UW-LA CROSSE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY & BIOCHEMISTRY

Bylaws, Policies, and Procedures

Latest revisions adopted by the CHM department on:
January 21, 2022

UW-LA CROSSE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY & BIOCHEMISTRY

Bylaws, Policies, and Procedures

Table of Contents

NOTES:

1.) URLs in these Bylaws are provided for convenience and should be reviewed regularly by the Bylaws Committee for accuracy.

2.) **Green text** indicates language required by University policy as of 2017 and should not be modified.

3.) Yellow highlighted sections with red text indicate proposed revisions by the dept Bylaws Committee that have not been voted upon.

4.) Yellow highlighted sections with all black text indicate topics for departmental discussion.

5.) Purple text was given a first read on _____

I. 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; and
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

Department meetings will be run according to the most recent edition of Robert's Rules of Order (http://www.robertsrules.com/) and WI state opening meeting laws (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/sites/default/files/office-open-government/Resources/OML-GUIDE.pdf) summary at (https://www.wisconsin.edu/general-counsel/legal-topics/open-meetings-law/)

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 listed in the University of Wisconsin System Redbook (https://www.wisconsin.edu/budget-planning/annual-operating-budget/redbook/) with at least a **50%** appointment.

2. **Voting eligibility** is specified within the respective sections of these Bylaws relating to those processes.

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 by-laws is required to amend the by-laws.

Any proposed amendment(s) shall be presented and distributed in writing at a department meeting and voted on at the next subsequent meeting.

Policies pertaining to personnel issues, which are the responsibility of the ranked-faculty (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, chairperson elections, and hiring.

Second readings can be waived for by-laws 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 bylaws entitled "Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons." A complete set of the Bylaws are available off the Senate webpage under "Senate Articles and Bylaws" (https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/)

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 XII.A** 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 as a result 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 track record 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 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 in 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 lecturer or clinical professor series (http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/committees/ias/pages/titling.html) and will outline specific duties including teaching and any additional workload. Total workload for IAS is defined as a standard minimum teaching load plus additional workload equivalency activities. See Faculty Senate Articles, Bylaws and Policies:
https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/committees/faculty-senate/faculty-senate-manual-021417.pdf

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 promotions and portfolio development at UW-La Crosse
https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/offices-services/human-resources/ias-promotion-guide.pdf
as approved by the UWL Faculty Senate on 02/09/13
https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B5olNNrU5bqucjBNSkVRWXM2TEk. These include, but are not limited to:

- Self-assessment of teaching (i.e. 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 promotions and portfolio development at UW-La Crosse* (https://kb.uwlax.edu/104056)

- 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 **XII.A**)
- 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 on the basis of the individual's title prefix. Examples of IAS service activities (as provided in section **5.1.1.3** of the *Guide to IAS promotions and portfolio development at UW-La Crosse* (https://kb.uwlax.edu/104056)
include:

- Serving on active departmental, standing Faculty Senate, and UW-System committees.
- Appointments with administrative responsibilities
- Volunteering to serve in 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 Instruction

In each of the courses offered by the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry, (except research and independent study courses) students will have an opportunity to evaluate their instructors. This evaluation will take place during the last three weeks of the classes using the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry Student Evaluation Instrument. (A copy of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) instrument is found in Appendix **XII.B**). The department will follow the UWL SEI policy and procedure available from the Faculty Senate webpage (https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/). When electronic submission of SEIs is used, students must be allotted at least fifteen minutes of class time to complete the SEIs during the day that the evaluations are administered in this manner. During this time, the instructor must not be present in the classroom or teaching laboratory.

1. Ranked Faculty & SEIs. Results from the Faculty Senate approved SEI questions are required for retention, tenure, and promotion in the form of (1) the single motivation item and (2) the composite SEI consisting of the 5 common questions. These numbers will be reported using the Teaching Assignment Information (TAI) form. The department will add both the motivation item and the composite SEI fractional median for each course. In addition, the candidate's overall fractional median for the term on both the single motivation item and the composite SEI are reported. Finally, the department adds the departmental fractional median for both the single motivation item and the composite, and the minimum and maximum composite SEI for the department.

2. IAS Renewal and Promotion. The same information as above is reported; however, no TAIs are generated for IAS.

IV. Merit Evaluation (Annual Merit Review)

A. Evaluation Procedures & Criteria

Consistent with ***UW-S 3.05*** and ***UWL 3.05***, the performance of all faculty (as well as continuing full-time academic staff) in the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry will be reviewed annually. The areas of review shall include teaching, scholarship, and service activities (also see sections **III.A-B** and **IV.A.1-2**). 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 hard copy shall be submitted, and one electronic copy shall be emailed, to the 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 who have completed at least one academic year at UWL are due to the Dean's Office on Dec. 15 annually.

Early in the fall semester, the department chair, working with the department **Annual Merit Review Committee** (section **IV.A.4.a**) will use the completed Annual Faculty Activity Reports, student evaluation of instruction (SEI) information, 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) using the criteria specified below.

Within the context of this Annual Merit Review, the department chair is responsible for reporting all of the other department members' merit ratings. Within seven days of completion of the reviews, the chair shall notify each department member, in writing, of their overall merit ratings (the **Base Merit** and **Merit Category Designation**), including an assessment of performance in each of the three

areas of faculty responsibility, assigned as **Performance Ratings** (see section **IV.A.4.b.*iv***). These assessments shall offer an opportunity for future goal setting and improvement as necessary.

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 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 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. 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.

a. Teaching. In the area of teaching (section **III.A.1**), faculty members are expected to motivate and challenge students to learn by using various pedagogical devices or techniques and by setting well-defined student learning objectives and expectations. Efforts and accomplishments to these ends are to be reported in the Annual Faculty Activity Report. Teaching effectiveness will be judged using the self-assessment information as reflected in the Annual Faculty Activity Report, peer evaluations of teaching, and student evaluations of instruction (SEIs) given in each course taught, except for research, independent study, and capstone courses. In the case of probationary faculty, peer evaluations based on classroom visitations will be maintained by the chair for use by the Retention/Tenure Review Committee (see sections **V.A** and **V.B**). Especially meritorious performance in this area is typically evidenced by outstanding student and/or peer evaluations of teaching as well as documented exemplary performance in any of the other activities described in section **III.A.1**.

b. Scholarship. As stated in section **III.A.2**, faculty members are expected to maintain an active program of scholarship. See **Appendix XII.A** for the departmental "Definition of Scholarly Activity." Faculty members are expected to report their scholarly activities and accomplishments in their Annual Faculty Activity Report.

c. Service. As noted in section **III.A.3**, the service component of a faculty member's responsibility may take many forms: active service to the program or major, the department, the university, the profession, and/or the public. Faculty members are expected to report their service activities in their Annual Faculty Activity Report.

d. Other Activities. Any meritorious activities or accomplishments as a university citizen not explicitly included in review criteria **IV.A.1.a-c** above (or sections **III.A.1-3**), and not considered a part of Base Merit should be described in the appropriate section of the Annual Faculty Activity Report or highlighted in an explanatory cover letter to that report.

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 (as described in section **III.B.1**), their professional development activities (section **III.B.2**), and their service activities (section **III.B.3**).

During the first week of May, the department chair will remind the continuing, full-time academic staff to complete the standard UWL **Annual Faculty Activity Report** that contains a description of their activities occurring between the dates of June 1 from the previous summer and May 30 of the current academic year. One hard copy will be submitted, and one electronic copy will be emailed, to the chair by no later than May 30. This report, along with student and peer evaluations, will form the basis for the Annual Merit Review.

The process for evaluating continuing full-time instructional academic staff will follow that of the faculty, as described in section **IV.A.1**. Within seven days of the department Annual Merit Review Committee meeting, the chair will notify each IAS member, in writing, of their overall merit ratings (**Base Merit** and **Merit Category Designation**), including an assessment of performance in teaching and service. These assessments will provide an opportunity for future goal setting and self-improvement, as necessary.

a. Teaching. In evaluating the teaching performance of instructional academic staff, the same criteria should be considered as those outlined for the tenure track faculty in section **IV.A.1.a** above. As noted in section **IV.A.1.a**, especially meritorious performance in teaching is typically evidenced by outstanding student and/or peer evaluations of teaching as well as documented exemplary performance in any of the other activities described in section **III.B**.

b. Professional Development / Creative Activity / Scholarship. As stated in section **III.B.2**, some level of professional development / creative activity / scholarship activities allow an IAS member to remain current in chemistry. IAS are expected to report their professional development activities and accomplishments in their Annual Faculty Activity Report.

c. Service. The service component of an IAS member's responsibility are outlined in section **III.B.3**. IAS are expected to report their service activities in their Annual Faculty Activity Report.

d. Other Activities. Any meritorious activities or accomplishments as a university citizen not explicitly included in review criteria **IV.A.2.a-c** above (or sections **III.B.1-3**), and not considered a part of Base Merit 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 normal 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. The 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 above in sections **IV.A.1-2** (and sections **III.A.1-3** and **III.B.1-3**). In addition, the annual merit evaluation of faculty must differentiate between levels of merit.

a. 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 chairperson), shall be formed by the previous year's Annual Merit Review committee. Chemistry 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, with the exception of the first year of committee implementation, in which three members will serve one-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 convene and direct the Annual (Merit) Review Committee. 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.

b. Responsibilities and Procedures of the Annual Merit Review Committee

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

- these Annual Merit Review procedures
- the standards for the determination and evaluation of Base Merit, the Merit Category Designations, and the Performance Ratings by category
- the Annual Faculty Activity Reports submitted by department faculty members; and
- additional information not included in the submitted reports (*e.g*., student and peer evaluation data, grade distributions, student grievances, *etc*)

***ii*. Base Merit/Solid Performance**. The committee shall conduct the **Base Merit** ("solid performance") review of all faculty. To receive full (100%) Base Merit, 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.

Should it be determined by the Annual Merit Review Committee that individuals are not performing at a satisfactory level, the committee may reduce one's Base Merit below 100% as deemed appropriate. In such cases, the committee shall determine the appropriate Base Merit reduction and make a written record of the reasons for these actions. In general, the results of this Base Merit review will be a simple "yes" (= 100%), or "no" (= <100%) designation.

Any funds removed from an individual's Base Merit shall be added to the department merit pool for distribution into the various Merit Category Designations. Faculty on approved leave shall be considered for Base Merit and may be considered for extra merit.

***iii*. Merit Category Designations**. Considering the Annual Merit Review Criteria outlined in section **IV.A.1**, the committee shall evaluate **all** faculty members for extra merit, to determine each person's overall **Merit Category Designation**. Extra merit activities generally include exemplary teaching accomplishments, such as new curriculum development and high SEI scores, significant ongoing research and scholarly productivity, and/or notable service contributions to the university, profession, or public. Faculty members are also invited to identify any other significant contributions that they would like considered as extra merit (section **IV.A.1.d**).

Faculty members shall be rated by each committee member for overall performance using a **0–10** point scale, with a score of **5.0** being considered the *accepted departmental performance standard*. Each committee member will submit their own ratings to the committee chair, who will then compile, sum, and average the scores for each faculty member evaluated. These compiled, overall ratings will be shared with the Annual Merit Review Committee and discussed.

After review of the compiled ratings and discussion, the committee will then place each department member into one of the following four **Merit Category Designations**:

1 = “Not Meritorious”

2 = “Meritorious”

3 = “Significantly Meritorious”

4 = “Exceptionally Meritorious”

These assigned Merit Category Designations will be reported, along with the distributions (number of faculty in each category), to each faculty member under review. Merit Category Designations will be used both in merit pay determination and in the evaluation of faculty members for purposes of retention, tenure, and promotion.

***iv*. Performance Ratings by Areas of Faculty Responsibility**. To aid in goal setting and promotion for tenure-track faculty who have not yet attained the rank of Professor, the Annual Merit Review Committee shall evaluate those faculty in each area of faculty responsibility (see **IV.A.1**).

In each of the three categories (teaching, scholarship, and service), performance will be rated using a **0–4** point scale, where **2.0** is considered the *accepted departmental performance standard*. Note that for IAS the “research” category shall include any appropriate professional development/creative activity/scholarship, as indicated in the *Guide to IAS promotions and portfolio development at UW-La Crosse* (https://kb.uwlax.edu/104056)

These assigned **Performance Ratings** will be reported, along with the department sub-population (tenure track faculty or IAS) averages to the probationary faculty member under review. Performance Ratings will also be used by the department's Retention/Tenure and Promotion committees.

c. Notification of Faculty of the Annual Merit Review Results. The chairperson notify, in writing, all faculty members of their Base Merit, Merit Category Designations, and categorical Performance Ratings within **seven** days of the completed actions of the Annual (Merit) Review Committee.

All faculty shall be notified of their **Base Merit** (“solid performance”) designation (yes = 100%, or no = <100%). Those persons not receiving 100% Base Merit shall be notified, in writing, of the reasons for this action as well as their percent reduction amount.

All faculty members shall be notified of their assigned **Merit Category Designation**, along with the distribution of numbers of faculty in each merit category.

The appropriate categorical **Performance Ratings** shall also be communicated to the faculty, along with average values where possible. The department chairperson shall be notified, in writing, of their Base Merit, Merit Category Designation, and categorical Performance Ratings by a representative member of the six remaining Annual Merit Review Committee members.

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 Category Designations (and overall performance scores) assigned through the Annual Merit

Review process (see **IV.A.4.b.*iii***). The pool of merit funds for academic staff is separate from the tenure-track faculty pool.

All faculty judged by the Annual Merit Review Committee to be meeting their basic responsibilities as "solid performers" and granted **100% Base Merit** (see **IV.A.4.b.*ii***) shall be allocated **75%** of the total merit adjustment pool, distributed across the board, as a percent of salary base. This merit adjustment shall be referred to as Base Merit.

The balance, or **25%**, of the merit adjustment dollars, shall be used to supply an "extra merit" pool, from which funds will be distributed as determined by the distribution of faculty into the various Merit Category Designations (section **IV.A.4.b.*iii***). *Exception*: unless otherwise instructed by legislative, Board of Regent, UW-System, or University policy, the extra merit pool funds shall be limited to whichever is smaller, **25%** of merit adjustment dollars, or **2%** of the department salary base.

The extra merit dollars will be distributed into each Merit Category Designation in proportion to the number of faculty (or IAS) in each category, and all members of a given category will be awarded merit dollars according to the system and formulae given below. Note here that although a whole-department Merit Category Designation distribution may be used for non-monetary reporting issues, the tenure track faculty and IAS faculty must be split into two separate merit category distributions because two separate sources fund these two different populations. At the appropriate times, the department chair (or Human Resources Office) will communicate the merit adjustment dollars awarded to each faculty member.

As stated in section **IV.A.4.b.*iii***, a faculty member's performance will be categorized as 1 = "Not Meritorious," 2 = "Meritorious," 3 = "Significantly Meritorious," or 4 = "Exceptionally Meritorious," based on their overall performance rating as determined by the Annual Merit Review Committee of the department. Those placed in the "Not Meritorious" category will receive no extra merit dollars, and any funds removed from an individual's Base Merit shall be added to the departmental merit pool for distribution into the various Merit Category Designations. The merit dollars for the other three categories will be distributed as described below.

If there are ***e*** faculty members in the Exceptionally Meritorious category (4), ***s*** faculty members in the Significantly Meritorious category (3), and ***m*** faculty in the Meritorious category (2), then faculty members in the **Exceptionally Meritorious** category (**4**) will receive an extra merit allotment (***EM***) given by:

$$\boldsymbol{EM = P\left[\frac{2.0\sum_{i=1}^{e} S_i}{2.0\sum_{i=1}^{e} S_i \;+\; 1.5\sum_{i=1}^{s} S_i \;+\; \sum_{i=1}^{m} S_i}\right]\left[\frac{4S_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{e} 4S_i}\right]}$$

For faculty members in the **Significantly Meritorious** category (**3**), the extra merit allotment (***SM***) they receive is given by:

$$\boldsymbol{SM = P\left[\frac{1.5\sum_{i=1}^{s} S_i}{2.0\sum_{i=1}^{e} S_i \;+\; 1.5\sum_{i=1}^{s} S_i \;+\; \sum_{i=1}^{m} S_i}\right]\left[\frac{3S_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{s} 3S_i}\right]}$$

For faculty members in the **Meritorious** category (**2**), the extra merit allotment (***M***) they receive is given by:

$$\boldsymbol{M = P\left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} S_i}{2.0\sum_{i=1}^{e} S_i \;+\; 1.5\sum_{i=1}^{s} S_i \;+\; \sum_{i=1}^{m} S_i}\right]\left[\frac{2S_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} 2S_i}\right]}$$

where:

P = the total dollars of the extra merit pool

$\boldsymbol{S_i}$ = amount of salary contributed by a faculty member to the extra merit pool

This distribution system ensures departmental compliance with the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents policy that a pay plan greater than 2% shall be distributed as 1/3 solid performance and 2/3 merit.

C. Appeals

A faculty member may request a reconsideration of their annual Base Merit designation, Performance Ratings, and Merit Category Designations. The department Annual Merit Review Committee will reconsider a faculty member's merit evaluation upon receiving, in writing, a request for such a hearing. This written request must include reasons for the reconsideration hearing and must be submitted to the department chairperson within **seven days** of notification of the Annual Merit Review results.

The Annual Merit Review Committee will meet to reconsider its action. The resulting recommendation then will be presented to the faculty member, in writing, within **seven days** of the reconsideration hearing. At the department level, the reconsideration recommendation of the Annual Merit Review Committee is considered final.

The department chair and any other Annual Merit Review Committee member may likewise make an appeal for reconsideration of their merit evaluation by submitting a written request to the remaining committee members within one week of notification of the merit evaluation results.

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 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*, the local *UWL Faculty Rules*, 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**), which are available online at https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/faculty-and-staff/policies-and-procedures/

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.

During the first semester of employment of each probationary faculty member, the department chair shall select two tenured members of the department to serve as **peer evaluators** for that person. In addition, the probationary faculty member will choose *two additional* faculty members to serve as their **mentors**. Twice each academic year, each peer evaluator and mentor will observe at least one class taught by the probationary faculty member. In addition, the evaluators/mentors shall review relevant course materials (*e.g*. syllabi, exams, *etc*.). The mentors/evaluators will assess the classroom experiences they observed in a written report to the probationary faculty member and to the chair of the Retention/Tenure Review Committee.

1. 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* shall apply to the review meeting.

2. 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 SEIs by individual course and semester (which are only available after completing a full academic year) and departmental comparison SEI data; and
- Merit evaluation data (if available)

3. 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** (below) 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, classroom mentor and peer evaluator reports, student evaluations of instruction (SEIs), 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.

In order to obtain a recommendation for reappointment, the probationary faculty member's performance must be judged to be satisfactory (see section **V.A.3.a**) 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 ***UW-S* 3.07**, **3.08** and ***UWL* 3.07, 3.08** of the *Faculty Personnel Rules*.

4. 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 HR. 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 UWL procedure and schedule regarding post-tenure review that was approved by the UW System Board of Regents in November 2016. The full policy is located at the following link: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B5olNNrU5bqueWdMNTRCajhQMDQ/view

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 received 100% base merit 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 guidelines and schedules regarding faculty promotion, which are available at https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/faculty-promotion-resources/

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** (below).

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*. 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** (below), 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 XII.A**).

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 XII.A**). 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 (as defined in **Appendix XII.A**), 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 taken from "A Guide to Faculty Promotions and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse", Appendix B: Rank, Promotion & Tenure Guidelines (Approved by Faculty Senate 5-8-08). Available online at the UWL HR website.

4. Reconsideration. A candidate may submit a written request for reconsideration to the committee. in writing, by writing to the Committee department chair, reconsideration by the committee. 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.

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* 6.02** and ***UWL* 6.02**. 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 Lecturers do not have the full range of tenure track faculty responsibilities (section **IIIB**), 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.

During the first semester of employment of each instructional academic staff member, the department chair shall select a member of the department to serve as a **peer evaluator** for that person. In addition, the new staff member will choose *one additional* faculty member to serve as a **mentor**. Once each academic year, the peer evaluator and the mentor will observe at least one class taught by the IAS member. In addition, the evaluators/mentors shall review relevant course materials (*e.g*. syllabi, assignments, *etc*.). The mentors/evaluators will assess the classroom experiences they observed in a written report to the IAS member and to the department chair. This procedure will be followed each year for the first three years of the IAS member's employment.

A. Annual Review

In accordance with Unclassified Personnel Rules Chapter 10, academic staff (instructional and non-instructional) will be evaluated annually. (https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/services/employee-relations/performance-management/)

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* shall apply to the review meeting.

1. Procedure. The review of instructional academic staff shall be conducted by the tenured faculty and Senior Lecturers 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** (below) 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), classroom mentor and peer evaluator reports, student evaluations of instruction (SEIs), and any other information, written or oral, presented to the committee.

In order 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.

B. IAS Promotion Procedures

Policies and procedure guiding promotion for IAS are available at
https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/ias-promotion-resources/
The Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry follows the *Guide to IAS promotions and portfolio development at UW-La Crosse* (https://kb.uwlax.edu/104056) approved by the UWL. Candidates for promotion Faculty Senate on 05/09/13. 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 Distinguished and Senior Lecturers. 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 in a given year.

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.

1. Criteria. To be considered for promotion to a higher title, IAS must meet the minimum university criteria as stated in the *Guide to IAS promotions and portfolio development at UW-La Crosse* (https://kb.uwlax.edu/104056) as approved by the UWL Faculty Senate on 05/09/13. Departmental expectations for IAS are described in section **III.B**

For the rank of **Associate Teaching Professor**, a candidate must have a minimum of ten (10) semesters of teaching in higher education or other appropriate experience with a minimum of six (6) semesters completed in rank as an assistant teaching professor at UWL. The candidate must provide evidence of a strong record of *accomplishment* in teaching as evidenced by self-assessment, peer reviews, annual/merit evaluations, and student evaluations. Evidence of professional development / creative activity / scholarship and/or service as described in section **III.B** is also expected.

For the rank of **Teaching Professor**, a candidate must have a minimum of twenty (20) semesters of teaching or other appropriate experience with a minimum of four (4) semesters in rank as associate teaching professor at UWL. The candidate must be able to demonstrate a sustained record of *accomplishment* in teaching and a sustained record of accomplishment in the areas of professional development / creative activity / scholarship and/or service as described in section **III.B.**

2. Standards. In keeping with the IAS Promotion guidelines 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 qualitites 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

C. Appeal Procedures

Within seven days of receiving the written reasons for a negative promotion decision, the candidate may, by writing to the department chairperson, request a reconsideration by the departmental committee that made the decision. The reconsideration review shall take place within 10 days of the filing date. The IAS member shall be given at least 7 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* 6.02** and ***UWL* 6.02**. The Complaints, Grievances, Appeals, and Academic Freedom Committee shall forward its recommendation to the Provost after completion of its review (see ***UWS* 6.05**).

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 each individual's job description.

VIII. Governance

A. Department Chair

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

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 chairperson is defined as any individual who is eligible and willing to serve as chairperson.

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 chairperson, the chancellor will appoint a chairperson 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 chairperson 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 chairperson-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 Bylaws 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.

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 Chair will receive a 0.25 reduction in teaching load. The specific duties of the Associate Chair will be negotiated between the chairperson and the associate chairperson, 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 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 chairperson shall not occur in the same year as the election of the chair, except in cases where a vacancy must be filled.

c. A candidate for associate chairperson is defined as any individual who is eligible and willing to serve as associate chairperson.

d. The procedure for electing the associate chairperson is the same as that for the chairperson described in Section VIII.A.1.

2. **Responsibilities and Rights of the Associate Department Chair.** The associate 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 Chair is authorized to act on behalf of the Department Chair whenever the Chair is unavailable to perform the duties of their office.

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. Revised text needed

7. Writing In the Major Program (WIMP) 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.

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 Text needed

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. 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 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 a 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 to the dean. The chair shall provide the involved faculty member 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 university policy as approved August 24, 1993.

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 account for sick leave in adherence to the most current UW System guidelines, https://www.wisconsin.edu/uw-policies/uw-system-administrative-policies/sick-leave/

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

- if no replacement position is granted, require the department faculty to assume the workload of the released member or/and cancel classes/courses.

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.

In order 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 University's Office of Human Resources (HR) in conjunction with AAO and UW System and WI state regulations.

A. Tenure-track Faculty. The approved UWL tenure track faculty recruitment and hiring policy and procedures are found at https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/recruitment/#tab-recruitment-processes **(this section sent back from Dept 20.01.17 for revision by Bylaws Cmte).**

In general, the department will appoint a subcommittee to conduct initial reviews of applicants and make recommendations to the whole department for personal on-campus interviews.

Additionally, UWL's spousal/partner hiring policy can be found at https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/spousal-and-partner-hiring/

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

C. Pool Search (Contingency Workforce). Hiring policy and procedures are found at https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/recruitment/#tab-recruitment-processes

D. Academic Staff. (same for instructional and non-instructional) Hiring policy and procedures are found at https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/classification--recruitment/recruitment/#tab-recruitment-processes

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

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 of 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 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. See section **VIII.D.4**.

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 Eagle Eye Student Handbook (https://www.uwlax.edu/student-life/student-resources/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. Complete details on the University's policy on student academic and nonacademic misconduct can be found at https://www.uwlax.edu/student-life/our-services/student-conduct/academic-misconduct/ and https://www.uwlax.edu/student-life/our-services/student-conduct/nonacademic-misconduct/ respectively.

Faculty and staff are expected to report academic misconduct per Chapter 14 of the UW System code. 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. Other

XII. 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 the 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

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.

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.

Appendix A: 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.

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.