

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN – LA CROSSE  
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY & BIOCHEMISTRY  
Bylaws, Policies, and Procedures

Latest revisions passed by the CHM department on:  
May 23, 2025

## Table of Contents

<b><u>TOPIC</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
<b>I. <u>Title</u></b>	<b>5</b>
<b>II. <u>Organization and Operation</u></b>	<b>5</b>
A. Preamble	
B. Meeting Guidelines	
1. Conductance of Department Meetings	
2. Standards for Closed Session Confidentiality/Sharing of Outcome	
3. Minutes	
C. Definitions of Departmental Membership & Voting	
D. Definitions of Quorum and Majority	
E. Changes to These Bylaws	
<b>III. <u>Faculty/Staff Responsibilities</u></b>	<b>6</b>
A. <u>Faculty</u>	
1. Teaching	
2. Scholarship	
3. Service	
B. <u>Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Responsibilities and Expectations</u>	
1. Teaching	
2. Professional Development / Creative Activity / Scholarship	
3. Service	
C. <u>Non-Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations</u>	
D. <u>Student Evaluation of Learning Environment</u>	
<b>IV. <u>Merit Evaluation</u></b>	<b>9</b>
A. <u>Evaluation Procedures &amp; Criteria</u>	
1. <u>Faculty Annual Merit Review Criteria</u>	
2. <u>Instructional Academic Staff in Permanent Budgeted Instructional Lines Annual Merit Review Criteria</u>	
3. <u>Non-Instructional Academic Staff Process Overview &amp; Criteria</u>	
4. <u>Annual-Merit Review Procedures</u>	
5. <u>Department of Chemistry &amp; Biochemistry Annual Merit Review Committee</u>	
B. <u>Distribution of Merit Funds</u>	
C. <u>Appeals</u>	
<b>V. <u>Faculty Personnel Review</u></b>	<b>11</b>
A. <u>Retention (procedure, criteria, and appeal)</u>	
1. Peer Evaluation of Teaching	
2. Departmental Review Materials	
3. Dean's Review Materials	
4. Procedure	
5. Timeline	
B. <u>Tenure Review and Departmental Tenure Criteria</u>	
C. <u>Post-Tenure Review</u>	
D. <u>Faculty Promotion Procedures (procedure, criteria, and appeal)</u>	
1. Review Process	
2. Criteria	
3. Standards	
4. Reconsideration	
E. <u>Review of Faculty who are School of Education affiliated faculty</u>	

<b>VI. <u>Instructional Academic Staff Review</u></b>	<b>17</b>
A. Peer Evaluation of Teaching	
B. <u>Annual Review</u>	
1. Procedure	
C. <u>Promotion Procedures</u>	
1. Criteria	
2. Standards	
D. Appeal Procedures	
<b>VII. <u>Non-Instructional Academic Staff Review</u></b>	<b>20</b>
<b>VIII. <u>Governance</u></b>	<b>20</b>
A. <u>Department Chair</u>	
1. Election of the Department Chair	
2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair	
3. Annual Departmental Feedback on Performance of the Department Chair	
B. <u>Associate Department Chair</u>	
1. Election of the Associate Department Chair	
2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Associate Department Chair	
3. Annual Departmental Feedback on Performance of the Department Associate Chair	
C. <u>Standing Departmental Committees</u>	
1. Annual Merit Review Committee	
2. Faculty Retention/Tenure Review Committee	
3. Faculty Promotion Review Committee	
4. IAS Promotion Review Committee	
5. IAS Annual Review Committee	
6. CHM100/103-General Chemistry and General Education Assessment Committee	
7. Writing in the Major Program (WIMP) Committee	
8. Curriculum Committee	
9. Assessment Committee	
10. Public Relations, Outreach & Webpage Committee	
11. Major Purchases Committee	
12. Laboratory Safety Committee	
13. Seminar Series Committee	
14. Bylaws Committee	
15. Inclusive Excellence and Diversity Committee	
16. Strategic Planning Committee	
D. <u>Departmental Programmatic Assessment Plan</u>	
E. Mentor and Mentee Process for Probationary Faculty and IAS	
F. <u>Additional Departmental Policies</u>	
1. Salary Equity Policy	
2. Sick Leave & Vacation	
3. Faculty Request for Position/Time Release From Department Appointment	
4. Student Grievances–Grade Appeals	
<b>IX. <u>Search and Screen Procedures</u></b>	<b>25</b>
A. Tenure Track Faculty	
B. Instructional Academic Staff	
C. Pool Search (Contingency Workforce)	
D. Academic Staff	

<b>X. <u>Student Rights and Obligations</u></b>	<b>25</b>
A. Complaint, Grievance and Appeal Procedures	
1. Grade Appeals	
2. Academic Non-Grade Appeals	
B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct	
C. Advising Policy	
<b>XI. <u>Appendices</u></b>	<b>27</b>
Appendix A. Department Statement on Scholarship and Expectations for Scholarship During the Probationary Period	
Appendix B. Statement on School of Education Affiliated Faculty Teaching, Scholarship, and Service Expectation	
Appendix C. Guidelines for Peer Evaluation of Teaching Process for Probationary Faculty and IAS	
Appendix D. Observation Worksheet Template	

## **I. Title: UW-La Crosse Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry Bylaws, Policies, and Procedures**

### **II. Organization and Operation**

Department members are governed by six interdependent sets of regulations:

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

#### **A. Preamble**

These Bylaws were adopted by the members of the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry in accordance with the University of Wisconsin-System and University of Wisconsin-La Crosse Faculty and Academic Staff Personnel Rules.

#### **B. Meeting Guidelines**

##### **1. Conductance of Department Meetings**

- a. Department meetings will be run according to the most recent edition of Robert's Rules of Order, Wisconsin Opening Meetings Law (OML), and the UWL OML Guide.
- b. Department meetings regarding personnel review and/or hiring may go into closed session according to 19.85(1) (c) of Wisconsin Statutes.
- c. Personnel review meetings involve the evaluation of the individual's performance as articulated in Sections IV, V, and VI. In the event that there are concerns that are not directly reflected in the candidate's review materials but may impact performance, these concerns may be discussed within the committee meeting, directly with the department chair, and/or with the Human Resources department.
- d. The department adopts the additional standards under Section II.B.2 to maintain confidentiality of closed sessions discussions.
- e. Violations of the department closed session confidentiality standards may include disciplinary actions.

##### **2. Standards for Closed Session Confidentiality/Sharing of Outcome**

- a. **Individual.** The individual under review may share the outcome with anyone they desire. The individual under review may request how the committee members voted.
- b. **Committee.** The review committee (under closed session) may not share any commentary or discussion with anyone, even other committee members, once removed from closed session.
- c. **Faculty Member Serving on the Committee.** While not required, an individual committee member may share their own personal views about the individual's portfolio directly with the individual under review, even outside of closed session. They may not share any other views expressed during the closed session meeting.
- d. **Department Chair.** The chair communicates the outcome with the individual under review and may share themes from the review with the individual. If there are personnel outcomes that impact department individuals, the chair may share relevant aspects of the outcome or themes from the discussion with impacted individuals or the department as appropriate. The chair may not identify individual commentary.

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

#### **C. Definitions of Membership & Voting Procedures**

**Members** of the department are defined as:

1. All ranked (tenure-track or tenured) faculty (including those on leave or sabbatical who are in attendance)
2. instructional academic staff members with at least a 50% appointment
3. non-instructional academic staff members with 100% appointments

**Voting members** of the department include:

1. All ranked (tenure-track or tenured) faculty members who have at least a 50% appointment within the department (including those on leave or sabbatical who are in attendance) and instructional academic staff members who are in Redbook positions, as reported to the chair by the UWL Budget Office. Voting eligibility is specified within the respective sections of these Bylaws relating to those processes.
2. Proxy votes are not permitted in meetings of the department and its committees.

#### **D. Definitions of Quorum and Majority**

For meetings of the department and its committees, a quorum is defined as the majority of the entire membership eligible to participate. Within a meeting, a majority is the simple majority (>50%) of those physically present.

#### **E. Changes to these Bylaws**

These by-laws may be amended by the following procedures:

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

Any proposed amendment(s) shall be presented and distributed at a department meeting and voted on at the next subsequent meeting. Policies pertaining to personnel issues, which are the responsibility of the ranked-faculty (tenure-track or tenured), or of the tenured faculty may only be changed by those voting. Personnel matters include decisions on retention, reappointment, tenure, promotion, chair elections, and hiring.

Second readings may be waived for bylaws amendments that do not pertain to personnel decisions.

### **III. Faculty/Staff Responsibilities**

#### **A. Faculty**

Faculty responsibilities are referenced in section IV of the Faculty Senate Policies entitled "Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairs." A complete set of the policies are available off the Senate webpage under "Faculty Senate Policies".

**1. Teaching.** Teaching is the primary mission of the faculty in the UW-La Crosse Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry, and faculty members are expected to be active teachers throughout their careers. This teaching mission extends beyond traditional classroom instruction. It is expected that all faculty will take active roles in ensuring that all programs of study in the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry (majors and minors) are meeting the contemporary needs of the students in terms of preparing them for entering the workforce, graduate schools, and/or professional training programs. As a result, the members of the faculty of the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry are expected to contribute to the primary mission of the department in a variety of ways. Examples of teaching contributions may include, but are not limited to:

- Curriculum development through the designing and implementation of new courses aimed at increasing the knowledge of students in areas of responsibility.
- Advising students in departmental programs, as well as other students, in their programs of study. This also includes serving as the faculty advisor for undergraduate research and independent study projects as well as cooperative education (internship) opportunities. Mentoring students for projects such as seminars, written expositions, etc. is another means by which the faculty member can contribute to the student's academic preparations.
- Continued professional teaching development by attending workshops and seminars aimed at improving teaching effectiveness. The faculty members of the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry are expected to be actively seeking new methods of challenging and motivating students as well as increasing student learning.

The faculty members of the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry are expected to keep current in their subject matter area and to participate in curriculum development by improving and updating the courses they teach. Faculty members are further expected to offer additional time to address student questions by holding office hours. Office hours and other course details should be part of a course syllabus that is distributed to the students at the beginning of a course. In addition, faculty members are expected to grade and return student assignments, including examinations, in a timely fashion. Finally, faculty members are expected to allow student evaluation of instruction in each course they teach (except research, independent study, and capstone courses).

**2. Scholarship.** The acquisition of new knowledge in the discipline and the discovery of new, effective ways to communicate it are key elements that characterize activities of university faculty. Consequently, it is expected that faculty will be active scholars. "Scholarship," as outlined here, includes both traditional chemical research as well as scholarship in science education. See Appendix A, Section XI for the departmental "Definition of Scholarship."

It is certainly possible that the scholarly emphasis of an individual faculty member may vary over one's academic career, with more work in chemical research at one time and more in science education at another. The department regards the items listed below as typical indicators of a successful scholarly program:

- Peer-reviewed publication(s) reporting scholarship for which the faculty member is the corresponding author.
- Peer-reviewed publication(s) reporting innovative teaching, curricular, or programmatic efforts and results for which the faculty member is the corresponding author.
- Peer-reviewed publication(s) reporting scholarship because of collaborative efforts.
- Oral and poster presentations at local, regional, and national symposia that detail scholarly accomplishments, and which include student co-authors/presenters where appropriate.
- A record of accomplishment of consistent efforts to secure financial support for the faculty member's programs of scholarship, for the development of innovative teaching methods, and/or for wider departmental/college/university programs and needs.
- A program of scholarly work that involves students in the appropriate aspects of the work.

**3. Service.** Members of the faculty of the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry are expected to remain actively engaged in service to the university at all levels. It is also expected that the faculty will maintain some level of commitment to professional service and/or service to the public. Examples of service activities expected of the faculty include, but are not limited to:

- Serving on active departmental and college committees, including search and screen and ad hoc committees.
- Serving on standing Faculty Senate and UW-System committees. Chemistry faculty members are especially encouraged to display leadership in university governance, such as by serving as Chairs on university committees.
- Appointments with administrative responsibilities, including department chair, program directorships, etc.
- Volunteering to serve professional organizations.
- Reviewing manuscripts and grant proposals for professional, private, and government institutions.
- Involvement with community outreach projects such as workshops, demonstrations, science fairs and camps, etc.
- Participation in student recruitment activities. This could include admissions recruiting for the university and/or the recruitment of students into departmental programs.

#### **B. Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Responsibilities and Expectations**

Requests for IAS hiring will be presented to the college dean. The request will indicate one of the standard titles from the UW System Titling and Total Compensation Job Library including, assistant teaching professor, associate teaching professor, or teaching professor and will outline specific duties including teaching and any

additional workload. Total workload for IAS is defined as a standard minimum teaching load plus additional workload equivalency activity. Section X of the Faculty Senate Policies define IAS workload.

**1. Teaching.** The teaching expectations of IAS are similar to those of the tenure track faculty, as described in section III.A.1. Examples of teaching expectations and evidence for instructional academic staff are also provided in section 5.1.1.1 of the Guide to IAS Promotion UW-La Crosse.

These include, but are not limited to:

- Self-assessment of teaching (i.e., self-reflection, teaching philosophy and personal growth statements, course expectations, approaches to grading and evaluation, methodology)
- Peer evaluation of teaching
- Student evaluation of instruction
- Advising students

**2. Professional Development / Creative Activity / Scholarship.** As stated above, the primary responsibility of an IAS member is to provide quality teaching; however, since professional development activities allow an IAS member to remain current in chemistry, some level of professional development or scholarship is expected. Professional development activities for IAS may include, but are not limited to, those activities that can be shown to relate to the individual's teaching or service responsibilities (as described in section 5.1.1.2 of the Guide to IAS promotion).

These include, but are not limited to:

- Participation in workshops, institutes, seminars, graduate courses, or participation in professional organizations or attendance at professional meetings
- Publication of literature reviews
- Formal coursework
- Participation in continuing education
- Mentoring
- Scholarship (as defined in Appendix A, Section XI)
- In-service training
- Professional certification

**3. Service.** The expectations for involvement in service activities by IAS members of the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry will differ based on the individual's title prefix. Examples of IAS service activities (as provided in section 5.1.1.3 of the Guide to IAS promotion).

These include, but are not limited to:

- Serving on active departmental, standing Faculty Senate, and UW-System committees.
- Appointments with administrative responsibilities
- Volunteering to serve professional organizations.
- Peer reviews of manuscripts and/or grant proposals
- Administration of grants
- Participation in student recruitment activities. This could include admissions recruiting for the university and/or the recruitment of students into departmental programs.
- Organization of lecture series, institutes, workshops, etc.
- Consulting and advising

### **C. Non-Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations**

The responsibilities and expectations of non-instructional academic shall conform closely to the categories and duties outlined in each individual's job description and shall serve to aid in the goal setting and professional development of the staff member.



#### **D. Student Evaluation of Learning Environment**

The department will follow the UWL student learning environment survey policy and procedure available on the Faculty Senate webpage ([Learning Environment Survey Policy](#)). Results from student learning environment surveys are required for retention, tenure, post-tenure review, and promotion of tenure-track/tenured faculty and for renewal and promotion of Instructional Academic Staff. Student survey summary reports (described in Policy Section 1.C.3) must be included in promotion, retention, and tenure files.

### **IV. Merit Evaluation**

#### **A. Evaluation Procedures & Criteria**

In accordance with [UWS Administrative Policy 1254](#) and consistent with the [Board of Regents for the UWS Administrative Code](#), [UWS 3.05](#), [UWL 3.05](#), [UWS 10.03](#), and [UWL 10.03](#), the performance of all faculty (as well as continuing full-time instructional academic staff) in the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry will be reviewed annually. The areas of review shall include teaching, scholarship, and service activities (see [Sections III.A-B](#)). Each year during the first week of May, the department chair shall remind the faculty to complete the standard [UWL Annual Faculty Activity Report](#) that contains a description of their activities occurring between the dates, June 1 of the previous summer and May 30 of the current academic year. One electronic copy shall be emailed to the department chair by no later than May 31. This Annual Faculty Activity Report shall serve as a vehicle for self-evaluation, which, along with student and peer evaluations, will form the basis for the annual merit review. The results of these merit reviews for all ranked faculty and IAS, who have completed at least one academic year at UWL, are due annually by October 1 to the Dean's Office and/or the [UWL Performance Management System](#).

Prior to October 1, the Annual Merit Committee ([Section IV.A.4.a](#)) will meet and assess the completed [Annual Faculty Activity Reports](#), student learning environment survey, and peer evaluation information from the previous year to evaluate each department member's performance in the three areas of faculty responsibility (teaching, scholarship, and service) relative to the criteria specified below and detailed in [Section III.A](#) or [III.B](#). Department standards for closed session meeting confidentiality ([Section II.B.2](#)) shall apply to the review meeting. Within seven days of the department Annual Merit Review Committee meeting, the department chair will notify each faculty and IAS member, in writing, of their merit designation ("Meritorious" or "Non-meritorious").

New faculty members who begin in the fall semester do not undergo an annual merit review in that first semester. They are reviewed for retention early in the spring semester. If retained, the salary adjustment for these new faculty will be (by contract) the average increment generated by the pay plan.

Faculty members who are on professional leave are expected to submit a completed Annual Faculty Activity Report at the end of the spring semester describing their leave and other professional activities.

The merit review committee members responsible for the evaluation of the department chair and associate department chair may, at its option, meet with the college dean to gather additional information prior to completing this portion of the review. The committee should remain aware that the department chair, associate department chair, and certain faculty members serving as program directors typically have various administrative appointments that alter their normal balance of teaching, scholarship, and service obligations, and this should be considered during the evaluation.

**1. Faculty Annual Merit Review Criteria.** The criteria used in the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry to evaluate a tenure track faculty member's annual performance are designed to promote effective teaching, quality scholarship, and meaningful service ([Section III.A](#)). In ranking the importance of the areas of faculty responsibility, teaching is of greatest importance, followed by scholarship and service. It is expected that all faculty will direct some effort to all areas of faculty responsibility; however, considering the varied interests and talents of the faculty, it is not expected that all persons will distribute their efforts in these areas in the same manner.

**2. Instructional Academic Staff in Permanent Budgeted Instructional Lines Annual Merit Review Criteria.**

The performance of all continuing, full-time Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) in the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry will be reviewed annually for purposes of merit. Since IAS do not have the same range of faculty responsibilities as tenure track members, the merit evaluation of IAS will be based upon the quality of their classroom/laboratory teaching, their professional development activities, and their service activities (Section III.B). The process for evaluating continuing full-time instructional academic staff will follow that of the faculty, as described in Section IV.A.1.

Any meritorious activities or accomplishments as a university citizen not explicitly included in review criteria (Section III.A or III.B) should be described in the appropriate section of the Annual Faculty Activity Report or highlighted in an explanatory cover letter to that report.

**3. Non-Instructional Academic Staff Process Overview & Criteria.** Because the annual evaluation process for these department members is significantly different from that of instructional faculty, these reviews shall be conducted by a “Special Merit Review Advisory Committee” appointed by the department chair (this committee may be the Annual Merit Review Committee). The review of non-IAS shall conform closely to the categories and duties outlined in each individual’s job description and should serve to aid in the goal setting and professional development of the staff member.

**4. Annual Merit Review Procedures.** Department faculty members shall be evaluated annually for merit, and the distribution of any merit salary dollars shall be based upon this annual evaluation. Procedures for evaluating instructional academic staff and distributing any merit salary dollars follow those of the faculty members; however, IAS merit salary dollars are obtained from a separate pool of funds than those distributed to the faculty. The evaluation shall consider all of the criteria listed in Section III.A or III.B. In addition, the annual merit evaluation of instructors must assign “Meritorious” or “Non-meritorious” designations to each individual.

**5. Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry Annual Merit Review Committee.** Each year, an Annual Merit Review Committee consisting of seven faculty members (6 appointed, plus the department chair), shall be formed by the previous year’s Annual Merit Review Committee. Department faculty members who have submitted an Annual Faculty Activity Report for the previous year are eligible to serve on the committee. Members will serve two-year terms. Membership will be rotated such that each faculty member will serve no more than 2 years over a six-year period. The committee composition shall represent the diversity of the department, including rank, instructional position, and gender. The department chair shall serve as an *ex-officio* (non-voting) member. This committee shall evaluate all faculty members. Members of the Annual Merit Review Committee shall not participate in their own evaluations; rather, they will be excused, and the six remaining committee members will conduct the evaluation.

**a. Responsibilities and Procedures of the Annual Merit Review Committee**

**i. Responsibilities.** Committee members shall meet to review and discuss:

- Annual merit review procedures
- Standards for the determination and evaluation of merit
- Annual Faculty Activity Reports submitted by department faculty members
- Additional information not included in the submitted reports (e.g., student and peer evaluation, grade distributions, student grievances, etc.)

**ii. Assignment of Merit Designation.** The Annual Merit Review Committee shall conduct the merit review of all faculty, assigning the designation “Meritorious” or “Non-meritorious” to each member. To be considered “Meritorious”, faculty members must perform their teaching responsibilities at a satisfactory level, as determined by students and peers, and meet their basic departmental and professional responsibilities (Sections III.A or III.B). Faculty members regarded as not having met these responsibilities are considered to be “Non-meritorious”. Faculty on approved leave shall also be considered for a merit designation.

**b. Notification of Faculty of the Annual Merit Review Results.** The department chair notifies, in writing, all instructional department members of their merit designation within seven days of the completed actions of the Annual Merit Review Committee.

Those receiving “Non-meritorious” designation shall be notified, in writing, of the reasons for this action, and details regarding the automatic appeals process.

The department chair shall be notified, in writing, of their merit designation by the chair of the Annual Merit Review Committee.

#### **B. Distribution of Merit Funds**

Annually, the department may be allocated merit monies as determined by the action of the state legislature, the Board of Regents, and/or the UW-System Administration as a percentage of the department total salary package. These monies shall be distributed to faculty members based on the merit designation assigned through the merit review process. The pool of merit funds for academic staff is separate from the tenure-track faculty pool.

As stated in Section IV.A.4.b.ii, an instructor’s performance will be categorized as “Meritorious” or “Non-meritorious” based on their overall performance rating as determined by the Annual Merit Review Committee. Those placed in the “Non-meritorious” category will not receive merit funds.

#### **C. Appeals**

Receipt of a “Non-meritorious” designation by an instructor will initiate an automatic reconsideration process. For probationary faculty or IAS, the reconsideration meeting will be conducted by the appropriate retention committee. For tenured faculty, the reconsideration would be conducted by the Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTR). Reconsidered candidates who currently serve on the retention or PTR committees must recuse themselves from this process.

Appeals beyond the department level may be presented to the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals and Academic Freedom (CGAAF) Committee (see section I.E., of the Faculty Senate Articles & Bylaws). As in all processes involving the evaluation of personnel, mechanisms for merit evaluation appeals beyond the department level are established on this campus. Your attention is directed to the UW System Administrative Code, and the UWL Faculty Handbook.

### **V. Faculty Personnel Review**

The department will follow the policies regarding retention and tenure described in the Faculty Personnel Rules (UWS 3.06 - 3.11 and UWL 3.06 - 3.08).

Tenure/retention decisions will be guided by the criteria established in the Bylaws at the time of hire unless a candidate elects to be considered under newer guidelines. The criteria outlined in sections V.A and V.B "Faculty Personnel Review" in these Bylaws should be applied to faculty with a contract date after July 1, 2009.

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

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

Retention reviews shall be conducted by the Retention/Tenure Review Committee, which shall consist of all tenured members of the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry. In the case where there are fewer than three tenured faculty members in the department, the department chair shall work with the dean to establish an appropriate committee. The chair of the committee shall be the department chair.

## **1. Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

- a. This procedure applies to faculty members in their probationary period.
- b. During the first semester of employment, the department chair shall select two members from the Faculty Retention/Tenure Review Committee to serve as peer evaluators for the probationary faculty member. The chair will appoint new peer evaluators through the duration of the probationary period.
- c. Peer evaluators will serve two-year terms. Terms of the evaluators will be offset by one year.
- d. The probationary faculty member being evaluated will ensure that the peer evaluators have access to the learning management system for the course, and documents including the syllabus.
- e. Each peer evaluator will perform at least one classroom observation each semester. The classroom observation should occur within the first half of the semester. Peer evaluators will inform the department chair and instructor by email of the date of each classroom observation and course being observed.
- f. At least one week before each classroom observation, the peer evaluator and probationary faculty member will meet to discuss the upcoming classroom observation as articulated in **Appendices C and D**.
- g. Within one week after each classroom observation, the peer evaluator and probationary faculty member will meet to discuss the classroom observation and peer evaluation of teaching as articulated in **Appendices C and D**.
- h. Within two weeks after each classroom observation, and no later than the end of week 10 of the semester, the peer evaluator will provide an evaluation letter to the probationary faculty member and the department chair. Peer evaluators should also provide an opportunity for the probationary faculty member to meet with them to discuss their evaluation letter.
- i. The letter submitted by the peer evaluator will be part of the probationary faculty member's retention/tenure review file and will be shared with the Retention/Tenure Review Committee by the department chair. The probationary faculty member may choose to submit a response to the peer evaluation letter. This response must be received by the department chair on or before the day that grades are due for the semester that the peer evaluation occurred. This response will also be included as part of the probationary faculty member's retention/tenure review file.
- j. Additional classroom observations may be made by the peer evaluator if the probationary faculty member makes the request. The peer evaluator must inform the department chair and instructor by email of the date of the additional classroom observation(s) and course being observed. The letter submitted by the peer evaluator must include any additional observations.

## **2. Departmental Review Materials.** Faculty under review will provide an electronic portfolio related to their teaching, scholarship, and service activities extracted from their date of hire to date of review.

Hyperlinked syllabi are required, and the candidate may choose to provide additional evidence. Additional materials may be required for departmental review and will be indicated in these Bylaws. The chair will remind each probationary faculty member to submit a recent copy of their Annual Faculty Activity Report (completed the previous spring semester), a current vita, and any supplemental materials deemed appropriate to the Retention/Tenure Review Committee at least fourteen days prior to the date of the review. The department chair will supply grade distributions and the results of student evaluations of instruction for each probationary faculty member to the Retention/Tenure Review Committee. Probationary faculty members may make oral or written presentations at the review meeting. The requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meeting Law and the department standards for closed session meeting confidentiality (Section II.B.2) shall apply to the review meeting.

**3. Dean's Review Materials.** Subsequent to the departmental review, departments will provide the following materials to the dean:

- Department letter of recommendation with vote
- Teaching assignment information (TAI) datasheet that summarizes the courses taught, workload data, grade distribution, and student learning environment survey.
- Merit evaluation data (if available)

**4. Procedure.** The review of probationary faculty shall be conducted by the tenured faculty of the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry in the manner outlined below.

Using the criteria in Section V.A.3.a, the Retention/Tenure Review Committee shall evaluate each probationary faculty member's performance based on the completed Annual Faculty Activity Report, vita, department Annual Merit Review data, peer evaluation letters, student learning environment survey, and any other information, written or oral, presented to the committee. In addition, the committee will consider the expertise of the faculty member under review and the need for this expertise in support of its department programs.

To obtain a recommendation for reappointment, the probationary faculty member's performance must be judged to be satisfactory and must show potential for continued professional growth. To obtain a recommendation for the granting of tenure, the faculty member under review must have demonstrated performance comparable to that of their tenured peers and have potential for promotion to the upper faculty ranks. Votes shall be cast by a show of hands on a motion to retain. Recommendations for reappointment ("retention") must receive the support of the majority of the committee as defined in Section II.D. A recommendation for reappointment that constitutes a tenure decision must receive the support of two-thirds of the committee. The results of the vote shall be recorded and included in the recommendation submitted to the dean.

In the case of a non-renewal recommendation, the committee shall prepare written reasons for its decision. These reasons shall be reported to the probationary faculty member by the committee chair.

Within seven days of the review meeting, each probationary faculty member shall be informed in writing by the committee chair of the results of the retention review. In the case of a positive retention decision, the written notice shall include concerns or suggestions for improvement identified by the committee.

**a. Criteria.** The members of the Retention/Tenure Review Committee shall use the submitted self, peer, and student evaluation information to judge each probationary faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service using the criteria outlined in section III. It is expected that all faculty will direct some effort to all areas of faculty responsibility; however, considering the varied interests and talents of the faculty, it is not expected that all persons will distribute their efforts in these areas in the same manner.

A recommendation for retention and/or granting of tenure may be denied if:

- The faculty member did not submit an Annual Faculty Activity Report at the end of the previous spring semester (as required in Section IV.A).
- The faculty member did not submit all of the appropriate retention review materials at least seven days prior to the date of review (as required in Section V.A.1).
- The faculty member does not show the potential for promotion to the upper faculty ranks (see Section V.D.3).

**b. Reconsideration.** If a non-renewal recommendation is made by the Retention/Tenure Review Committee, the probationary faculty member may request reasons for the recommendation. This request must be made in writing within 10 days of the non-renewal notice. The chair of the Retention/Tenure Review Committee shall supply these reasons in writing within ten days of the request. The reasons then become part of the personnel file of the probationary faculty member.

If the probationary faculty member wishes a reconsideration of the initial non-renewal recommendation, they shall request such a meeting, in writing, within two weeks of the receipt of the written reasons for non-renewal. The meeting for reconsideration by the Retention/Tenure Review Committee shall be held within two weeks of the receipt of the request. The faculty member shall be notified a minimum of seven days prior to the meeting.

The faculty member shall be present at the reconsideration meeting. Both the Retention/Tenure Review Committee and the faculty member may choose up to two members of the university community to be present also. These third parties may question either of the other parties and make comments to them. These third parties also shall file a report of the reconsideration meeting with the Retention/Tenure Review Committee and the faculty member. In later appeals, such third parties may be called in as witnesses. The faculty member may make a personal presentation at the reconsideration meeting. The reconsideration meeting shall be held in accordance with subchapter IV of chapter 19, Wisconsin Statutes.

The faculty member may appeal a negative reconsideration decision. Such an appeal must be filed, in writing, with the university Hearing Committee within 20 days of notice that the reconsideration has affirmed the nonrenewal decision.

Procedures regarding notice and reconsideration shall be in accord with those described in UWS 3.07, 3.08 and UWL 3.07, 3.08.

**5. Timeline.** Starting with tenure-track faculty hired, effective fall 2008, all first-year tenure-track faculty will be formally reviewed in the spring of their first year. A departmental letter will be filed with the dean and Human Resources. Formal reviews resulting in contract decisions will minimally occur for tenure-track faculty in their 2nd, 4th, and 6th years.

#### **B. Tenure Review and Departmental Tenure Criteria**

The procedure for a Tenure Review is the same as that of a Retention Review, which is described in Section V.A. A recommendation for reappointment that constitutes a tenure decision must receive the support of two-thirds of the Retention/Tenure Review Committee. The results of the vote shall be recorded and included in the recommendation submitted to the dean.

#### **C. Post-Tenure Review**

The department follows the UWS Regent Policy 20-9 and the UWL Post-Tenure Review Policy that was approved by the UW System Board of Regents in November 2016. Department standards for closed session meeting confidentiality (Section II.B.2) shall apply to the review meeting.

The criteria used to evaluate post-tenure faculty members to determine if they “meet expectations” or “do not meet expectations” shall relate to the faculty responsibilities outlined in section III.A of these Bylaws. To “meet expectations” a faculty member under review shall be deemed to be an effective teacher and must demonstrate activity in at least one of the two areas of scholarship and service. In addition, the faculty member under review shall have undergone Merit Evaluation (Annual Merit Review; Section IV) for each of the most recent five years, and the results of those evaluations may be considered. Normally, if post-tenure faculty members have been deemed “Meritorious” for the past five years, then they will be considered to “meet expectations.”

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

The department will follow the faculty promotion guidelines as outlined in the UWL Faculty Promotion Resources page.

**1. Review Process.** The Faculty Promotion Review Committee shall consist of all tenured faculty at the rank, or higher rank, than the faculty rank to which a promotion is being considered. In cases where a committee

consists of fewer than three faculty members, the department chair shall work with the dean to establish an appropriate committee. Each fall semester, the department chair shall convene the Faculty Promotion Review Committee as needed. The department chair will chair the committee(s) unless ineligible due to the rank requirement for committee(s) membership. In such a case, a chair shall be elected for a one-year term by a simple majority vote. The committee chair(s) shall establish the date(s) for the promotion consideration meeting(s).

Before the end of spring semester, lists of faculty who will meet the minimum university eligibility requirements for promotion in the coming academic year are distributed by the Human Resources Office to department chairs. These lists will be reviewed for accuracy by the chair. At this time, the department chair will notify the faculty members who are eligible of their eligibility and, upon request, will provide the standard Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report Form, copies of the university and department regulations on promotion, and information on the provisions of the Wisconsin Open Meeting Law. A description of departmental promotion procedures and criteria is presented in Section V.D.2.

Early in the fall semester, the names of individuals on a list of faculty members who meet the minimum department criteria for promotion will be forwarded to the appropriate Faculty Promotion Review Committee. At this time, the department chair will re-notify, in writing, faculty members who are eligible for promotion of their status and of the date of the promotion consideration meeting (which is at least 20 days in the future). Faculty members choosing to seek promotion must provide all members of the Faculty Promotion Review Committee with their promotion materials no later than two weeks prior to the promotion consideration meeting.

Public notice of promotion consideration meetings shall be made at least ten days prior to the meeting. Promotion candidates will be informed of their rights under the Wisconsin Open Meeting Law. Department standards for closed session meeting confidentiality (Section II.B.2) shall apply to the review meeting. If an open meeting is requested, only the portion of the meeting dealing with the faculty person requesting the meeting will be open to all persons. This portion of the meeting will be conducted in accordance with the open meetings rules of the State of Wisconsin

After discussion of a candidate's performance with respect to the criteria in Section V.D.2, votes shall be cast by a show of hands on a separate motion to promote for each promotion candidate. At least a two-thirds majority is necessary for a positive promotion recommendation. The results of the vote shall be recorded by the committee chair and entered into the committee's portion of the Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report Form. The committee shall prepare written reasons for each of its recommendations.

Within seven days of the promotion consideration meeting, the committee chair shall notify each candidate of the committee's recommendation. For positive recommendations, the committee chair shall include a letter of recommendation drafted collectively by the committee as part of the Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report Form. With these materials, the department chair shall also transmit, in writing, the recommendation to the dean. A copy of this letter shall be provided to the candidate at least one day prior to the submission of the promotion file to the dean.

In cases of a negative decision by the committee, a written notice including reasons for the negative decision will be prepared by the committee and transmitted to the candidate within seven days of the promotion consideration meeting.

**2. Criteria.** To be considered for promotion to a higher rank, faculty must meet the minimum university criteria provided in the Employee Handbook and the minimum departmental standards by rank (Section V.D.3).

For the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must provide evidence of the following: teaching excellence, the establishment of a program of scholarship, and participation in service activities. Evidence of teaching excellence shall include the results of self, peer, and student evaluations of instruction.

Scholarship shall be consistent with the department's definition of scholarly activity ([Appendix A, Section XI](#)).

To be promoted to the rank of Professor, a faculty member must show evidence of continued excellence in teaching, significant scholarly productivity, and substantial service activity. Continued teaching excellence is measured by the results of self, peer, and student evaluations of instruction. Significant scholarly productivity is judged using the department criteria for scholarly activity ([Appendix A, Section XI](#)). Substantial service activity will include service to the department and institution, the profession, and/or the public.

**3. Standards.** In keeping with the promotion guidelines put forth by the Faculty Senate, and considering the mission of the university, the role of the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry within the university, and the nature of the discipline, the criteria used to evaluate faculty for promotion shall be the standard three areas of faculty responsibility outlined in [Section III.A](#): teaching, scholarly activity, and service to the department and institution, the profession, and/or the public. In ranking the importance of the areas of faculty responsibility, teaching is of greatest importance, followed by scholarship and service.

Using the above areas of evaluation, promotion recommendations shall be based on the following standards:

**Professor:**

- Earned doctorate in field of principal responsibility.
- Faculty member who is well respected within the department for excellence in teaching and who has taken a leadership role in enhancing the curriculum in the department.
- Faculty member with a continuing scholarly program.
- Faculty member who provides strong leadership in department service and is well respected at the school or college level for university and professional service.

**Associate Professor:**

- Earned doctorate in field of principal responsibility.
- Faculty member who is well respected within the department for excellence in teaching and who has taken an active role in improving the level of instruction in the department.
- Faculty member with an established scholarly program who has taken an active role in service to the department and participates in university and professional service.

Standards are taken from "[A Guide to Faculty Promotions and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse](#)", [Appendix B: Rank, Promotion & Tenure Guidelines](#).

**4. Reconsideration.** A candidate may submit a written request for reconsideration to the department chair. The faculty member will be allowed an opportunity to respond to the written reasons using written and/or oral evidence and witnesses at the reconsideration meeting. Written notice of the reconsideration decision shall be forwarded to the dean within seven days of the reconsideration meeting.

Rules and procedures for filing a grievance are specified in [UWS 6.02](#). Each promotion candidate has the right to appeal a negative reconsideration decision in a grievance filed with the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals, and Academic Freedom (CGAAF) Committee. The Complaints, Grievances, Appeals, and Academic Freedom (CGAAF) Committee shall forward its recommendation to the chancellor (see [UWS 6.02](#)).

**E. Review of Faculty and IAS Who Are School of Education-Associated Faculty**

The SOE and content dean will receive and review the portfolio at the same time and will each forward their recommendation to the provost. For retention and tenure, if there are discrepant reviews of a candidate, the provost will confer with the deans to ensure DPI policies and expectations are applied.



## **VI. Instructional Academic Staff Review**

Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) in the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry are held to the same teaching expectations as tenure track faculty (see section III.A). Because IAS Members do not have the full range of tenure track faculty responsibilities (section III.B), their teaching load is usually larger than that of the tenure track faculty. Any special expectations of a member of the academic staff are stated in the contract letter.

### **A. Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

1. This procedure applies to IAS in their first three years of employment.
2. During the first semester of employment, the department chair shall select two members from the IAS Retention Review Committee to serve as peer evaluators for the IAS member. The chair will appoint new peer evaluators through the first three years of employment.
3. Peer evaluators will serve two-year terms. Terms of the evaluators will be offset by one year.
4. The IAS member being evaluated will ensure that the peer evaluators have access to the learning management system for the course, and documents including the syllabus.
5. Each peer evaluator will perform at least one classroom observation each semester. The classroom observation should occur within the first half of the semester. Peer evaluators will inform the department chair and instructor by email of the date of each classroom observation and course being observed.
6. At least one week before each classroom observation, the peer evaluator and IAS member will meet to discuss the upcoming classroom observation as articulated in **Appendices C and D**.
7. Within one week after each classroom observation, the peer evaluator and IAS member will meet to discuss the classroom observation and peer evaluation of teaching as articulated in **Appendices C and D**.
8. Within two weeks after each classroom observation, and no later than the end of week 10 of the semester, the peer evaluator will provide an evaluation letter to the IAS member and the department chair. Peer evaluators should also provide an opportunity for the IAS member to meet with them to discuss their evaluation letter.
9. The letter submitted by the peer evaluator will be part of the IAS member's annual review file and will be shared with the IAS Retention Review committee by the department chair. The IAS member may choose to submit a response to the peer evaluation letter. This response must be received by the department chair on or before the day that grades are due for the semester that the peer evaluation occurred. This response will also be included as part of the IAS member's annual review file.
10. Additional classroom observations may be made by the peer evaluator if the IAS member makes the request. The peer evaluator must inform the department chair and instructor by email of the date of the additional classroom observation(s) and course being observed. The letter submitted by the peer evaluator must include any additional observations.

### **B. Annual Review**

In accordance with UWS Chapter 10 Academic Staff Appointments, academic staff (instructional and non-instructional) will be evaluated annually.

Evaluations of instructional academic staff will occur in the fall semester. As a requirement for reappointment, each IAS member will provide an electronic portfolio related to their teaching, professional

development / scholarship / creative activity, and service activities extracted either from their date of hire to date of review or from their previous two years of employment, whichever is less. Hyperlinked syllabi are required, and the IAS member may choose to provide additional evidence. The chair will remind each instructional academic staff member to submit an updated Annual Faculty Activity Report (from Digital Measures), a current vita, and any supplemental materials deemed appropriate to the IAS Annual Review Committee at least fourteen days prior to the date of the review. The department chair will supply grade distributions and the results of student evaluations of instruction for each IAS member to the IAS Annual Review Committee. Academic staff members may make oral or written presentations at the review meeting. The requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meeting Law and department standards for closed session meeting confidentiality (Section II.B.2) shall apply to the review meeting.

**1. Procedure.** The review of instructional academic staff shall be conducted by the tenured faculty and Teaching Professors of the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry (the IAS Annual Review Committee) in the manner outlined below.

Using the criteria in Section VI.A.1.a the IAS Annual Review Committee shall evaluate each IAS member's performance based on the updated Annual Faculty Activity Report - Individual, vita, department Annual Merit Review data (if available), peer evaluation letters, student learning environment survey, and any other information, written or oral, presented to the committee.

To obtain a recommendation for reappointment, the IAS member's performance must be judged to be satisfactory (see Section VI.A.1.a). Votes shall be cast by a show of hands on a motion to recommend reappointment. Recommendations for reappointment must receive the support of the majority of the committee as defined in Section II.D. The results of the vote shall be recorded and included in the recommendation submitted to the dean.

In the case of a non-renewal recommendation, the committee shall prepare written reasons for its decision. These reasons shall be reported to the instructional academic staff member by the committee chair.

Within seven days of the review meeting, each IAS member shall be informed in writing by the committee chair of the results of the retention review. In the case of a positive retention decision, the written notice shall include concerns or suggestions for improvement identified by the committee.

**a. Criteria.** The members of the IAS Annual Review Committee shall use the submitted self, peer, and student evaluation information to judge each IAS member's performance in the areas of teaching, professional development / scholarship / creative activity, and service using the criteria outlined in Section III.B. It is expected that all academic staff members will direct some effort to all areas of IAS responsibility; however, it is expected that the primary focus of these efforts will be on teaching.

### **C. IAS Promotion Procedures**

The Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry follows the Guide to IAS promotion. Candidates for promotion must conform their application portfolio to the guidelines given therein.

The departmental committee for Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Promotion Review shall consist of all tenured faculty and Teaching Professors. In cases where a committee consists of fewer than three department members, the department chair shall work with the dean to establish an appropriate committee.

During the fall semester, the department chair shall convene the IAS Promotion Review Committee as needed. The department chair will chair this committee. The committee chair shall establish the date for the promotion consideration meeting in accordance with established university deadlines for the IAS promotion process each year. Department standards for closed session meeting confidentiality (Section II.B.2) shall apply to the review meeting.

After discussion of a candidate's performance with respect to the criteria in section VI.B.1 (below), and the results of the candidate's student, peer, and annual merit evaluations. Votes shall be cast by a show of hands on a separate motion to promote for each promotion candidate. At least a two-thirds majority is necessary for a positive promotion recommendation. The results of the vote shall be recorded by the committee chair and entered on the committee's portion of the "Department IAS Promotion Review Committee Transmittal & Signature Page" or contained in a similar letter written by the chair. The committee shall aid the chair in preparing written reasons for each of its recommendations. Within seven days of the meeting, the committee chair shall notify each candidate of the committee's recommendation in writing.

For positive recommendations, the committee chair shall include a written recommendation on behalf of the committee as part of the "Department IAS Promotion Review Committee Transmittal & Signature Page," or contained in a similar letter written by the chair. With these materials, the department chair shall also transmit a written recommendation to the dean. A copy of this letter shall be provided to the candidate at least one day prior to the submission of the promotion file to the dean.

When a candidate is not recommended for promotion by the department, no further consideration shall occur, nor shall the candidate's file be forwarded to the dean. The candidate shall be given written notification of the negative decision and written reasons for a negative decision within seven days.

- a. **Criteria.** To be considered for promotion to a higher title, IAS must meet the minimum university criteria as stated in the [IAS Promotion Resources page](#). Departmental expectations for IAS are described in section III.B.
- b. **Standards.** In keeping with the [IAS Guide to Promotion](#) put forth by the Faculty Senate, the criteria used to evaluate IAS for promotion shall be the standard three areas of IAS responsibility outlined in section III.B: teaching, professional development / creative activity / scholarship, and service to the department and institution, the profession, and/or the public. In ranking the importance of the areas of IAS responsibility, teaching is of primary importance, followed by professional development / creative activity / scholarship and/or service.

Using the above areas of evaluation, promotion recommendations shall be based on the following standards:

**Teaching Professor:**

- Advanced degree in chemistry or related field
- Evidence of extensive teaching experience and subject matter expertise
- An IAS member who has gained a reputation among peers for demonstrably sustained superior teaching contributions (in addition to the qualities noted below)
- Continued involvement in professional development / creative activity / scholarship and/or service activities

**Associate Teaching Professor:**

- Evidence of high-quality teaching
- Involvement in instruction-related activities, such as developing course materials, advising, curriculum development, participation in departmental outreach programs, etc.
- Demonstrated commitment to developing a program of professional development and being a contributing member of the program and department

**D. Appeal Procedures**

Within seven days of receiving the written reasons for a negative promotion decision, the candidate may, by writing to the department chair, request a reconsideration by the departmental committee that made the decision. The reconsideration review shall take place within ten days of the filing date. The IAS member shall be given at least seven days' notice of such review. The IAS member shall be allowed an opportunity to respond to the written reasons, to present written or oral evidence or arguments relevant to the decision,

and/or to use witnesses. Reconsideration shall be non-adversarial in nature. The committee shall give fair and full consideration to all relevant materials. Written notice of the reconsideration decision shall be transmitted to the candidate and to the appropriate dean within seven days.

Each promotion candidate has the right to appeal a negative reconsideration decision in a grievance filed with the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals, and Academic Freedom (CGAAF) Committee. Rules and procedures for filing a grievance are specified in UWS 6.01, 6.02 and UWS 13.01, and UWS 13.02.

## **VII. Non-Instructional Academic Staff Review**

### **A. Annual Review**

In accordance with Unclassified Personnel Rules Chapter 10, academic staff (instructional and non-instructional) will be evaluated annually. The expectations of non-instructional academic staff shall conform closely to the categories and duties outlined in their job description.

## **VIII. Governance**

### **A. Department Chair**

The department will adhere to the selection and duties of the chair that are delineated in sections IV and V of the Faculty Senate Policies.

#### **1. Election of the Department Chair.**

- a. Elections shall occur during the spring semester providing sufficient time that the dean recommendation be made to the provost no later than March 1.
- b. A candidate for chair is defined as any individual who is eligible and willing to serve as chair.
- c. To determine willingness to serve, the dean shall send a survey to all eligible individuals asking if they are interested in serving at this time. If no individuals are eligible and willing to serve as chair, the chancellor will appoint a chair after consulting with the provost, dean and department.
- d. Based on the survey responses, the dean's office will prepare an election ballot containing the names of all candidates and provide this ballot to all eligible voters.
- e. Redbook listed faculty and instructional academic staff members, with at least a 50% appointment and a recommendation for appointment beyond the current year, have the right to vote in the election of the department chair.
- f. All members of the department are free to exchange viewpoints regarding the election and any individual's candidacy in a manner that is not disruptive to the operations of the department. Departments may also arrange formal or informal fora for this purpose.
- g. Each eligible voter shall vote for one person and return the ballot to the dean.
- h. If no candidate has received the majority of votes, a runoff election shall occur. Runoff elections will continue until a chair is selected.
- i. The dean shall tabulate the results of the election and submit the name of the candidate receiving the majority of votes as the chair-elect to the provost/vice chancellor for approval, who, in turn, shall submit it to the chancellor for approval. If approval is not given, the dean shall conduct another election under the provisions of this policy.
- j. Upon request, the dean will provide voting results reported as totals. Individual votes are kept confidential. However, election results are subject to open records law.

## **2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair.**

A thorough listing of the chair's responsibilities is contained in the Faculty Senate Policies Section IV: Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons. These duties include preparing class schedules and teaching assignments, developing curriculum revisions, preparing and monitoring the department's operating budget, arranging department meetings and appointing faculty to department committees, appointing and monitoring search and screen committees/activities for departmental vacancies, within the context of established policy, evaluating the performance of faculty, academic staff, and classified personnel within the department, preparing the department's annual report, and representing the department in various university matters.

## **3. Annual Departmental Feedback on Performance of the Department Chair**

There shall be an annual opportunity for department members to give anonymous feedback to the department chair, via survey. The survey should be administered by the department ADA, late in spring semester, with results of the survey sent to the department chair.

## **B. Associate Department Chair**

The department will select an associate department chairperson to serve a three-year term that is offset from the chair's term by at least one year. The associate department chair will receive a 0.25 reduction in teaching load. Specific duties will be negotiated between the department chair and the associate department chair, according to the strengths of both individuals.

### **1. Election of the Associate Department Chair**

- a. Any tenured faculty member of the department is eligible to serve as associate department chair.
- b. Elections shall occur during the spring semester, providing sufficient time that the dean recommendation be made to the provost no later than March 1. The election of the associate department chair shall not occur in the same year as the election of the department chair, except in cases where a vacancy must be filled.
- c. A candidate for associate department chair is defined as any individual who is eligible and willing to serve.
- d. The procedure for electing the associate department chair is the same as that for the department chair, as described in Section VIII.A.1.

**2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Associate Department Chair.** The associate department chair's chief responsibility is to assist the department chair in the performance of their duties, as directed by the chair. In addition, the associate department chair is authorized to act on behalf of the department chair when they are unavailable to perform the duties of their office.

### **3. Annual Departmental Feedback on Performance of the Associate Department Chair.**

There shall be an annual opportunity for department members to give anonymous feedback to the associate department chair, via survey. The survey should be administered by the department ADA, late in spring semester, with results of the survey sent to the department associate chair.

## **C. Standing Departmental Committees**

- 1. Annual Merit Review Committee.** See the departmental Annual Merit Review Procedures given in Section IV.A.4.
- 2. Faculty Retention/Tenure Review Committee.** See Section V.A.

3. **Faculty Promotion Review Committee (for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor).** See [Section V.D.1.](#)
4. **IAS Promotion Review Committee.** See [Section VI.B.](#)
5. **IAS Annual Review Committee.** See [Section VI.A.](#)
6. **CHM 100/103-General Chemistry and General Education Assessment Committee.**
7. **Writing in the Major Committee.** Responsible for regular review and maintenance of the departmental WIMP, according to established university policy.
8. **Curriculum Committee.** Responsible for review of all curriculum proposals and eventually forwarding recommendations to the department for approval.
9. **Assessment Committee.** Responsible for assessing all departmental curricula and programming, and for making recommendations to the department; drafts required departmental biennial assessment reports and other assessment reports as needed.
10. **Public Relations, Outreach and Webpage Committee.** Responsible for preparing the annual department newsletter, The Free Radical, the Chemistry Major Handbook, and promotional brochures used in student recruitment efforts. Also responsible for maintenance and oversight of the departmental website.
11. **Major Purchases Committee.** Responsible for maintaining updated, prioritized lists of departmental equipment needs—typically, units costing more than \$2,500. Also responsible for laboratory/classroom/technology modernization pre-proposal planning.
12. **Laboratory Safety Committee.** Responsible for periodic review of department/laboratory safety equipment and safety procedures; production and presentation of best lab safety practices for research and lab preparation students; conducting lab safety inspections as defined in Department Policies.
13. **Seminar Series Committee.** Responsible for scheduling and promoting seminars for departmental majors and faculty by speakers from other institutions; hosting the speakers.
14. **Bylaws Committee.** Responsible for maintenance and refinement of these Bylaws, as needed, including external html link checking, and incorporation of any university or college policies that may impact these Bylaws and the procedures and policies herein.
15. **Inclusive Excellence and Diversity Committee.** This committee analyzes and interprets equity data, gathers relevant resources, and advocates for evidence-based strategies to help our department better anticipate and address equity gaps.
16. **Strategic Planning Committee.** This information-gathering and idea-generating committee meets regularly to discuss the mission, vision, and direction of the department, including maintenance of a three- to five-year strategic plan with measurable goals and timelines. Proposals generated are forwarded to other department committees and/or the entire department for discussion and potential action. The committee shall regularly query and report back to the department on major initiatives to be addressed.

It is expected that smaller groups of Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry faculty members who are most closely associated with the individual (curricular) sub-disciplines of the department shall congregate on an *ad hoc* basis, to conduct the necessary business of the sub-discipline. For example, they should discuss and define/determine the sub-discipline curricula, coordinate, and refine lecture and laboratory content, select lecture and lab texts, notebooks, and ancillary materials, prepare innovative curricular design grant proposals,

and agree upon regular rotations of course teaching assignments. The department chair may assign an appropriate faculty member to convene the aforementioned meetings each year.

#### **D. Departmental Programmatic Assessment Plan**

The Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry Assessment Committee and/or Department Program Director(s) will develop student learning outcomes for all majors housed within the department and will review these outcomes every three years. These student learning outcomes must be approved by the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry faculty. Various direct and indirect assessment tools will be used to measure the achievement of these outcomes. The Assessment Committee/Program Director(s) will be responsible for responding to the assessment results and based on the results, will make recommendations to the department on an annual basis. Furthermore, general education courses housed in the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry will be assessed in alignment with UWL's general education program assessment procedures.

#### **E. Mentor and Mentee Process for Probationary Faculty and IAS**

A mentor's role is to support a mentee's professional development. Mentoring is not part of the personnel review process (Sections V and VI). Mentors offer advice and resources that foster growth and success in areas including teaching, scholarship, and service. Examples of ways in which a mentor may support a mentee include:

- Assisting with setting goals and navigating career progression.
- Interpreting and addressing feedback from students (student evaluations of teaching) and peers (retention review letters and other feedback).
- Offering advice on teaching strategies and curriculum development.
- Assisting with strategies for overseeing a successful research program, including support for writing grant proposals and finding resources.
- Connecting mentees with relevant people and opportunities within and outside the university, including providing guidance on committee assignments and other service opportunities.
- Providing regular and constructive feedback on strengths and areas for improvement.

#### **F. Additional Departmental Policies**

**1. Salary Equity Policy.** The following Salary Equity Policy provides for the identification of salary inequities within the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry and describes the procedures for recommending equity adjustments to the dean of the college.

- a. Definition.** An equity adjustment is a salary adjustment that results from the need to address unusual salary disparities that cannot be remedied by the annual department distribution of salary adjustment packages. An equity adjustment may be recommended for reasons such as: (1) to address issues of gender or race equity; (2) to address inequities due to salary compression or inversion; (3) to address inequities resulting when individuals acquire advanced degrees, or (4) to address changes in one's assigned responsibilities. Equity adjustments should not be made which negate past merit adjustments.
- b. Requests.** Department salary equity adjustment requests shall be presented in writing to the dean of the college. This shall be done at the same time as the department makes annual salary adjustment recommendations unless equity adjustment recommendations are invited at other times by the dean.

A request for a salary equity adjustment may be initiated by:

- **The Department Chair.** The department chair is the department custodian of current salary data as well as relevant historical salary adjustment information. It is the responsibility of the chair to periodically review this information and where evidence of salary inequity exists, request of the dean an appropriate equity adjustment. Such requests must be in writing and should include supporting documentation and rationale.
- **A Faculty Member.** A faculty member may request an equity adjustment on their own behalf. This request must be presented, in writing, with documentation and rationale to the department chair. The

chair may add a written recommendation and additional documentation to the request prior to forwarding it to the dean. The chair shall provide the faculty member involved with copies of any added recommendations or documentation.

Notice on action taken on salary equity recommendations will be directed to the department chair and the affected faculty member according to Faculty Senate Policies.

UWL utilizes CUPA peer data to benchmark faculty and staff salaries (or UW System matches if CUPA data does not exist). Faculty and IAS salaries are benchmarked by rank and discipline whenever possible. The Faculty Senate Promotion, Tenure and Salary (PTS) committee reviews trends in data regarding equity, inversion and compression and makes recommendations for the disbursement of salary equity funds and/or pay plan (if available). Departments do not have the ability to make equity adjustments and Deans only have a limited ability when guided by PTS/Faculty Senate procedures. Individuals with job offers from another institution should provide the written offer to their chair and dean for potential consideration of a salary adjustment if approved by the provost and Vice Chancellor of Administration and Finance.

**2. Sick Leave & Vacation.** Department members will take sick leave in adherence to the most current UW Administrative Policy 1212. For unclassified staff, 12-month employees garner vacation time, 9-month employees do not.

**3. Faculty Request for Position/Time Release from Department Appointment**

The Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry encourages faculty to participate in professional development activities, realizing that such opportunities may require full or partial release from one's instructional responsibilities in the department. A faculty member's release from a department appointment may:

- result in a replacement position awarded to the department during the faculty member's absence, or
- require the department faculty to assume the workload of the released member or/and cancel classes/courses if no replacement position is granted.

It is expected that, when possible, the department will honor reasonable requests for release time for professional development. However, it may be necessary for the department to refuse such a request:

- if the expertise of the faculty member is required and, although a replacement position may be available to the department, it is likely that no satisfactory replacement may be found, or
- if no replacement is awarded the department and the department faculty are unwilling or unable to assume the workload resulting from the requested position release.

For the department to review and evaluate faculty requests for a reduction in department appointment, the faculty member shall submit a written request to the department. The request shall describe the professional development activity, the extent of released time, and identify any replacement position support to be available to the department if the request is granted.

The decision to recommend approval of the request is the responsibility of the department full-time tenure track faculty and full-time continuing academic staff.

The decision to approve the request is the responsibility of the dean of the college and/or the chancellor of the university.

**4. Student Grievances—Grade Appeals**

a. When the instructor no longer is on campus nor available for consultation, the student must notify the department chair of the grievance. The chair will appoint a committee including themselves and two faculty members qualified to evaluate the grievance. This committee will be allowed to use whatever procedures deemed necessary to arrive at a judgment and make a recommendation. If deemed necessary, the recommendation will be forwarded to the dean of the college.



- b. When the instructor is on campus and available for consultation, the student grievance is a matter to be considered in conference with the student and the instructor involved. If the student is not satisfied with the results of such a meeting, they may discuss the matter with the department chair. The chair is not empowered to change a grade, but if it appears that a legitimate grievance exists, the chair will take up the matter privately with the instructor involved.

After the chair's recommendation, and the instructor's response, a student may file a written appeal for a grade change, with the department chair. Upon receipt of the written request, the chair will form an ad hoc committee consisting of three department members, not including the chair or the instructor, to review the appeal. This committee may request additional information from the student and the instructor before forming and forwarding its recommendation to the instructor. Any decision to change a grade remains that of the instructor.

## **IX. Search and Screen Procedures**

The department will follow recruitment and hiring procedures prescribed by the UWL Human Resource Policy in conjunction with AAO (Affirmative Action Officer) and UW System regulations, and department standards for closed session meeting confidentiality (Section II.B.2).

**A. Tenure-track Faculty.** The department will follow UWL Search and Search Policy and Procedures and UW System Administrative Policy 1275 during recruitments. In general, the department will approve a subcommittee to conduct initial reviews of applicants and make recommendations to the whole department for personal on-campus interviews. Additionally, the UWL Spousal and Partner Hiring policy will be followed when necessary.

**B. Instructional Academic Staff.** The department will follow UWL Search and Search Policy and Procedures and UW System Administrative Policy 1275 during recruitments. In general, the department will approve a subcommittee to conduct initial reviews of applicants and make recommendations to the whole department for personal on-campus interviews.

**C. Pool Search (Contingency Workforce).** The department will follow UWL Search and Search Policy and Procedures and UW System Administrative Policy 1275 during recruitments.

**D. Academic Staff. (same for instructional and non-instructional)** . The department will follow UWL Search and Search Policy and Procedures UW System Administrative Policy 1275 during recruitments.

### **E. Hiring of Faculty and IAS Who are School of Education Affiliated Faculty**

The dean of the School of Education shall consult with departmental search & screen committee hiring School of Education Faculty by providing input on position description language that describes the responsibility for delivering and maintaining DPI approved programs. Prior to a departmental recommendation to hire, the dean of SoE (or designate) may meet with search finalists and provide input to the departmental search & screen committee.

## **X. Student Rights and Obligations**

### **A. Student Course- and Faculty- Related Concerns, Complaints, and Grievances**

**1. Informal Complaints.** If a student has a concern or a complaint about a faculty member or course, the general process for making informal complaints is outlined in steps a-c below. Students are welcome to bring a friend or a UWL staff member with them during the following steps. Students who report concerns/complaints/grievances, whether informally or formally, will be protected from retaliation and have the right to expect an investigation and the option to have regular updates on the investigation:

- a. The student should speak directly to the instructor.
- b. If the student is uncomfortable speaking with the instructor, or they are unsatisfied with the solution, they should go to the chair of the faculty member's home department.

- c. If the student is uncomfortable speaking with the department chair, or the chair is the faculty member in question, or they are unsatisfied with the solution, the student should speak with their college dean.

Depending on the specifics of the student's concern, it may be helpful for them to reach out to additional offices:

- Complaints/concerns/grievances about grades, teaching performance, course requirements, course content, incivility, or professional ethics should follow the process outlined above. Students may also wish to seek support from the Student Life office.
- Complaints/concerns/grievances related to hate/bias and discrimination may follow the process outlined above, and in addition or instead students may contact the Campus Climate office and/or submit a hate/bias incident report.
- Complaints/concerns/grievances related to sexual misconduct may begin with the process outlined above but will need to also involve the Equity & Affirmative Action and Violence Prevention offices, and/or the Title IX Team. Students should know that faculty members are mandatory reporters of sexual misconduct, but that confidential resources are available to them.

**2. Formal Complaints.** If the student is unsatisfied with the solution to their informal complaint, they have the right to file a formal institutional complaint with the Student Life Office, as described in the Student Handbook.

**3. Grade Appeals.** Students who believe that the grade they received for a course does not reflect their performance in that course may appeal the disputed grade. This appeal must take place before the end of the semester immediately following the semester in which the grade was recorded. The student should first discuss this difference with the instructor. If a student-instructor meeting is not possible, or if such a meeting does not result in resolution of the difference, the student should contact the department chair. After meeting with the student, the chair will discuss the student's concern with the instructor, if possible. Following these meetings, the chair will make a recommendation to the instructor regarding the grade change.

After the chair's recommendation, and the instructor's response, a student may file a written appeal for a grade change, with the department chair. Upon receipt of the written request, the chair will form an ad hoc committee consisting of three department members, not including the chair or the instructor, to review the appeal. This committee may request additional information from the student and the instructor before forming and forwarding its recommendation to the instructor.

Any decision to change a grade remains that of the instructor, unless the instructor is no longer available, in which case any recommendation to change a grade is made by a chair-appointed committee of two faculty members and the department chair.

**4. Academic Non-Grade Appeals.** Students may initiate and resolve complaints regarding faculty and staff behavior. Such complaints should be lodged either orally or in writing with the department chair or dean of the college within 90 days of the last occurrence. The hearing procedures for these non-grade concerns are detailed in the UWL Student Handbook.

## **B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct**

Students who enroll in courses offered by the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry are expected to attend and participate in these classes. They are expected to devote sufficient non-class time to the study of course material, to complete all class assignments in a timely manner, and to undertake additional study as necessary to demonstrate satisfactory mastery of the material. Furthermore, the departmental faculty and staff expect that students will maintain a high level of academic honesty and integrity, and any indication that these standards are not being met will be confronted. UWL has established policies on student academic and nonacademic misconduct.

Faculty and staff are expected to report academic misconduct per UWS Chapter 14. The Office of Student Life Office provides guidance and assistance. Academic and nonacademic misconduct policies are referenced in the student handbook: <https://www.uwlax.edu/student-life/student-resources/student-handbook/>.

### **C. Advising Policy**

Each student who majors in a program offered by the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry will be assigned a faculty advisor in the department. Students are encouraged to meet with their faculty advisor at least once each semester to discuss their academic progress, career interests, and course schedules.

## **XI. Appendices**

### **Appendix A: Department Statement on Scholarship**

The faculty members of the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry, from the perspective of professional chemists and educators, submit the following definition for “scholarly activity.”

The acquisition of new knowledge in the discipline and the discovery of new, effective ways to communicate it are key elements that characterize activities of university faculty. Consequently, it is expected that faculty will be active scholars. This criterion is secondary in importance only to effective teaching. “Scholarship” as defined here includes both traditional chemical research as well as scholarship in science education.

It is certainly possible that the scholarly emphasis of individual faculty members may vary over their academic careers, with more work in chemical research at one time and more in curriculum development or other areas at another. However, it is expected that all faculty will remain scholarly active throughout their academic career. Given the effectiveness of chemical research in preparing chemistry majors for careers in science and in developing and maintaining essential, discipline-specific knowledge of the faculty, it is expected that all faculty will demonstrate competence in directing undergraduate student research.

An essential aspect of all forms of scholarship is its external evaluation by peers. Consequently, a primary factor in the evaluation of scholarship of all types is the extent to which it has received peer review and dissemination. The principal ways that this is done are through publication and presentation of the results or products of scholarship and through peer review of competitive grant proposals for funds to support scholarly work.

Expectations for Scholarship During the Probationary Period. During their probationary period, faculty are expected to establish a vibrant, sustainable research program that benefits from external support, engages students in the research process, and ultimately leads to dissemination of the work.

In order to further clarify expectations for probationary faculty, the Department regards the items listed below as typical indicators of a successful scholarly program. These criteria are not meant to imply an absolute minimum standard but are presented to outline the hallmarks of a sustainable program of scholarship, namely:

1) external support, 2) student involvement where appropriate, and 3) dissemination of the results.

Thus, tenure-track faculty are expected to establish these three elements of a sustainable research program during their probationary period as Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry faculty members.

- Peer-reviewed publication(s) and/or patent(s) reporting scholarship for which the probationary person is the corresponding author, published or accepted for publication by the time of tenure review
- Peer-reviewed publication(s) reporting innovative teaching, curricular, or programmatic, efforts and results for which the probationary person is the corresponding author, published or accepted for publication by the time of tenure review
- Peer-reviewed publication(s) and/or patent(s) reporting scholarship as a result of collaborative efforts, published or accepted for publication by the time of tenure review
- Oral and poster presentations at local, regional, and national symposia that detail scholarly accomplishments, and which include student co-authors/presenters where appropriate
- A track record of consistent efforts to secure external financial support for the probationary person's programs of scholarship, for the development of innovative teaching methods, and/or for wider departmental/college/university programs and needs

- A program of scholarly work that involves students in the appropriate aspects of the work
- A program of scholarly work that is regarded as independently sustainable over the long term

## **Appendix B: Statement on School of Education Affiliated Faculty Teaching, Scholarship, and Service Expectations**

### **I. Teaching**

#### **Preparation and Currency:**

SoE affiliated faculty are expected to incorporate current techniques that are relevant to the PK-12 setting as described in WI PI.34.11 2 (a, b):

- a. Faculty who teach in initial and advanced programs leading to licensure shall have preparation specifically related to their assignment, hold an advanced degree, and demonstrate expertise in their assigned area of responsibility.
- b. Faculty who teach in initial and advanced programs shall be knowledgeable about current elementary, middle, and secondary curriculum, practices, requirements, technology, and administrative practices appropriate to their assignment.

#### **Field and Student Teaching Supervision Assignments:**

Faculty and IAS who supervise teacher candidates (TCs) in field placements or student teaching settings as part of their workload assignment are expected to perform the duties required, including observing TCs in the field, meeting with cooperating teachers and TCs, supporting TCs with portfolio assembly, submission, and evaluation as needed, and submitting required documentation to SoE in a timely manner.

SoE affiliated faculty are expected to meet the following requirements in order to supervise teacher candidates in the field, as stated in PI.34.11 2 (c):

Faculty who supervise pre-student teachers, practicum students, student teachers, or interns shall have at least 3 years of teaching, pupil services, or administrative experience or the equivalent as determined by the department in prekindergarten through grade 12 settings.

The following aspects of field and student teaching supervision should be taken into account when evaluating faculty teaching workload and performance.

- Observations of teacher candidates (TCs) during their field or student teaching placements is required and should be performed in line with SoE Office of Field Experience expectations.
- Triad conferences between each teacher candidate, university supervisor (UW-L faculty/IAS) and cooperating teacher are also required in both field and student teaching settings and should be performed in line with SoE Office of Field Experience expectations.
- Documentation responsibilities include completing observation reports using appropriate reporting tools, which are ultimately compiled by the faculty member. These should be performed in line with SoE Office of Field Experience expectations
- Support and evaluation of pre-student teaching and student teaching portfolios is expected of faculty with Field II and Student Teaching Seminar assignments. For pre-student teaching portfolios, faculty are expected to provide feedback and evaluate the TC portfolios. For student teaching portfolios prepared during student teaching placements, faculty are expected to provide more extensive ongoing support, clarification, and technical assistance as the TCs prepare and submit their required teacher performance assessment (edTPA) portfolio.

### **II. Scholarship**

SoE affiliated faculty are hired in a role associated with preparing educators and are therefore expected to be engaged in scholarly activities that inform and enhance the work they do with prospective teachers.

PI.34.11 2 (b): Faculty who teach in initial and advanced programs shall be knowledgeable about current elementary, middle, and secondary curriculum, practices, requirements, technology, and administrative practices appropriate to their assignment.

Components for the Review of Institutions of Higher Learning - acceptable evidence to support PI.34.11 2 (b) includes: listings of publications, articles, professional development participation, special projects, grants.

Consequently, the following statements should guide departmental considerations of scholarship for SoE affiliated faculty.

- Publications, articles, grants, and/or conference presentations that focus on the act of teaching and/or instructional methods (if peer reviewed) shall be considered scholarship rather than teaching activities. Conference attendance is considered faculty development rather than scholarship.
- Equal consideration should be given to high quality scholarship that informs PK-12 education in practitioner journals (with a rigorous review process) to high quality scholarship that informs PK-12 education in academic journals (with a rigorous review processes).
- SoE affiliated faculty may choose to pursue scholarship that is directly focused on preparing future teachers and/or PK-12 education, and/or content-focused scholarship in addition to scholarship that aligns with and informs their work as teacher educators, and/or scholarship that blends content and PK-12 education. SoE affiliated faculty should use narrative statements to articulate the connection(s) between their scholarship and their work as PK-12 teacher educators wherever possible.

### III. Service

SoE affiliated faculty are expected to participate in service that aligns with and informs PK-12 education and their work as teacher educators as stated in PI.34.11 2 (d):

Faculty who teach in an initial or advanced program shall be actively engaged in professional practice with prekindergarten through grade 12 schools, professional organizations, and other education related endeavors at the local, state or national level.

SOE-related service activities that clearly align with DPI expectations include:

- Serving on SoE Task Force/Ad Hoc committees that span academic units
- Program Directorship - the specific tasks and responsibilities associated with Program Directorship should be delineated in program and/or department bylaws
- Chairing SoE Program level committees
- Developing PK-12 partnerships such as Professional Development Schools (PDS)
- Participating in SoE student recruitment, outreach, and support activities
- Serving as liaison with PK-12 (PDS) partnerships

#### **Academic Advising:**

WI Department of Public Instruction (DPI) mandates that SoE affiliated faculty provide individual academic and professional advising to students as outlined in PI.34: PI 34.13 Student services. (1) ADVISING RESOURCES AND MATERIALS. The institution shall insure all students have access to and are provided information and resources on student services including personal, professional and career counseling, career information, tutoring, academic, and job placement assistance.

### **Appendix C: Guidelines for Peer Evaluation of Teaching Process for Probationary Faculty and IAS**

These guidelines were developed in consultation with the promotion guidelines from JPC and IAS-PC, the LENS instrument, and CATL resources. The guidelines align with department and promotion priorities; they do not include all items from LENS and the CATL evaluation rubric. Peer evaluation is a shared responsibility. Prior to a classroom observation, the peer evaluator and probationary faculty member should meet to discuss this document.

## **I. Pre-Observation**

Prior to the classroom observation, the faculty member and peer evaluator are encouraged to review/prepare materials and have a meeting according to the guidelines below.

### **a. Probationary Faculty Member Pre-Observation Meeting Task List**

- Provide the evaluator access to the Learning Management System for the course to be reviewed
- Schedule a pre-classroom observation meeting and the classroom observation day with your evaluator. The classroom observation should occur in the first half of the semester.
- Highlight some areas that you are focused on improving this semester, and how you are doing so. These may be based on sources that include past peer/department evaluations, results from student learning environment surveys, and self-reflection.
- Schedule a post-classroom observation meeting.

### **b. Peer evaluator Pre-Observation Meeting Task List**

Prior to the meeting, the peer evaluator will review the learning management system for the course and documents including the syllabus. Since the peer evaluator letter should describe how the overall structure and design of the course aligns to departmental curricular objectives and student learning outcomes, some important topics to consider include:

- Does the course have an organized syllabus that complies with UWL policy, including clearly defined objectives and grading scale?
- Does the course Learning Management System reflect the syllabus and support student learning?
- What topics from your past reviews of this reviewee would you like to follow up on?

### **c. Pre-Observation Meeting (1 week before observation)**

- Discuss the upcoming observation and information developed as part of the pre-observation meeting tasks.

## **II. Classroom Observation**

The peer evaluator should note how the course organization aligns to departmental curricular objectives and student learning outcomes, and how the delivery supports a positive classroom experience. Peer evaluators are encouraged to use the classroom observation worksheet template (**Appendix D**) as a guide, but it is not submitted with the peer evaluation letter.

## **III. Post-Observation Meeting**

Following the classroom observation, the faculty member and peer evaluator are encouraged to review materials and have a meeting according to the guidelines below.

- Discuss the observation, including how the overall structure and design of the course contributes to student learning.
- Discuss student assessment and instructor feedback strategies used in the course.
- The peer evaluator should share general strengths and areas for growth that they plan to discuss in their evaluation letter.

## **IV. Peer Evaluation Letters**

Within two weeks after the classroom observation the peer evaluator will provide a copy of the peer evaluation letter to the probationary faculty or IAS member. The peer evaluation letter should summarize the information drawn from the pre- and post-observation meetings with the instructor, course materials, assessment practices, and the classroom observation. The letter should be submitted to the instructor and the department chair by the end of week 10 of the semester.

## Appendix D. Observation Worksheet Template

**Instructor being reviewed:**

**Course/section:**

**Approx. number of students in attendance:**

majors / minors / gen.ed

**Date/Time:**

**Location:**

**Student population:** Fr / So/ Jr/ Sr

During the observation, you should note how the course organization aligns to departmental curricular objectives and student learning outcomes and how the delivery supports a positive classroom experience. Use the following prompts to guide your observations during the classroom visit. This document is for your personal notes. Your letter is the official documentation of the review.

### **Organization (Class session)**

Describe how the classroom delivery aligns to departmental curricular objectives and student learning outcomes

- Were the objectives for the class session communicated clearly?
- Describe the strategies the instructor used to meet the objectives for the class session.
- Describe the effectiveness of activities/strategies used to enhance student learning.

### **Classroom climate**

Describe how the instructor promoted and supported the inclusion, accessibility, and success of all students.

- Describe interactions between the instructor and students.
- Describe the effectiveness of opportunities for student engagement that were observed.