effectiveness.

Professional Development Plans

Each fall, each faculty member of the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders will formulate, in consultation with the Department Chair, a one-year Professional Development Plan. This Plan will include goals for the upcoming Academic Year in the four aforementioned performance review categories. Professional Development Plans will be kept in each instructor’s personnel file in the Department.

Although the Department assigns the highest priority to Teaching Effectiveness, needs and interests of individual faculty and/or needs and resources of the Department may lead to changes in individual professional goals. Accordingly, changes in review category rankings may be negotiated at the time of initial employment in the Department prior to a contract being issued. Later in an individual’s employment within the Department, a category other than Teaching Effectiveness may be considered primary for a given time span. Consequently, changes in **category** rankings may also

be negotiated at the conclusion of each performance review for a faculty member once a positive tenure decision has been reached.

When a tenured faculty member wishes to negotiate a change in review category rankings, a written proposal must be submitted for consideration to the DPC Chair and the Department Chair within a month after the Departmental aspects of performance review have been concluded. Under extraordinary circumstances, such written proposals may be considered if submitted at other times. The faculty member will be informed in writing within 30 days by the Department Chair whether the DPC and the Department Chair find the proposed changes acceptable.

Each faculty member's Professional Development Plan will be used in all performance reviews. For summative purposes, progress toward the goals outlined in the Professional Development Plan will be discussed during the Department Chair's annual meeting with each faculty member. Formative reviews are referenced to the faculty member's Professional Development Plan; it is expected that the review will contribute to the formulation of the next Plan.

Summative Reviews for Probationary Faculty and Faculty Promotion

Summative reviews evaluate faculty performances for the period covered by the review, and they lead to personnel actions. For tenure track faculty members, summative reviews serve as a basis for recommendations about re-appointment, tenure, and promotion. For summative reviews, the faculty member being reviewed submits required materials to the DPC. The Committee also collects other relevant information, such as classroom visits by members of the DPC and student evaluations, and all data are reviewed on a pre-specified review date. All recommendations are made following the review date.

Probationary Faculty. Summative reviews of probationary faculty are conducted for re-appointment recommendations and to monitor progress toward tenure. During the first year of employment, a summative review is conducted in fall semester even though the initial contract is for two years. During the second year, reviews are conducted in the fall semester for appointment to the third year and in the spring semester for appointment to the fourth year. In the third, fourth and fifth years of employment, reviews are conducted in the spring semester for appointment to the fifth, sixth and seventh years. For these reviews, data are collected typically during the semester prior to each review. However, depending on the date of the review, data from the semester in which the review occurs may be used. In addition, a Mid-Probationary Performance Progress Review will occur for probationary faculty in the spring of their third year as part of the annual performance review. The performance of probationary faculty members will be reviewed in all categories for summative purposes. Procedures for this Mid-Probationary Review are:

- Each probationary tenure track faculty member will develop a brief individualized faculty development plan which discusses how accomplishments to date fit the plan, and what she or he expects the dossier to contain at the point of the tenure and promotion decisions. The development of this plan should be coordinated with the DPC.
- The DPC and the Department Chair will review and discuss the dossier.
- The candidate, the Chair of the DPC, and the Department Chair will meet with the College Dean to discuss the dossier. The candidate's professional development plan will be considered in addition to her or his accomplishments in accordance with the plan. The outcome of this meeting could range from a commendation for good work to strong recommendations to alter the plan and/or the implementation of it or, if it appears that no reasonable course of action will result in a favorable tenure recommendation, to a recommendation for termination. This review shall serve as the annual performance review for the candidate.
- To assist an individual in working toward the Mid-Probationary Review, faculty mentor(s) will be appointed during the first year by the Department Chair in consultation with the new appointee. The mentor(s) should assist the new faculty member in assembling the mid-probationary review dossier and will meet with the DPC at the time the candidate is considered for tenure and promotion. (An individual's mentor(s) may change, depending on the candidate's needs and/or the availability of mentors.)

The DPC typically collects teaching performance data during the semester prior to the semester in which the review is conducted. However, individual probationary faculty may request classroom visits and/or collection of student evaluations of teaching for the “off” semesters or during the summer term, and these data may be submitted to the DPC for consideration during subsequent re-appointment, promotion, and tenure reviews. Data collected by the Department as part of the annual performance review process may also be submitted to the DPC.

Tenured Faculty. Summative reviews of tenured faculty are conducted as a basis for promotion recommendations, and reviews will address all categories outlined in this document.

Notification of Summative Review

Faculty requiring a mandated summative review will be informed about the schedule of reviews as specified in the annual administrative calendar. For summative reviews, each faculty member to be reviewed will receive written notification of the pending review at least 20 days prior to the review date by the Chair of the DPC. Faculty can self-nominate or be nominated by others for early tenure and early promotion. Deadlines for submitting nominations will be announced.

Review Materials and Procedures

Materials should be submitted for the period under review. Specific review purposes and the associated review periods are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1: Summative Review Purposes and Review Periods	
Review Purpose	Review Period
Re-appointment	Previous 12 months
Tenure	From initial appointment
First promotion	From initial appointment
Second promotion	From most recent promotion

All required materials relevant to the review, and including a complete professional career vita, must be submitted to the Chair of the DPC at least two weeks prior to the scheduled review. In addition, the person being reviewed may submit any additional materials he or she considers pertinent.

A statement of intent should preface all other materials submitted in support of the review. The statement should delineate factors relevant to the review, including philosophy of teaching, current career goals, professional objectives, and considerations that would alter a balanced contribution across categories secondary to Teaching Effectiveness.

All summative reviews for faculty must consider the categories of Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly Activity, Academic Advising, and Service. In addition, Required materials and review procedures for each of these categories will be addressed in the following sections.

Teaching Effectiveness

For re-appointment, promotion, and tenure decisions, academic teaching will be evaluated for each class being taught during the semester(s) in which data are collected. If the instructor is responsible for 50% or more of the instruction of a course, the DPC observations are mandatory. If the instructor is responsible for less than 50%, observations by the DPC may be conducted and/or requested by the instructor. In addition, clinical teaching will be evaluated for all types of clinical activities including direct supervision of screening, diagnostic evaluation, treatment and liaison supervision.

Academic Teaching

To evaluate academic teaching, members of the DPC will, and the Department Chair may, visit the classroom. Student evaluations will be accomplished by the DPC or its designee.

Classroom Visits. Within one week of notification of review, the instructor will furnish the DPC Chair and the Department Chair with a list of times when classroom visits are feasible. Such a listing should be provided for each class under review being taught during the data collection period.

At the time the list of visit dates is provided, the instructor will also submit to the DPC Chair a folder for each class taught during the review period. Each class folder should contain one copy of the materials listed below. The DPC will share this folder with the Department Chair.

1. Class syllabus with time schedule for the current semester
2. Other relevant materials may be submitted. Such materials may include, but are not limited to, information about course assignments, classroom innovations, examinations, and the like. Other relevant materials submitted could constitute a complete teaching portfolio.

A DPC member will visit each course under review being taught by the instructor. At least two DPC members will make teaching observations; if an instructor teaches only one course, these visits will occur on separate days whenever possible. The instructor will be informed about the planned days for any visits. The DPC encourages the instructor to talk with visitors prior to any visit about the goals, objectives, and planned activities for the sessions to be visited. DPC visitors for classroom observations will use a department-approved Classroom Observation Guide. A copy of the guide can be found in Appendix A.

Following each visit, a written summary indicating perceived teaching strengths and areas to improve will be drafted by each visitor who will then arrange to discuss the summary with the instructor. These summaries are placed in a Department personnel folder but are not sent to the Dean. They are considered, however, when the DPC drafts performance review documents for transmittal to the Department Chair. This procedure provides the instructor an opportunity to write a response to the summary to the DPC if he or she chooses to do so before the close of the academic year.

Student Evaluations. Each faculty member provides the department assessment coordinator with a set of student learning outcomes for each course taught. Course student learning outcomes are combined with a standard core of course and instructor items to generate a Qualtrics survey. Instructors must launch the survey for each course taught each semester. Instructors may choose to award students with extra credit points or to require completion of the survey as confirmed by the signed verification page in Qualtrics.

Clinical Teaching

The instructor will furnish the Chair of the DPC at least two weeks before the review with materials relevant to his or her clinical teaching for each type of clinical experience (i.e., screening, diagnostic evaluation, treatment, liaison). These materials will include, but will not be limited to, requirements, assignments, reading lists, and responsibilities for each clinical activity.

The Director of the Clinic is charged with launching the clinical Qualtrics survey. The Academic Department Associate will cut and paste Qualtrics data and written comments and send them to each clinical instructor, the Department Chair and the Chair of the DPC.

Scholarly Activity

The instructor will furnish the DPC Chair two weeks prior to the review with a list of scholarly activities and appropriate documents supporting the scholarly work. The four sub-categories for Scholarly Activity to be considered are: Scholarship of Discovery, Scholarship of Integration, Scholarship of Application, and Scholarship of Teaching (Boyer, 1990; Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997; and others).

Sub-Category A: Scholarship of Discovery

The scholarship of discovery refers to “research” in its traditional sense. It includes pursuit and discovery of knowledge through original research.

Sub-Category B: Scholarship of Integration

The scholarship of integration refers to “serious disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insight to bear on original research” (Boyer, 1990, p. 19). Further, integration involves “making connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way, often educating nonspecialists, too” (Boyer, 1990, p. 18).

Sub-Category C: Scholarship of Application

The scholarship of application refers to use of professional knowledge in serving the interests of the larger community. Scholarship of application is seen in activities where “theory and practice vitally interact, and one renews the other” (Boyer, 1990, p. 23).

Sub-Category D: Scholarship of Teaching

The scholarship of teaching refers to the consistent and systematic evaluation of teaching-learning efforts.

Evidence of Scholarly Activity

For any given sub-category of scholarly activity, instructors may present four types of evidence: major publications, presentations at professional meetings, other scholarly work, and other publications and/or participations. In the following paragraphs, descriptions and examples of each type of evidence are provided; examples are not meant to be either inclusive or exclusive.

Major Publications

This type of evidence includes products of substantial significance to the field of Communication Sciences and Disorders and to related fields, including, but not limited to, Education, Special Education, Early Intervention, Rehabilitation, Adult Health, Psychology, Linguistics, and Psycholinguistics. Give citations and include copies of items when possible. Items will be returned to the developer on request after conclusion of the review process. If the item has not yet been published or produced, describe the status of the work (e.g., in press, submitted). The following activities are examples of Major Publications.

1. Books
2. Articles in refereed journals, in print or on-line
3. Book chapters
4. Software
5. Video taped productions
6. Other media

Presentations at Professional Meetings

This type of evidence includes an array of activities associated with presentations at professional meetings. A judgment of the quality of the professional meeting, the review process used to select participants, and the role the participant played when a formal presentation was not required is to be provided for each item listed. The following activities are examples of Presentations at Professional Meetings.

1. Papers for presentation at professional meetings
2. Other presentations at professional meetings
3. Participation in professional meetings (e.g., chairing sessions, serving as discussant, participating in round table or panel presentations)

Other Scholarly Work

This type of evidence includes activities that support an array of professional and scholarly pursuits. The person being reviewed should provide supporting details about items in the category (e.g., amount of grant support received; number of student-faculty research projects supervised with the names of students and topics; length of presentations, topics, dates). The following activities are examples of Other Scholarly Work.

1. Grants received
2. Student-faculty research, including thesis direction
3. Presentations to faculty colleagues in the Department or elsewhere at UW-Eau Claire
4. Grants and research projects proposed
5. Attendance at professional meetings
6. Attendance at professional workshops
7. Research findings implemented in courses
8. Professional awards
9. Appointment as an editor or associate editor for a book or journal
10. Curriculum development activities

Other Publications and/or Participations

This type of evidence includes material written in support of someone else's written work. The following activities are examples of Other Publications and/or Participations.

1. Reviews of articles, chapters, books, software, or other professional material
2. Minor editing for publication (e.g., reviewer for someone's article submitted to a professional journal)
3. Production of manuals
4. Reviews of materials submitted to be considered for presentations at professional conferences (e.g., recommending acceptance/rejection of papers submitted for ASHA convention)

Academic Advising

The faculty member will furnish the Chair of the DPC two weeks prior to review with information about the numbers of graduate and undergraduate students assigned as advisees and a description of any extraordinary advising responsibilities (e.g., NSSHLA, unclassified graduate students, group advising coordination, etc.). A faculty member's academic advising ability will not be evaluated until he or she has advised students at UW – Eau Claire for at least two semesters.

Advising will be evaluated using a Qualtrics survey once a year. A link to the form will be distributed to undergraduate students by the Department Chair or a designee during the spring semester. The Academic Department Associate or Department Chair will distribute summary results of the evaluations to advisors and the Chair of the DPC.

Service

The faculty member will furnish the DPC Chair two weeks prior to review with a list of professional activities demonstrating service. All service activities should be listed and described, including dates of service and the time devoted to service activities.

It is recognized that at particular stages of careers, a sizable commitment to one or more forms of service may occupy a significant and valid amount of an instructor's time, energy, and skills. All sub-categories of service, described below, are judged to be of equal importance.

Service to the University: Service to the university refers to service with various groups such as committees and advisory boards, at the department, school, college, university, or system level.

Departmental citizenship is a departmental service requirement designed to foster a positive working environment and promote cooperation and collegiality. A candidate for hiring, promotion or tenure is expected to act professionally and ethically, be open to the ideas of other department faculty and staff, and assist other department members in carrying out the work of the department. Actively participating in department committee work, working with other department members to promote teaching, research and service excellence and solve problems that arise in the course of department work, and covering classes for colleagues and examples of positive departmental citizenship.

Service to the Profession: Service to one's profession refers to active participation in professional organizations at the local, state, national, and international level.

Service to the Public: Service to the public refers to participation in community movements of an educational nature, or in University Outreach activities, or to using one's professional expertise in consulting or advisory capacity to agencies, businesses, or individuals, or to similar types of activities through which the University and/or the Department achieves greater recognition and prestige in the community, state, and nation.

Summative Review Outcomes for Probationary Faculty and Faculty Promotion

Information provided to the DPC and the Department Chair during summative reviews of performance will be used to formulate a Performance Review Summary. Such summaries will characterize each review category as "*unacceptable*," "*fair*," "*good*," "*very good*," or "*excellent*." In addition, the same descriptors will be used to characterize overall performance. These descriptors will be used as the basis for recommendations. The following guidelines will be used in formulating recommendations.

Promotion to Associate Professor and/or granting of tenure may be recommended only when Teaching Effectiveness and at least two of the other three sub-categories receive ratings of "*good*" or better; the remaining sub-category must receive a rating of "*fair*" or better. A recommendation for tenure will not be made if any sub-category is rated "*unacceptable*."

- Promotion to Professor may be recommended only if performance in at least one of the four categories is rated as being "*very good*" or better and the others as "*good*" or better.
- A simple majority supporting vote from those DPC members casting votes or from its appropriate sub-committee will be required for a recommendation to grant tenure or promotion.

The Chair and Secretary of the DPC will transmit a copy of the letter sent to the Department Chair and then meet with the person being reviewed after the final Committee vote to transmit the Committee's evaluation of performance.

At least three workdays prior to the submission of review recommendations to the Department Chair or other University administrators, the DPC will provide copies of documents relevant to the current review to the person undergoing review.

Such documents may include student evaluations of classroom and clinical teaching, narratives about classroom visits, as well as the Performance Review Summary. The person being reviewed may submit a written response to these materials. If a written response is submitted, it will be attached to the original documents before the reports are forwarded to any administrators.

The DPC will forward to the Department Chair a written summary of the review along with all supporting materials that were submitted to the DPC. The Department Chair will meet with the probationary faculty member for the purpose of communicating to him/her the judgments of the Chair and suggestions regarding the faculty member's teaching and other responsibilities and to discuss progress toward tenure.

Faculty Formative Reviews

Formative reviews in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders have the purpose of facilitating the continued professional development of the faculty member being reviewed. The focus of such reviews is to expand existing areas of interest and expertise and/or to develop new ones.

In contrast to summative reviews, which are directed by the DPC, the faculty member being reviewed directs his or her formative review. Because formative reviews are faculty-driven, no materials are required for submission to the DPC. Moreover, specific timelines and procedures are not specified, and formal recommendations are not made following formative reviews. Formative reviews may be conducted in conjunction with routine performance reviews in the pre-tenure period, and probationary faculty may choose to participate in formative reviews prior to receiving tenure.

After tenure or a promotion is granted, post-tenure peer reviews, which have formative and summative components, are conducted at least every five years. During the spring semester preceding the review year, the Chair of the DPC will notify the faculty members to be reviewed of the upcoming post-tenure review. No more than two post-tenure formative reviews will occur within any one academic year. The post-tenure review should be accomplished by April 1 of the following year.

Post-tenure reviews are to be conducted according to the review process outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

PERFORMANCE REVIEW PROCEDURES: CLINICAL INSTRUCTOR

Prior to the 2008-09 academic year, instructional staff who did not hold tenure track positions were hired under an “instructional academic staff” position series. During the 2008-09 year, all department staff agreed to change these positions to a “clinical instructor” series. Use of the clinical instructor series does not confer faculty rank and does not lead to or count toward tenure. This series includes the following categories, appointment/advancement levels, and associated position requirements:

	Clinical Instructor	Clinical Assistant Professor	Clinical Associate Professor
<i>Position Requirements</i>	<i>Entry</i>	<i>Entry/Promotion</i>	<i>Entry/Promotion</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education 	Minimum of master's degree	Minimum of master's degree	Minimum of master's degree
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experience 	The equivalent of a minimum 3 years post-master's clinical experience; could include Clinical Fellowship Year (CFY).	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Entry/Promotion:</i></p> The equivalent of a minimum of 5 years full-time, post-master's clinical/academic experience; could include CFY; could include university service and A minimum of 60 university academic or clinical instruction credits taught	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Entry/Promotion:</i></p> The equivalent of a minimum of 7 years full-time, post-master's clinical/academic experience; could include CFY; could include university service and A minimum of 120 university academic or clinical instruction credits taught
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Job Performance 	Evidence of very good to excellent clinical skills based on supervisor observation	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Entry:</i></p> Evidence of “very good” to “excellent” clinical skills based on supervisor observation <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Promotion:</i></p> Positive student ratings of instruction/supervision and Positive supervisor evaluation of clinical/academic teaching skills; DPC judgment of, at least, “good” in the teaching category	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Entry:</i></p> Evidence of “very good” to “excellent” clinical skills based on supervisor observation <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Promotion:</i></p> Consistent positive student ratings of instruction/supervision and Positive supervisor evaluation of clinical/academic teaching skills; DPC judgment of, at least, “very good” in the teaching category and Evidence of professional leadership in clinical/academic practice beyond the CSD department (or in a broader community)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional Development and Certification 	Maintains clinical competence as evidenced by the accrual of CEUs Holds current national certification (i.e., ASHA)	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Entry/Promotion:</i></p> Maintains clinical competence in areas of expertise as evidenced by the accrual of CEUs and Holds current national	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Entry/Promotion:</i></p> Maintains clinical competence in areas of expertise as evidenced by the accrual of CEUs and Holds current national

	CCC) and WI DRL license	certification (i.e., ASHA CCC) and WI DRL license	certification (i.e., ASHA CCC) and WI DRL license <i>and</i> Receives recognition of leadership in clinical/academic instruction
--	-------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Review Categories

The University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire personnel rules provide that the review of clinical instructor performance shall include only the specific areas for which the staff member was hired. In that regard, Teaching Effectiveness will nearly always be the area of performance and review. The areas of Scholarly Activity, Academic Advising, and Service will be included in a review to the extent that these parameters of performance have been specified in the staff member’s contract. Definitions of Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly Activity, Academic Advising Ability, and Service, as specified on pages 2-3 of this document, will apply equally to clinical instructors and to faculty. If materials related to Scholarly Activity, Academic Advising, and Service are submitted to the DPC but not part of the clinical instructor’s contract, these materials will be reviewed and may be commented upon but will not be the basis of the summative review.

Priority Ranking of Categories

The Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders considers Teaching Effectiveness to be the highest priority among the review categories. Although clinical instructors may be reviewed in the areas of Scholarly Activity, Academic Advising, and Service, these categories are viewed as secondary to and supportive of Teaching Effectiveness.

Professional Development Plans

Each clinical instructor in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders (except those working under a “no intent to re-hire” contract) will formulate, in consultation with the Department Chair, a one-year Professional Development Plan each fall. This Plan will include goals for the upcoming Academic Year in the aforementioned performance review categories. Professional Development Plans will be kept in each instructor’s personnel file in the Department.

The clinical instructor’s Professional Development Plan will be used in all performance reviews. For summative purposes, progress toward the goals outlined in the Professional Development Plan will be discussed during the Department Chair’s annual meeting with each clinical instructor. Formative reviews are referenced to the clinical instructor’s Professional Development Plan; it is expected that the review will contribute to the formulation of the next Plan.

Summative Reviews for Clinical instructor

For summative reviews, the clinical instructor being reviewed submits required materials to the DPC. The Committee also collects other relevant information, such as observations based on classroom visits and student evaluations, and all data are reviewed on a pre-specified review date designated by University policy. All recommendations are made following the review date.

Summative reviews of clinical instructors with one-year or multiple-year contracts are conducted annually. An academic staff member on a contract with “no intent to re-hire” may elect to be reviewed following the procedures outlined in this document. The purpose of these summative reviews is to inform recommendations to re-hire.

The Department Personnel Committee typically collects teaching performance data during the semester in which the review is conducted. However, individual probationary clinical instructors may request classroom visits and/or collection of student evaluations of teaching for the “off” semesters, and these data may be submitted to the DPC for consideration during subsequent re-appointment or promotion reviews.

For reviews conducted during the fall semester, student data typically will be collected during the previous spring. For reviews conducted during the spring semester, data will be collected during the previous fall term. Data may be collected also during the summer term if requested by the DPC or the instructor.

Notification of Summative Review

Clinical instructors will be informed about the schedule of reviews as specified in the annual administrative calendar. For summative reviews, each clinical instructor to be reviewed will be notified of the pending review at least 20 days prior to the review date.

Review Materials and Procedures

Materials should be submitted for the period under review. Specific review purposes and the associated review periods are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2: Summative Review Purposes and Review Periods	
Review Purpose	Review Period
Re-appointment	Previous 12 months
First promotion	From initial appointment
Second promotion	From most recent promotion

All required materials relevant to the review, and including a complete professional vita, must be submitted to the Chair of the DPC two weeks prior to the scheduled review. In addition, the person being reviewed may submit any additional materials he or she considers pertinent.

A statement of intent should preface all other materials submitted in support of the review. The statement should delineate factors relevant to the review, including philosophy of teaching, current career goals, professional objectives, and when appropriate, any circumstances that would lead to consideration of categories other than Teaching Effectiveness.

All summative reviews for clinical instructors must consider the category of Teaching Effectiveness. Scholarly Activity, Academic Advising, and Service may also be considered if those parameters are specified in the staff member's contract. Required materials and review procedures for each of these categories will be addressed in the following sections.

Teaching Effectiveness

It will be true, without exception, that Teaching Effectiveness will be assigned the highest priority in all performance reviews for clinical instructors. For re-appointment or rehire decisions for clinical instructors, academic teaching will be evaluated for each class being taught during the semester(s) in which data are collected. Academic staff members may request DPC data collection for additional semesters. In addition, clinical teaching will be evaluated for all types of clinical activities in which the person is involved, including direct supervision of screening, diagnostic evaluation, treatment, and liaison supervision.

Because it is anticipated that all clinical instruction staff will be evaluated on Academic Teaching, those procedures from pages 5-6 are reproduced here. If an academic staff member is also to be evaluated on Scholarly Activity, Academic Advising, and/or Service, please refer to pages 6-9 for descriptions of materials and procedures.

Academic Teaching

To evaluate academic teaching, members of the DPC will, and the Department Chair may, visit the classroom. Student evaluations will be accomplished by the DPC or its designee.

Classroom Visits. Within one week of notification of review, the instructor will furnish the DPC Chair and the Department Chair with a list of times when classroom visits are feasible. Such a listing should be provided for each class taught during the data collection period.

At the time the list of visit dates is provided, the instructor will also submit to the DPC Chair a folder for each class taught during the review period. Each class folder should contain one copy of the materials listed below. The DPC will share this folder with the Department Chair.

1. Class syllabus with time schedule for the current semester
2. Other relevant materials may be submitted. Such materials may include, but are not limited to, information about course assignments, classroom innovations, examinations, and the like. Other relevant materials submitted could constitute a complete teaching portfolio.

A DPC member will visit each course taught by the instructor. At least two DPC members will make teaching observations; if an instructor teaches only one course, these visits will occur on separate days whenever possible. The instructor will be informed about the planned days for the visits. The DPC encourages the instructor to talk with visitors prior to any visit about the goals, objectives, and planned activities for the sessions to be visited. DPC visitors for classroom observations will use a department-approved Classroom Observation Guide. A copy of the guide can be found in Appendix A.

Following each visit, a written summary indicating perceived teaching strengths and areas to improve will be drafted by each visitor who will then arrange to discuss the summary with the instructor. These summaries are placed in a Department personnel folder but are not sent to the Dean. They are considered, however, when the DPC drafts performance review documents for transmittal to the Department Chair. This procedure provides the instructor an opportunity to write a response to the summary to the DPC if he or she chooses to do so before the close of the academic year.

Student Evaluations. Each faculty member provides the department assessment coordinator with a set of student learning outcomes for each course taught. Course student learning outcomes are combined with a standard core of course and instructor items to generate a Qualtrics survey. Instructors must launch the survey for each course taught each semester. Instructors may choose to award students with extra credit points or to require completion of the survey as confirmed by the signed verification page in Qualtrics. The Academic Department Associate will format Qualtrics survey results with comments for each course and provide those to the faculty member at the end of each semester. Faculty will submit survey results along with comments with review materials.

Clinical Teaching

The instructor will furnish the Chair of the DPC at least two weeks before the review with materials relevant to his or her clinical teaching for each type of clinical experience (i.e., screening, diagnostic evaluation, treatment, liaison). These materials will include, but will not be limited to, requirements, assignments, reading lists, and responsibilities for each clinical activity.

The Director of Clinical Programs in CCD is charged with collecting student data related to the instructor's effectiveness as a clinical teacher. If the Director is a member of the DPC, s/he will conduct the meeting. Otherwise the meeting is conducted by a DPC designate.

At the meeting, students will complete the Summary of Student Evaluations of Supervisors. A copy of this form can be found in Appendix C. Students also will be invited to generate spontaneous written comments. The DPC members or DPC designate will collect evaluation forms and written comments. To ensure anonymity of student generated data, the Department Program Assistant will type written comments, and handwritten originals will be given to the Department Chair for appropriate records management.

Summative Review Outcomes for Clinical instructor

Information provided to the DPC and the Department Chair during summative reviews of performance will be used to formulate a Performance Review Summary. Such summaries will characterize each review category as “*unacceptable*,” “*fair*,” “*good*,” “*very good*,” or “*excellent*.” In addition, the same descriptors will be used to characterize overall performance. These descriptors, along with information on workload, will be used as the basis for recommendations.

The following guidelines will be used in formulating recommendations.

- Re-appointing or rehiring of clinical instructors may be recommended only when Teaching Effectiveness and at least the majority of performance has received ratings of “*good*” or better; all other performance areas must receive a rating of “*fair*” or better. A recommendation to rehire will not be made if any performance is rated “*unacceptable*.”
- Promotion from Clinical Instructor to Clinical Assistant Professor may be recommended only if performance in the Teaching Effectiveness category has been consistently rated as being “*good*” or better and performance in any other categories reviewed has been rated as “*good*” or better. Performance criteria for this promotion are displayed in the table above.
- Promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor may be recommended only if a record of ratings of performance in the Teaching Effectiveness category has been “*very good*” or better and ratings of performance in the other categories reviewed has been “*good*” or better. Criteria for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor are displayed in the table above.

The Chair and Secretary of the DPC will transmit a copy of the letter sent to their Department Chair and then meet with the person being reviewed after the final Committee vote to transmit the Committee’s evaluation of performance.

At least three workdays prior to the submission of review recommendations to the Department Chair or other University administrators, the DPC will provide copies of documents relevant to the current review to the person undergoing review. Such documents may include student evaluations of classroom and clinical teaching, narratives about classroom visits, as well as the Performance Review Summary. The person being reviewed may submit a written response to these materials. If a written response is submitted, it will be attached to the original documents before the reports are forwarded to any administrators.

The DPC will forward to the Department Chair a written summary of the review along with all supporting materials that were submitted to the DPC. The Department Chair will meet with the clinical instructor member for the purpose of communicating to him/her the judgments of the Chair and suggestions regarding the academic staff member’s teaching and other responsibilities and to discuss personnel decision recommendations.

Formative Reviews for Clinical Instructor

Clinical Instructors may elect to participate in the formative review process. Formative reviews in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders have the purpose of facilitating the continued professional development of the clinic instructor being reviewed. The focus of these reviews is to expand existing areas of interest and expertise and/or to develop new ones.

In contrast to summative reviews, which are directed by the DPC, the instructor being reviewed directs his or her formative review. Because formative reviews are staff-driven, no materials are required for submission to the DPC. Moreover, specific timelines and procedures are not specified, and formal recommendations are not made following formative reviews. Formative reviews may be conducted in conjunction with routine summative performance reviews, using some or all of the materials and observations generated during

Formative Review Procedures

It is assumed that clinical instructors would wish the review process to address Teaching Effectiveness, as it is the only area included in all clinical instructor contracts. The other areas may be included, of course, if appropriate: Scholarly Activity, Advising, and Service.

The clinical instructor being reviewed conducts the formative review collaboratively with his or her peers from among the Department's faculty or clinical instructor. The academic staff member being reviewed will act as Team Captain and will invite at least two members from the Department to assist with his or her review. These assistants will serve as consultants, collaborators, and facilitators in the review process. The clinical instructor being reviewed also may choose any additional university faculty or clinical instructor to assist in the review.

Formative Review Outcomes

Formative reviews are conducted for the benefit of the clinical instructor being reviewed, and it is expected that these reviews will contribute to the instructor's formulation of a new Professional Development Plan. In addition, because of the collaborative nature of formative reviews, it is anticipated that all members of a review team will benefit from the group's reflections on professional activity.

All formative review information other than the vita and Professional Development Plan, oral or written, becomes the exclusive property of the clinical instructor being reviewed. Divulging any formative review information by anyone other than the person being reviewed for any purpose is prohibited without the express permission of the instructor being reviewed.

MODIFICATIONS TO THE DEPARTMENT EVALUATION PLAN

The Department Evaluation Plan is conceived as a dynamic document that reflects the values, needs, and resources of the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders. Consequently, modifications to the Plan will be considered regularly to ensure that the procedures used in performance reviews continue to be responsive to changes in the departmental environment.

The Department Evaluation Plan will be **reviewed annually in the spring semester** and may be modified at that time for implementation during the following academic year. Early during each spring semester, the DPC will meet with the assembled instructional staff of the Department to discuss the Department Evaluation Plan and the procedures for conducting performance reviews. Proposed changes in the Plan will be addressed at that meeting, and instructional staff comments and suggestions will be solicited. The Department Chair will not be present at the meeting, but the Chair of the DPC will share with the Department Chair clarifications and interpretations of the Department Evaluation Plan discussed in the meeting. Before modifications to the Department Evaluation Plan may be implemented, they must be reviewed and accepted in writing by the DPC, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Formal approval of a final, modified version of the Department Evaluation Plan should occur at all administrative levels by the end of the spring semester. The Department Chair shall distribute the approved plan to department members, thereby informing them of the agreed upon criteria.

If at any point during the development or revision of the plan, the DPC, the Department Chair, or the Dean cannot reach an agreement over any aspect of the plan, the next higher level (Department Chair, Dean, or Provost and Vice Chancellor) shall attempt to informally mediate any differences and to secure agreement so that the plan may move forward. If the Provost and Vice Chancellor's effort at informal mediation fails, the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee shall be convened by the Chancellor to examine the issues and to make a recommendation to the Chancellor concerning the portion of the plan for which an agreement could not be reached. The decision of the Chancellor is final. When the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee recommendation is supported by $\frac{3}{4}$ of those voting, the Committee can expect that its recommendation will be supported except for only the most compelling reasons.

APPENDIX A: Classroom Observation Guide

Faculty/staff member being evaluated _____

Course _____ Date _____

Instructions: Assign one of the following values to represent your impression regarding the topics below:
4 = Excellent 3 = Very good 2 = Satisfactory 1 = Needs improvement N/A = Not applicable

Presentation/Content - The instructor:

1. _____ Provided an introduction or oral overview of the topics to be covered in class that day.
2. _____ Used audiovisual aids: ___ whiteboard ___ doc cam ___ videos/audios
3. _____ Spoke audibly and enunciated clearly.
4. _____ Avoided distracting mannerisms.
5. _____ Made clear transitions from topic to topic with pacing conducive to learning.
6. _____ Interjected humor when appropriate.
7. _____ Was well prepared and organized and made good use of class time..
8. _____ Explained concepts clearly and sufficiently with examples, when appropriate.
10. _____ Bridged concepts with previous content or life experiences.
10. _____ Responded to students positively with adequate and appropriate feedback.
11. _____ Cited at least one study pertaining to a topic discussed.
12. _____ Provided learning activities to facilitate application of content and/or practice or skills.
13. _____ Created/maintained a safe environment that encouraged participation and an exchange of ideas.

Apparent Student Reactions - Students:

1. _____ Asked questions that demonstrated an attempt to apply skills/concepts from the course.
2. _____ Were actively engaged in the learning process by doing exercises, applying concepts when asked, working with peers, etc.

Course Syllabus and Course Handouts:

1. _____ Clearly state course expectations/outcomes.
2. _____ Include clear instructions for assignments.
3. _____ Cite current references.
4. _____ Provide explicit criteria for grading.
5. _____ Include all required university items (attendance, etc.)

Evaluator: _____

APPENDIX C: Summary of Student Evaluations of Supervisors

Supervisor: _____

Semester/Year: _____

No. Responding: _____ Graduate _____ Undergraduate

	A Strongly Agree	B Agree	C Undecided	D Disagree	E Strongly Disagree	F Not Applicable
201. There is sufficient opportunity for consultation with this supervisor						
202. This supervisor observes clinical sessions frequently enough.						
203. This supervisor provides sufficient constructive feedback to me about my performance in a clinical situation.						
204. This supervisor demonstrates knowledge of clinical rationale and methods.						
205. This supervisor provides an appropriate amount of direction through the clinical practicum experience.						
206. This supervisor communicates information and ideas clearly.						
207. This supervisor has helped me toward development of my professional attitudes and behaviors						
208. This supervisor has helped me improve my clinical interaction skills.						
209. This supervisor has helped me to improve my clinical record keeping and report writing skills.						
210. This supervisor has helped me to improve my clinical problem solving ability.						
211. This supervisor has helped my growth toward clinical competence.						
212. This person is an effective supervisor.						

APPENDIX D: Evaluation of Advising Rating Form

EVALUATION OF ADVISING SURVEY

**Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders (CSD)
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire**

Current Advisor: [drop-down menu here with all options available]

Current Standing: [drop-down menu here with all options available]

Number of semesters (including current) assigned to this advisor: [drop-down menu here with 1-11]

Check here if you have never met with this advisor: (Then do NOT complete the remainder of this survey. Simply select **Submit** below.)

RATE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS IN RESPECT TO THE ADVISING YOU'VE RECEIVED FROM THE ADVISOR NAMED ABOVE.

0	1	2	3	4
Cannot Rate	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

- 1 My advisor is helpful and knowledgeable regarding academic decision-making.
- 2 My advisor facilitates and encourages my participation in decision-making.
- 3 I find my advisor to be compassionate and supportive regarding academic matters.
- 4 My advisor maintains confidentiality about advising matters.
- 5 My advisor provided sufficient options for meeting times.
- 6 I was referred for assistance elsewhere by my advisor, when appropriate.
- 7 My advisor did not demonstrate racism, sexism, or harassment.
- 8 The advising I received helped me develop long-range plans.
- 9 My advisor kept organized and accurate records related to advising.
- 10 I feel my advisor was honest with me, even when it would've been difficult to do so.

◆ Please provide specific feedback for any rating scale items above that you rated as “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree.”

PLEASE ASSIGN AN OVERALL RATING TO THE ADVISING YOU RECEIVED.
[HAVE CHECK-BOX OPTION ON EACH 1-5 BELOW. ONLY ONE BOX SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO BE CHECKED.]

1	2	3	4	5
Low	Below Average	Average	Above Average	High

- ◆ What did you value most about your advising experience?
- ◆ Given the opportunity, how would you have changed your advising experience?
- ◆ Additional comments.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME!

**Marie A. Stadler, Ph.D., Chair
Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire
Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54702-4004**

APPENDIX E: Verification of Successful Post-Tenure Peer Review

**VERIFICATION OF POST-TENURE PEER REVIEW
The University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire
Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders**

I, _____, along with _____
(Faculty under review) (DPC Assistant)

and _____, have successfully completed my
(DPC Assistant)

_____ Post-Tenure Peer Review.
(Academic Year)

Faculty Member

DPC Assistant

DPC Assistant

Date

APPENDIX F: Performance Review Data Summary

CSD DPC Performance Review Data Summary for:

Name: _____ Date: _____ Years of UWEC Service: _____

DPC Secretary may use this sheet to record data from meeting, to relay information to the DPC Chair, and for reference in writing related letters from DPC to CSD Chair. This sheet must not be construed or used as a report in and of itself.

Current CSD ratings used here:

Excellent (E) / Very Good (VG) / Good (G) / Fair (F) / Poor (P) / Unacceptable (U)

NB: Not all areas below will necessarily be rated for each Faculty or Staff member, based on their contract and on other factors that may be negotiated with CSD Chair and DPC from time to time.

1. Teaching Effectiveness: **E** **VG** **G** **F** **P** **U** Vote Count: _____

2. Advising: **E** **VG** **G** **F** **P** **U** Vote Count: _____

3. Scholarly Activity: **E** **VG** **G** **F** **P** **U** Vote Count: _____

4. Service to University, Professions, Community, etc.:
E **VG** **G** **F** **P** **U** Vote Count: _____

5. Workload: Typical for Department Yes No Vote Count: _____

Comments: _____

6. Overall Rating: **E** **VG** **G** **F** **P** **U** Vote Count: _____

7. Recommended Reappointment: Yes No Vote Count: _____

8. Recommend Rehire (Academic Staff): Yes No Vote Count: _____

9. Recommend Tenure (Faculty): Yes No Vote Count: _____

Comments: _____

10. Recommend Promotion to: _____ Vote Count: _____

Comments: _____

Recorded by _____, DPC Secretary

APPENDIX G: Merit Raise Plan
Adopted by the CSD DPC
November 5, 2002

1. All faculty and academic staff on renewable contracts shall be considered eligible for merit raises.
2. The Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders adopts the "FLAT" merit raise plan.
3. The following system for awarding merit raises will be used.
 - a. Activities that should be considered for merit raises are:
 - teaching effectiveness, including academic teaching and clinical teaching
 - scholarly activity
 - academic advising
 - service
 - workload, including administration
 - b. An individual may be considered for the following levels of merit:
 - 1 = Solid performance: no additional raise for merit
Solid performance is defined as a performance level "typical" for our department and the usual, high expectations we hold for ourselves.
 - 2 = Initial level of merit raise on top of percentage raise (1 merit point)
 - 3 = Middle level of merit raise on top of percentage raise (2 merit points)
 - 4 = Highest level of merit raise on top of percentage raise (3 merit points)
 - c. One (1) to 2 merit points may be awarded to an individual in the areas of teaching effectiveness and/or scholarly activity. One point for activities noticeably above the typical performance in the department; two points for activities outstanding in the department. One (1) merit point may be awarded for excellent performance in academic advising, service, and/or workload.
 - d. The Chair of the Department is charged with deciding how many merit points each individual should be awarded. Any merit increases for part-time employees will be based on the person's percent of appointment. The Chair's recommendation for level of merit raise for each person is forwarded to the Provost.
 - e. According to the UW-Eau Claire Faculty and Academic Staff Comprehensive Salary Plan, the Chair's recommendations "along with any documentation supporting this rating, shall be shared with the faculty or instructional academic staff member at least two weeks prior to submission to the Provost and Vice Chancellor's Office. During those two weeks, the faculty or instructional academic staff member may request a meeting with the [Chair] to appeal his/her salary rating and to review his/her salary rating relative to the other ratings (without names) assigned by the [Chair]. In the event that the [Chair] and the faculty or instructional academic staff member cannot reach an agreement on an appropriate salary rating, the [Dean] shall meet with both the immediate supervisor and the faculty or instructional academic staff member to mediate the disagreement. The decision of [Dean] is final."
4. The merit play plan is to be included in the Department Evaluation Plan and thus included in the mandated annual review by the faculty and academic staff of the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders.