

Department of Physics

Bylaws, Policies, and Procedures

First Reading, May 10, 2002

Second Reading, Approved – May 15, 2002

Approved Changes, March 13, 2009

Approved Changes, September 7, 2012

Approved Changes, February 3, 2017

Approved Changes, May 9, 2017

Contents

1	Organization & Operation	4
1.1	Preamble	4
1.2	Robert’s Rules of Order	4
1.3	Quorum Definition	4
1.4	The Use of Proxies	4
1.5	Changes to the Bylaws	4
1.6	Appendices	4
2	Student Rights & Obligations	5
2.1	Evaluation of Teaching	5
2.2	Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures	5
2.2.1	Grade Appeals	5
2.2.2	Academic Non-Grade Appeals	5
2.3	Advisement	5
2.4	Expectations/Responsibilities	6
3	Faculty Responsibilities	7
3.1	Teaching Expectations	7
3.2	Scholarship Expectations	7
3.3	Service Expectations	7
4	Academic Staff Responsibilities	8
4.1	Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Responsibilities	8
4.1.1	Teaching Expectations	8
4.1.2	Scholarship Expectations	8
4.1.3	Service Expectations	8
4.2	Non-Instructional Academic Staff (NIAS) Responsibilities	8
5	Merit Evaluation/Annual Review	9
5.1	Overview of the Merit Evaluation Process	9
5.1.1	Faculty Evaluation Overview	9
5.1.2	IAS Evaluation Overview	10
5.2	Guidelines for Completing the Annual Merit Report	10
5.3	Guidelines for Assigning Weighting Factors (Faculty)	11
5.3.1	Teaching	11
5.3.2	Scholarship	11
5.3.3	Service	12
5.4	The Faculty Merit Evaluation Process	12
5.5	Faculty Distribution of Merit	12
5.6	Instructional Academic Staff Merit Review	14
5.6.1	Guidelines for Assigning Weight Factors (IAS)	14
5.6.2	The IAS Merit Evaluation Process	15
5.6.3	IAS Distribution of Merit	15

5.7	Appeals	16
5.8	Annual Review of NIAS	16
5.9	Post-tenure Review	16
5.9.1	Deadlines	16
5.9.2	Committee Makeup	16
5.9.3	Review Process	16
5.9.4	Criteria	17
5.9.5	Notification	17
6	Retention and Tenure Decisions	18
6.1	Review Process	18
6.2	Criteria	18
6.3	Reconsideration	19
7	Promotion Recommendations	20
7.1	Tenured & Tenure-track Faculty	20
7.1.1	Review Process	20
7.1.2	Criteria	21
7.1.3	Reconsideration	21
7.2	Instructional Academic Staff	21
7.2.1	Review Process	21
7.2.2	Criteria	22
7.2.3	Reconsideration	22
8	Governance	24
8.1	Selection of the Chair	24
8.2	Responsibilities and Rights of the Chair	24
8.3	Standing Departmental Committees	24
8.3.1	Strategic Planning Committee (see Appendix F)	24
9	Other	25
9.1	Affirmative Action, Design for Diversity, and Staffing Plan	25
9.2	Definition of Scholarship	25
9.2.1	Definition of Professional Development for IAS	25
9.3	Program Goals and Methods of Assessment	25
9.4	Salary Inequity Policy	26
9.5	Summer Appointment Policy	26
A	Student Evaluation of Instruction Questions	27
B	Departmental Individual Development Plan for IAS	28
C	Faculty Merit Evaluation Scoring and Distribution	34
C.1	Score Sheet	34
C.2	Distribution	34

D Faculty Promotion Guidelines and Forms	36
E IAS Promotion Guidelines and Forms	37
F Strategic Planning Committee Bylaws	38
G Statement on School of Education Affiliated Faculty Teaching, Scholarship, and Service	40

1 Organization & Operation

1.1 Preamble

The Bylaws in this document were adopted by the members of the Physics Department in accordance with the University of Wisconsin System and the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse Faculty and Academic Staff Personnel Rules.

1.2 Robert's Rules of Order

Meetings of the Physics Department and its Committees are conducted in accordance with Roberts Rules of Order, Newly Revised.

1.3 Quorum Definition

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 a majority of those present.

1.4 The Use of Proxies

Proxy votes are permitted in meetings of the Department and its Committees only as specified in these bylaws.

1.5 Changes to the Bylaws

Amendments or additions to these bylaws may be adopted at any Department meeting by a two-thirds vote of the faculty of the Department, following a first reading of the proposed amendments or additions at a previous Department meeting.

1.6 Appendices

Appendices represent current policies and procedures and are not part of the Bylaws. Appendices can be changed as needed by a simple majority vote of the voting members of the Department.

2 Student Rights & Obligations

2.1 Evaluation of Teaching

In each of the courses offered by the Physics Department (except independent study courses, seminar, and those with fewer than 5 students), students will have an opportunity to evaluate their instructors. Usually this evaluation will take place in the last weeks of a semester using the Physics Department Student Evaluation Form. (A copy of the Student Evaluation of Instruction questions used by the Department is contained in Appendix A.)

2.2 Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures

2.2.1 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 a 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 the decision to change a grade becomes that of the Department Chair.

2.2.2 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 student handbook.

2.3 Advisement

Each student who majors in a program offered by the Physics Department 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.

2.4 Expectations/Responsibilities

Students who enroll in courses offered by the Physics Department are expected to attend and participate in these classes. They are expected to devote sufficient non-class time to complete all class assignments in a timely manner and to undertake additional study of the material as necessary to demonstrate satisfactory mastery of the material.

3 Faculty Responsibilities

For School of Education affiliated faculty, see the additional considerations outlined in Appendix G.

3.1 Teaching Expectations

Faculty of the Physics Department are expected to keep current in their subject matter area and to work to improve student learning. They 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 the course syllabus shared with students at the beginning of the course. In addition, faculty are expected to grade and return student assignments, including examinations, in a timely fashion. Finally, faculty are expected to administer student evaluations of instruction in each course they teach (except independent study courses, seminar, and those with fewer than 5 students).

3.2 Scholarship Expectations

Faculty in the Physics Department are expected to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship. The Department's definition of scholarly activities (see Section 9.2) includes publishing papers or books in the discipline and in applications of the discipline. Presentations in these areas at professional meetings, and in other appropriate forums, also constitute scholarship. In addition, writing successful grant proposals to support any of these activities is an important area of scholarship.

3.3 Service Expectations

Faculty of the Physics Department are expected to serve the institution, the public and their profession. This service can take the form of participating on Departmental, College and University committees, offering specialized advice to off-campus groups and joining and participating in the activities of professional societies in their discipline.

4 Academic Staff Responsibilities

4.1 Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Responsibilities

For School of Education affiliated IAS, see the additional considerations outlined in Appendix G.

4.1.1 Teaching Expectations

The teaching expectations of IAS are identical to those of the tenure track faculty, as described in Section 3.1.

4.1.2 Scholarship Expectations

For merit (see Section 5.6) and promotion (see Section 7.2), IAS in the Physics Department may choose to develop and maintain an active program of Scholarship/Professional development. For IAS, the Physics Department considers professional development as outlined in Section 9.2.1. The Department's definition of scholarly research activities (see Section 9.2) includes publishing papers or books in the discipline and in applications of the discipline. Presentations in these areas at professional meetings, and in other appropriate forums, also constitute research scholarship. In addition, writing successful grant proposals to support any of these activities is an important area of research scholarship.

4.1.3 Service Expectations

For merit (see Section 5.6) and promotion (see Section 7.2), IAS of the Physics Department may choose to serve the institution, the public and their profession. This service can take the form of participating on Departmental, College and University committees, offering specialized advice to off-campus groups or joining and participating in the activities of professional societies in their discipline.

4.2 Non-Instructional Academic Staff (NIAS) Responsibilities

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.

5 Merit Evaluation/Annual Review

5.1 Overview of the Merit Evaluation Process

Consistent with UWS 3.05-3.11 and UWL 3.05-3.08, the performance of all faculty (as well as IAS) in the Physics Department will be reviewed annually. The areas of review shall include Teaching, Scholarship (Scholarship/ Professional Development where IAS are concerned), and Service duties (and chair duties for the Department Chair). Part-time IAS undergoes the same evaluation process as full-time IAS.

Early in the fall semester, the Department Chair will meet with each faculty member and together they will decide upon the percentage of time that the faculty member will devote to teaching, scholarship and service. Together they will also decide upon a specific set of goals in each of these areas of faculty responsibility. During the same period, each IAS will complete an annual Departmental Individual Development Plan (IDP; see Appendix B) with his/her department chair to determine the percentage of time allotted for teaching, professional development/scholarship and/or service, and the nature of the activities that will be conducted in that year. Feedback from the previous years annual merit review should be utilized during this process. The goals and percentage of time will be put in writing and signed by both the Chair and faculty/IAS member. In a similar fashion, the Chair will set written goals for the upcoming academic year.

All faculty and IAS are responsible for entering their teaching, scholarship, professional development, and service activities into the electronic portfolios system (Digital Measures). Guidelines for this process are in Section 5.2. Before June 1, all faculty and IAS must run a Digital Measures Faculty/IAS Activities Report (with hyperlinks) for the prior year (June 1st – May 31st) and submit it to the Department Chair. This report is hereafter known as the Annual Merit Report. For faculty, this report, along with student evaluation summaries will constitute the basis for the annual merit review. For IAS, the Annual Merit Report, student evaluation summaries, and peer evaluation will constitute the basis for the annual merit review. Faculty and IAS are responsible for the accuracy and completeness of their Annual Merit Reports.

New faculty/IAS members who begin in the fall semester do not undergo or participate in Annual (Merit) Review in that first semester. If retained, the salary adjustments for these new faculty will be (by contract) the average increment generated by the merit pay plan.

5.1.1 Faculty Evaluation Overview

Each fall semester, the Department Chair will distribute copies of the completed Annual Merit Reports, individual goal statements, and student evaluation scores of all faculty members of the Department to each Department faculty member participating in the merit review process. Each participating faculty member (tenured and probationary) will review these materials and evaluate the performance of every other participating faculty member using the 20 point scale described in Section 5.3 (using the Score Sheet found in Appendix C.1). Faculty evaluation materials will not be distributed to IAS members.

The completed faculty evaluations will be returned to the Department Chair or a designated representative (the evaluation forms for the Chair will be submitted to a designated

faculty member for tabulation) who will use this information to determine a final set of performance scores for each of the other faculty members of the Department. The Department Chair is responsible for all merit evaluations of the Department, excluding the Chair. Within seven days of the review, the Chair shall notify each faculty member in writing of his/her merit rating including an assessment of performance in each of the areas of faculty responsibility. This assessment shall offer an opportunity for future goal setting and improvement as necessary.

The Dean will review the Department Chair using the average of the evaluation scores provided by the other participating Department faculty members (tenured and probationary), and criteria established to judge a Chair's administrative performance. The Dean is responsible for the Chair's merit rating.

5.1.2 IAS Evaluation Overview

Each fall semester, the completed Annual Merit Reports, individual development plans, grade distributions and student evaluation scores of all IAS members of the Department will be given to the Department's IAS merit committee. This committee will review these materials and evaluate the performance of every IAS member using the process described in Section 5.6.

5.2 Guidelines for Completing the Annual Merit Report

Before June 1, all faculty and IAS must have entered teaching, scholarship, professional development, and service activities into the electronic portfolios system (Digital Measures) for activities from the prior year (June 1st – May 31st). All faculty and IAS must run a Digital Measures Faculty/IAS Activities Report (with hyperlinks) for those dates and submit it to the Department Chair before June 1. As described in Section 5.1, this Annual Merit Report is an important component in the annual merit review for both faculty and IAS. Faculty and IAS are responsible for the accuracy and completeness of their Annual Merit Reports.

When entering information, a faculty/IAS member should list the activities and accomplishments that impact their merit. Only activities and accomplishments that occurred from June 1 to May 31 of the preceding year should be included. Items should be brief, but specific. When appropriate, dates, places, participants, and titles should be provided. For funded grant proposals, the amount and funding period should be provided. Activities may be listed in your annual report only once – there can be no duplicate entries. If any activity could be entered in more than one category, enter it only in the category you see as most appropriate.

Faculty members who are on professional leave are also required to enter their activities on Digital Measures, run an annual report covering the previous year (June 1st – May 31st), and submit the report to the Chair by June 1st. Optionally, these faculty may submit a supplemental document describing their leave activities to include as part of their merit report.

5.3 Guidelines for Assigning Weighting Factors (Faculty)

The faculty evaluation process uses a 20 point scale and three weighting factors: T for teaching, R for research and S for service, with $T + R + S = 20$. The weighting factors T, R and S should meaningfully reflect the percentage of time a faculty member devotes to each area. For tenured and probationary faculty, the nominal numbers for T, R and S are 12, 4 and 4, respectively. To decrease the numbers for R and S there must be an increase in number for T, as agreed on by the Department Chair. Evaluation of the Department Chair uses a 20 point scale and four weighting factors: T, R, S and C for Chair with $T + R + S + C = 20$. The weighting factor C is in the range from 5 to 8 while T, R and S should meaningfully reflect the percentage of time the Department Chair devotes to each area.

5.3.1 Teaching

In the area of teaching, faculty are expected to motivate and challenge students to learn by using various pedagogical devices or techniques and by setting well-defined expectations. It is assumed that student assignments and examinations will be reviewed and graded in a timely manner, and that student achievement will be appropriately assessed. Faculty are expected to keep current in their subject matter areas, to update the curriculum and to assess the effects of their teaching effectiveness. Other efforts and accomplishments include (in unranked order) academic advising; funded educational grants; submission of educational proposals; attending, conducting, or organizing educational workshops and conferences; mentoring and supervising undergraduates (e.g. research, portfolio development, field experience, student teaching, teaching assistants). Efforts and accomplishments to these ends are to be included in the Annual Merit Report.

In agreement with the faculty member, the Chair will assign the faculty member a weighting factor for teaching, T, from 0 (lowest) to 20 (highest) for his/her teaching activities. Here T is a number that reflects the number of contact hours being taught, modified by the number of preparations, course enrollments, nature of the courses, funded educational grants, etc. Normally T is equal to 12 for tenured and probationary faculty who carry an average teaching load (as determined by the teaching load of the tenured and probationary faculty in the Department).

5.3.2 Scholarship

As stated in Section 3.2, faculty members are expected to maintain an active program of scholarship, as defined in Section 9.2. Efforts in this area of responsibility include writing research grant proposals, preparing, presenting, and/or publishing papers on a topic of original research, refereeing or reviewing journal submissions or grant proposals, writing and publishing books, and conducting or organizing scholarly workshops or conferences. Faculty members are expected to include their scholarly activities and accomplishments in the Annual Merit Report.

Based on the Departments Definition of Scholarship (see Section 9.2), the Chair, in consultation with the faculty member, will assign the faculty member a weighting factor, R, for his/her scholarly activity. Normally, $R = 4$ and shall normally be in the range from 0 to 8.

5.3.3 Service

The service component of a faculty members responsibility may take many forms: service to the program or major, the Department, the College, the University, the profession, or the general public. Examples of appropriate service activities include (in unranked order) physics and astronomy programs, providing service-oriented workshops, drafting program or policy documents, serving on committees, serving as an officer in a professional society, consulting with external agencies. Faculty members are expected to include their service activities in the Annual Merit Report.

In consultation with the faculty member, the Chair will assign the faculty member a weighting factor, S , for his/her service activity. Normally, $S = 4$ and shall normally be in the range from 0 to 8.

5.4 The Faculty Merit Evaluation Process

All tenured and probationary faculty shall participate in the merit evaluation process, except those who are in their first semester. During the merit evaluation process, Annual Merit Reports for all participating faculty shall be distributed to all participating faculty in the Department. Each participating faculty member will evaluate all other participating faculty of the Department. The evaluator assigns a score in each of the three categories (four for the Department Chair) to every other participating faculty member. The score in each category shall be based on the quality and quantity of work performed, successful completion of the goals, etc., and should be made in comparison with the rest of the faculty.

The weighting factors represent the largest score a faculty member can earn in each category. The total points awarded by each evaluator must be 14 points multiplied by number of tenured and probationary faculty (other than the evaluator).

Teaching effectiveness will, in part, be judged using student evaluations given in each of the courses taught. Teaching effectiveness will also be judged on, but not limited to, development of new courses and laboratories, curriculum development, etc.

5.5 Faculty Distribution of Merit

A faculty members performance will be categorized as Not Meritorious, Meritorious, Significantly Meritorious or Exceptionally Meritorious, based on his/her total merit score (the sum of the teaching, scholarship and service ratings [and chair, when applicable]) as follows:

Merit Category	Total Merit Score
Not Meritorious (Not entitled to any merit pay and requiring remedial action)	0 – 7.99
Meritorious (Solid Performance) (Not entitled to supplemental merit pay)	8 – 11.99
Significantly Meritorious (Entitled to supplemental merit pay)	12 – 15.99
Exceptionally Meritorious (Entitled to additional supplemental merit pay)	16 – 20

With each years pay plan a faculty merit pool is directed to the Department (a separate IAS merit pool is directed to the Department). Of a pool of P dollars, 67% will be allocated to those members in the three meritorious categories as a percentage of their base salary. The remaining 33% of the pool will be used for supplemental merit units, which are defined and distributed as follows. If there are m members in the Significantly Meritorious category and M members in the Exceptionally Meritorious category, then members in the Significantly Meritorious category receive a supplemental merit pay (SMP) given by

$$SMP = 0.33P \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m S_i}{\sum_{i=1}^m S_i + 1.5 \sum_{i=1}^M S_i} \right] \left[\frac{S_i f_i}{\sum_{i=1}^m S_i f_i} \right]$$

and members in the Exceptionally Meritorious category receive a supplemental merit pay (EMP) given by

$$EMP = 0.33P \left[\frac{1.5 \sum_{i=1}^M S_i}{\sum_{i=1}^m S_i + 1.5 \sum_{i=1}^M S_i} \right] \left[\frac{S_i f_i}{\sum_{i=1}^M S_i f_i} \right]$$

where

$$P = \sum_{i=1}^N S_i,$$

N = number of faculty in the Department,

S_i = amount of salary contributed by a faculty member to the merit pool, and

f_i = average merit score received by a faculty member.

5.6 Instructional Academic Staff Merit Review

The annual evaluation process for continuing academic staff is similar to that of faculty. The expectations, areas of responsibility and their relative importance will be communicated to IAS based on the conditions of their contract.

Early each semester, the Department Chair will assign tenured faculty to serve as classroom evaluators. Each semester, each IAS will be observed in at least two different courses by at least two different classroom evaluators. These peer evaluators will assess the classroom experiences they observed in a report to the IAS member, the Chair of the IAS Merit Review Committee and the Department Chair.

5.6.1 Guidelines for Assigning Weight Factors (IAS)

The evaluation process for IAS uses a 20 point scale and three weighting factors: T for teaching, R for Scholarship/Professional Development and S for service as described in Section 4.1, with $T + R + S = 20$. IAS are required to perform Teaching + Scholarship/Professional Development and/or Service. The weighting factors T, R, and S should meaningfully reflect the percentage of time an IAS member devotes to each area. For full-time IAS, the nominal numbers for T is 16 and $R + S = 4$. For part time IAS, the nominal percentages for T and $R + S$ are 80% and 20%, respectively. The completion of Annual Merit Reports by IAS is identical to faculty forms as described in Section 5.2.

5.6.1.1 Teaching

In the area of teaching, IAS expectations are identical to those of faculty as described in Section 5.3.1. Efforts and accomplishments to these ends are to be included in the Annual Merit Report.

In agreement with the IAS member, the Chair will assign the IAS member a weighting factor for teaching, T, from 0 (lowest) to 20 (highest) for his/her teaching activities. Here T is a number that reflects the number of contact hours being taught, modified by the number of preparations, course enrollments, nature of the courses, funded educational grants, etc. Normally T is equal to 16 for IAS with an average teaching load (as determined by the teaching load of the IAS members in the Department).

5.6.1.2 Scholarship/Professional Development and/or Service

For the purposes of merit and promotion, IAS members are required to engage in Service and/or Scholarship/Professional Development activities as described in Sections 4.1.2 and 4.1.3. IAS members are expected to include these activities and accomplishments in the Annual Merit Report.

Based on the Departments Definition of Scholarship and Professional Development (see Section 9.2), the Chair, in consultation with the IAS member, will assign the IAS member a weighting factor, $R + S$, for his/her scholarly activity. Normally, $R + S = 4$, and will lie in the range from 0 to 8.

5.6.2 The IAS Merit Evaluation Process

The 5-member IAS Merit Review Committee shall consist of at least one Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) and up to four tenured or tenure-track members of the department.

During the Merit Evaluation Process, Annual Merit Reports for all IAS shall be distributed to members of the IAS Merit Review Committee. The committee will be responsible for evaluating the performance of the IAS.

Teaching effectiveness will, in part, be judged using student evaluations given in each of the courses taught. Peer observations based on classroom visitations will be filed by tenured faculty and distributed to the committee for review. Teaching effectiveness will also be judged on, but not limited to, development of new courses and laboratories, curriculum development, etc.

During the evaluation of an IAS member, the committee will assign a score in each of the categories of Teaching and optional Scholarship/Professional Development/Service. The score in each category shall be based on the quality and quantity of work performed, successful completion of plans contained in the IDP, etc., and should be made in comparison with the rest of the IAS. The weighting factors represent the largest score an IAS member can earn in each category.

IAS evaluations will be based on the same criteria and procedures as for the faculty (see Section 5.4), with each committee member assigning scores to each IAS. IAS members of the committee will not score themselves. If there are three or more IAS in the Department, the average score of all IAS being evaluated should lie in the range of 12 to 15.99 (Significantly Meritorious). If there are two IAS in the Department, their average score should lie in the range of 10 to 18. If there is only one IAS in the Department, the appropriate score on an absolute scale will be assigned.

During the IAS evaluation process, the committee will meet to discuss the merit evaluation criteria and the Annual Merit Reports for each IAS in the Department. Any IAS on the committee will absent themselves from discussion of their report. The committee members will then have the opportunity to revise their scores before the committee votes on the final evaluations for each IAS.

The committees scores and suggestions for improvement will be communicated to the Department Chair for incorporation into each IAS members Departmental Individual Development Plan.

The IAS Merit Review Committee will also use the results to complete the IAS members annual performance review.

5.6.3 IAS Distribution of Merit

An IAS members performance will be categorized as Not Meritorious, Meritorious, Significantly Meritorious or Exceptionally Meritorious, based on his/her total merit score. The pool of merit funds for instructional academic staff is separate from the faculty pool. The merit funds will be distributed similarly to faculty merit as described in Section 5.5, with IAS appointment percentages taken into account.

5.7 Appeals

A faculty/IAS member may request a reconsideration of his/her annual performance rating. This request must be made in writing to the Chair within one-week of the Chairs distribution of performance ratings. The appellant will meet with the Chair to discuss his/her evaluation. Within one week of this meeting, the Chairs final evaluation decision will be communicated, in writing, to the faculty/IAS member. Chairs may similarly appeal their performance rating with the Dean.

For faculty and IAS, appeals beyond the Departmental level may be presented to the Dean, and then to The Complaints, Grievances, Appeals and Academic Freedom Committee. (See the Faculty Senate Bylaws.)

5.8 Annual Review of NIAS

All NIAS will undergo an annual performance appraisal, following current UWS and UWL policy. As of Fall 2016, the procedure is outlined at the link below.

<https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/faculty-and-staff/performance-appraisals/>

5.9 Post-tenure Review

Consistent with UWL Post-Tenure review policy, the performance of all tenured faculty will be reviewed on a five-year cycle.

5.9.1 Deadlines

Post-tenure reviews will be completed and forwarded to the Dean no later than December 15. The Dec. 15 deadline starts the next 5 year cycle. For newly tenured faculty the 5 year cycle starts in the Fall after receiving tenure.

5.9.2 Committee Makeup

The departmental post-tenure committee shall be comprised of all tenured faculty, except those being reviewed. When a member, the Department Chair serves as the Committee chair. The committee will elect a chair in the Department Chair's absence.

5.9.3 Review Process

The faculty member must receive at least 21 calendar days of notification of the time/date of the meeting and deadline (7 days prior to the meeting) for which the review materials will be due.

Seven days before the committee meeting the faculty member under consideration needs to provide to the Committee Chair an electronic report from the electronic faculty portfolio system, (e.g., annual activity report with hyperlinks) drawn from the current five year cycle. The portfolio should also include the following materials:

- Hyperlinks to at least 1 syllabus for each course taught

- Hyperlinks to evidence of scholarly activities
- Service activities (hyperlinks are not required)
- (For SoE affiliated faculty only) Evaluative letter from the Dean of the School of Education

The candidate may also submit a narrative to supplement this report. Seven days prior to the meeting the Department Chair will provide the committee members composite SEI scores for each of the semesters being evaluated.

5.9.4 Criteria

The committee will consider the faculty member's performance in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and/or service, consistent with that faculty's workload assignments as indicated in their yearly goals, since last review.

The post-tenure review Committee will meet to review the faculty members materials and determine whether the faculty member 1) meets expectations, or 2) does not meet expectations.

5.9.5 Notification

The post-tenure review committee chair provides a letter to the Dean and faculty member within 14 calendar days of the committee meeting (no later than Dec.15) with the following information:

The date and the numerical result of the vote indicating the overall categorization of "meets/does not meet expectations" for the faculty member. The letter should include the names of all of the tenured faculty who voted and the committee chair's signature.

A brief description of the consensus points of the committee regarding the faculty member's strengths/deficiencies in teaching, scholarship, and/or service that formed the basis for the committees decision. The faculty member can request a meeting with the committee chair to discuss the evaluation further, if the faculty member wishes.

In the case of a "does not meet expectations" outcome, the department will also forward the faculty composite SEI scores for each semester being evaluated. The UWL post-tenure review policy describes the additional procedures regarding the development and implementation of remedial plans.

6 Retention and Tenure Decisions

6.1 Review Process

The Retention/Tenure Review Committee shall consist of all tenured members of the Physics Department. 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 using these guidelines. A committee need be formed only to consider contract and/or tenure reviews. Non-contract reviews may be performed by the Department Chair alone.

Early each semester, the Department Chair will assign tenured faculty to serve as classroom evaluators. Each semester, each probationary faculty member will be observed in at least two different courses by at least two different classroom evaluators. These peer evaluators will assess the classroom experiences they observed in a report to the probationary faculty member, the Chair of the Retention/Tenure Review Committee and the Department Chair.

Retention reviews are conducted according the University schedule. At least 20 days prior to the annual retention review, the Department Chair will notify each probationary faculty member in writing of the time and date of the review meeting. The Chair will also remind candidates to submit a recent copy of their Annual Merit Report, a current vita, and any supplemental materials they deem appropriate to the Review Committee at least one month prior to the date of the review. The Department Chair will supply the results of student evaluations for each probationary faculty member to the Review Committee, as well as merit and teaching assignment summaries. 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. For tenure decisions, a probationary faculty member may request that the committee not move into closed session.

Using the criteria in section 5.2, the Retention/Tenure Review Committee shall evaluate each probationary faculty members performance based on the completed Annual Merit Report, vita, classroom peer evaluations, student evaluations, and any other information, written or oral, presented to the Committee. Votes shall be cast by show of hands on a motion to retain. At least a two-thirds majority is necessary for a positive retention recommendation. The results of the vote shall be recorded by the Committee Chair.

In case of a non-renewal recommendation, the Committee shall prepare written reasons for its decision. These reasons shall be retained by the Committee Chair until requested by the probationary faculty member.

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.

6.2 Criteria

The members of the Retention/Tenure Review Committee shall use the submitted self, peer and student evaluation information to judge each probationary faculty members performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service (and chair, if applicable). Of these areas of

responsibility, teaching is most important.

After establishing a record of successful teaching, a program of continued scholarship is necessary for retention and, ultimately, a positive tenure recommendation (see Section 9.2.)

Service is also an important faculty responsibility. For probationary faculty a service record should be established after demonstrated success in teaching and scholarship. Probationary faculty are expected to have a successful record of accomplishments in all three areas of responsibility by the end of their probationary period.

6.3 Reconsideration

If a non-renewal recommendation is made by the Retention/Tenure 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 10 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, he/she shall request such a meeting in writing within two weeks of the receipt of the written reasons for non-renewal. The procedure for the reconsideration meeting is detailed in UWL 3.07 (4), (5), and (6).

7 Promotion Recommendations

7.1 Tenured & Tenure-track Faculty

7.1.1 Review Process

The Promotion Recommendation Committee(s) 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 four faculty members, the Department Chair shall work with the applicant to establish an appropriate committee using these guidelines. Early each fall semester the Department Chair shall form the Promotion Recommendation Committee(s), as needed, and establish the date(s) of the promotion consideration meeting(s). At its first meeting, the Committee(s) shall elect a Chair (who may be the Department Chair) for a one-year term by a simple majority vote.

Human Resources and/or the Dean will distribute to the Department Chair lists of faculty who meet the minimum university eligibility requirements for promotion in the upcoming academic year. These lists will be reviewed for accuracy by the Chair. At this time, the Department Chair will notify in writing the faculty members who are eligible for promotion of their status and the date of their promotion consideration meeting. Upon request, the Chair will also provide copies of the University and Departmental regulations and guidelines on promotion, and information on the provisions of the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law.

Faculty who are eligible, and wish to be considered, for promotion must submit a promotion portfolio/report to the Department Chair at least one month prior to the date of the promotion consideration meeting. The promotion portfolio/report shall be produced according to the current UWL guidelines for faculty promotions (see Appendix D). The peer evaluations described in Section 6.1 may be included in this portfolio. The Department Chair will forward these materials and student evaluation information to the members of the Promotion Recommendation Committee prior to the consideration meeting date. Faculty may submit other written materials or make an oral presentation at the consideration meeting. The requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meeting law shall apply to this meeting.

After discussion of a candidates performance with respect to the criteria in Section 7.1.2, votes shall be cast by a show of hands on a separate motion to promote for each promotion candidate. At least a two-thirds majority is necessary for a positive promotion recommendation. The results of the vote shall be recorded by the Committee Chair, and entered on the Committees portion of the Faculty Promotion Report. The committee shall prepare written reasons for each of its recommendations.

Within 7 days of the promotion consideration meeting, the Department Chair shall notify each candidate of the Committees recommendation. For positive recommendations, the Committee Chair shall include a letter of recommendation on behalf of the Committee as part of the Department Promotion Committee Report. With these materials, the Department Chair shall also transmit in writing a 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.

7.1.2 Criteria

To be considered for promotion to a higher rank, faculty must meet the minimum University criteria as stated in the Employee Handbook (also see Appendix D). For the rank of Associate Professor a candidate must provide evidence of teaching excellence, the establishment of a program of scholarship, and involvement in service activities. Evidence of teaching excellence shall include the results of self, peer and student evaluation of instruction. Scholarship shall be consistent with the Department's definition of scholarly activity (see Section 9.2). 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 evaluations. Significant scholarly productivity is judged by the quality and quantity of presentations, publications, and grant acquisitions. Substantial service activity will include service to the Department, the institution and the profession.

7.1.3 Reconsideration

Candidates who are not recommended for promotion may request the reasons for the non-promotion recommendation. This request must be submitted in writing to the Department Chair within seven days of the notice of the Committees recommendation. Within two weeks of receiving the written reasons, a candidate may request, by writing to the Department Chair, reconsideration by Promotion Recommendation Committee. The faculty member will be allowed an opportunity to respond to the written reasons using written 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.

7.2 Instructional Academic Staff

7.2.1 Review Process

The 5-member IAS Promotion Recommendation Committee shall consist of the Department Chair, at least one Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) and up to three additional tenured or tenure-track members of the department. IAS members under review cannot serve on the IAS Promotion Recommendation Committee. In cases where no IAS members are available to serve on the IAS Promotion Recommendation Committee, additional tenured or tenure-track members of the department shall serve on the committee. In cases where the required number of departmental faculty members cannot be met, the Department Chair shall work with the applicant to establish an appropriate committee using these guidelines. Early each fall semester the Department Chair shall form the IAS Promotion Recommendation Committee, as needed and establish the date(s) of the promotion consideration meeting(s). At its first meeting, the Committee shall elect a Chair (who may be the Department Chair) for a one-year term by a simple majority vote.

Human Resources and/or the Dean will distribute to the Department Chair lists of IAS who meet the minimum university eligibility requirements for promotion in the upcoming academic year. These lists will be reviewed for accuracy by the Chair. At this time, the Department Chair will notify in writing the IAS members who are eligible for promotion of their status and the date of their promotion consideration meeting. Upon request, the Chair

will also provide copies of the University and Departmental regulations and guidelines on promotion, and information on the provisions of the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law.

IAS who are eligible, and wish to be considered, for promotion must submit a promotion portfolio/report to the Department Chair at least one month prior to the date of the promotion consideration meeting. The promotion portfolio/report shall be produced according to the current UWL guidelines on IAS promotion (see Appendix E).

The Department Chair will forward these materials and student evaluation information to the members of the IAS Promotion Recommendation Committee prior to the consideration meeting date. IAS may submit other written materials or make an oral presentation at the consideration meeting. The requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meeting law shall apply to this meeting.

Within 7 days of the promotion consideration meeting, the Department Chair shall notify each candidate of the committees recommendation. For positive recommendations, the Chair shall include a letter of recommendation as part of the IAS Promotion Report. This letter should 1) address Teaching and Scholarship/Professional Development and/or Service activities of the candidate and 2) justify the decision that the candidates record warrants promotion. The Chair shall also include SEIs (with an explanation of the departmental SEI process) and Merit Review results from the last 6 semesters. Additionally, the Chair shall include the Departments Statement on IAS Scholarship/Professional Development as outlined in Section 9.2. With these materials, the Department Chair shall also transmit in writing a 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.

7.2.2 Criteria

To be considered for promotion, IAS must meet the University criteria as stated in UWLs guide to IAS promotion (see Appendix E). As required by the Instructional Academic Staff Personnel Policies and Procedures, all candidates for promotion will be judged on teaching plus professional development/scholarship and/or service. A candidate for promotion must provide evidence of teaching excellence. Evidence of teaching excellence shall include the results of self, peer and student evaluation of instruction. Scholarship/Professional Development activity, if pursued, shall be consistent with the Departments definition of scholarly activity (see Section 9.2) and professional development (Section 9.2.1). Scholarly productivity is judged by the quality and quantity of presentations, publications, and grant acquisitions. Service activity, if pursued, will include service to the Department, the institution and the profession. Service for IAS may include conference organization and article review activities.

7.2.3 Reconsideration

Candidates who are not recommended for promotion may request the reasons for the non-promotion recommendation. This request must be submitted in writing to the Department Chair within seven days of the notice of the Committees recommendation. Within two weeks of receiving the written reasons, a candidate may request, by writing to the Department Chair, reconsideration by the IAS Promotion Recommendation Committee. The IAS member will be allowed an opportunity to respond to the written reasons using written 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.

8 Governance

8.1 Selection of the Chair

Specific details of the selection process are contained in Faculty Senate Bylaw section regarding Selection of Department Chairpersons. Any tenured or probationary faculty member of the Department is eligible to serve as Chair. The term of office is three years. All faculty and continuing members of academic staff are eligible to vote in the election for a Chair.

8.2 Responsibilities and Rights of the Chair

A thorough listing of the Chairs responsibilities is contained in Faculty Senate Bylaw Section describing Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons. These duties include: preparing class schedules and teaching assignments; overseeing the Dual-degree programs; developing curriculum revisions; preparing and monitoring the Departments operating budget; arranging Department meetings and appointing faculty to Departmental committees; appointing and monitoring search and screen activities for Departmental vacancies; evaluating the performance of faculty, academic staff and classified personnel within the Department; preparing the Departments annual report; and representing the Department in various university matters.

8.3 Standing Departmental Committees

8.3.1 Strategic Planning Committee (see Appendix F)

9 Other

9.1 Affirmative Action, Design for Diversity, and Staffing Plan

Because of the difficulty of knowing when changes in staff will take place and the small number of staff in the Physics Department, no detailed plan is given. When staff changes are anticipated and/or made, the Department will consult with the Affirmative Action Officer for the University to insure that the procedures and actions taken are consistent with the University's Affirmative Action Plans and Diversity Goals.

9.2 Definition of Scholarship

In the Department of Physics, scholarship activities are those activities that either contribute to, or apply, the body of scientific knowledge in physics, physics education, teacher education, or related areas through systematic experimental or theoretical inquiry.

An essential component of scholarship is publication of original research in peer-reviewed media (e.g. print journals, books, electronic journals).

Other activities and accomplishments that are considered scholarship include, but are not limited to (in unranked order): writing and publishing books, chapters, and articles; funded grant proposals; progress reports submitted for continuing grants; presentations of research results at meetings and conferences; conducting or organizing research workshops or conferences; refereeing or reviewing journal papers or grant proposals; submission of grant proposals; publications in conference proceedings; development and construction of research apparatuses; consulting on projects, etc. See the definition of scholarship in the JPC Guide to Faculty Promotions (Appendix D) for further details on reporting these activities.

9.2.1 Definition of Professional Development for IAS

In addition to the scholarship activities outlined in Section 9.2, for IAS promotion and merit purposes, Professional Development activities are those that enable the IAS member to be a better teacher or scholar or to provide more effective service to the university, community, or his/her discipline. Such activities include, but are not limited to (in unranked order): attending conferences, meetings, seminars, or workshops; formal coursework; receiving training on the use of equipment or on pedagogical techniques; attaining or working towards a professional certification, etc. See the definition of professional development in the JPC Guide to IAS Promotion (Appendix D) for further details on reporting these activities.

9.3 Program Goals and Methods of Assessment

1. The Chair is responsible for appointing a Department Assessment Committee.
2. A suitable form of assessment should be done in each course by each instructor every semester.
3. At least one Department meeting each year should be devoted to the discussion of assessment, information discovered and actions to be taken.

4. The Department will consult with and coordinate with the University Assessment Coordinator in the Provost/Vice Chancellor's Office as needed.

9.4 Salary Inequity Policy

1. Any claim of salary inequity must
 - (a) be initiated by the individual who believes their salary is inequitable and
 - (b) be based on considerations of rank, preparation, experience and performance (as determined by Department merit evaluation processes).
2. Individuals requesting Salary Inequity Adjustments will present their case to the Department Chair in writing. If the Chair believes the case deserves adjustments, then the case, with a letter of support written by the Chair, will be forwarded to the Dean.
3. If the Chair does not believe the case deserves adjustment and the individual wishes to persist, then the individual requesting Salary Inequity Adjustments may present their case to the Department Faculty in writing. If the faculty believes the case deserves adjustment, then the case, with a letter of support written by the Chair (or another member of the Department Faculty if requested by the individual), will be forwarded to the Dean.
4. If the faculty of the Department do not agree the case deserves adjustment and the individual wishes to persist, then the individual may present their case directly to the Dean.

9.5 Summer Appointment Policy

Eligible candidates include current physics faculty and scientists working in the Department, such as post-doctoral researchers or graduate students. Minimum qualifications are M.S. or Ph.D. (ABD).

If there is more than one candidate, the Chair of the Department will Chair a committee consisting of every faculty member in the Department excluding those applying for the summer positions. This committee will choose an instructor. The strongest criteria for choice will be based upon the students in the class receiving the best possible instruction. Preference should be given to those who have officially declared their retirement within the next three years.

A Student Evaluation of Instruction Questions

The following questions will be distributed to students for Student Evaluation of Instruction in Physics Courses. Instructions to students will follow current UWL policy.

1. I was looking forward to taking this class.
2. The instructor was helpful to students.
3. The instructor was well-prepared.
4. The instructor communicated the subject matter clearly.
5. I learned a great deal from this instructor.
6. Overall, this instructor was excellent.
7. The instructor demonstrated competence in the subject matter and/or proficiency in the laboratory equipment & techniques.
8. The instructor clearly conveyed course and/or laboratory goals & objectives, expectations, and grading policy.
9. The instructor used evaluation procedures (exams, quizzes, homework, etc.) which were fair and appropriate.
10. The instructor set reasonable standards for student achievement while providing sufficient challenge.
11. The instructor was genuinely concerned that students learn and understand the course material, and fostered an atmosphere conducive to learning.
12. The instructor provided opportunities for students to improve their overall problem-solving skills, critical thinking, and/or ability to reason.
13. The instructor successfully fulfilled the course goals and objectives.

B Departmental Individual Development Plan for IAS

See next 5 pages.

INSTRUCTIONS TO DEPARTMENT CHAIRS:

All IAS will be reviewed annually using this form [Items 1- 5 (including Table 1) completed by chair - form signed by IAS and chair].

- A copy of this form signed by the IAS member and the chair (with letter if applicable) should be sent to the faculty member, the Dean’s Office and HR (hrinfo@uwlax.edu) simultaneously when completed.
- The latest date they can be submitted to HR through the Dean's Office is July 31. Individual Deans' Offices may wish to have the annual reviews submitted in Spring prior to the contract renewals (for academic year contracts).

Accompanying letter written by the chair (or department committee) ^

- Required if IAS is Redbooked¹ and at a 50% appointment or higher.
- Recommended if IAS is non-Redbooked at a 50% appointment or higher.
- Letter should address aspects of the individual’s job performance with respect to their position description (PD).
- Letter may include commentary on elements of the individual’s portfolio associated with potential promotion if requested by the IAS member (Table 2).

^Departments with many IAS are encouraged to create committees within the department to provide review of IAS that provides feedback on professional development.

(OPTIONAL) Feedback on potential promotion readiness (Table 2 completed by IAS)

- IAS with several semesters at UWL^A and an interest in potential promotion^B may complete Table 2 requesting feedback on additional professional development prior to their annual review.
 - ^ARedbooked¹ IAS with at least 2 years at UWL with a 75%+ contract
 - ^BIAS who are eligible for and planning to go up for promotion in the next 2-3 years
- Chairs/departments may provide verbal feedback on the item requested by the IAS member and then attend to specific goals or directions in the letter.

For promotional purposes the classification progression for IAS is as follows:

Associate Lecturer	Lecturer (no prefix)	Senior Lecturer
Clinical Assistant Professor	Clinical Associate Professor	Clinical Professor

Additional information at: [IAS promotion resources](#)

¹ “The Redbook” refers to the official UW System budget book. Individuals who are hired into a “Redbooked” position, have their names associated with a specific budget FTE line. Individuals who are non-Redbooked, are sometimes referred to as “adjuncts,” “pool hires,” “temporary Instructional Academic Staff,” and/or “short term.” A person could be hired as “non-Redbooked” for many semesters in a row. Non-Redbooked individuals are not eligible for IAS promotion or pay plan increases.

Employee Name:	Employee ID:
Title:	Department:
Review Completed by:	Review period – from to
Department Chair:	Review Date:

IAS ANNUAL REVIEW FORM REQUIRED ELEMENTS:

1. TABLE 1 - Teaching Quality Evidence

SEIs (comparable to department median and rank for IAS)	REQUIRED	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Expectation (discuss with IAS and in letter*) <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectation OR <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds expectations
Syllabi^	REQUIRED	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Expectation (discuss with IAS and in letter*) <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectation OR <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds expectations
Learning outcomes are included in course syllabi^	REQUIRED	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Expectation (discuss with IAS and in letter*) <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectation OR <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds expectations
Participation in departmental or college level required course-based assessments	IF RELEVANT	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Expectation (discuss with IAS and in letter*) <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectation OR <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds expectations

^Faculty Senate expected to require as of Fall 2017 for all courses except independent study.

Departments vary in the extent to which they use or require the following – check “not applicable” if not used in review

Grade Distributions	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Expectation (discuss with IAS and in letter*) <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectation OR <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds expectations
Student Comments	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Expectation (discuss with IAS and in letter*) <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectation OR <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds expectations
Peer Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Expectation (discuss with IAS and in letter*) <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectation OR <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds expectations
IAS self-reflection/teaching philosophy	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Expectation (discuss with IAS and in letter*) <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectation OR <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds expectations

**if letter is provided (required for 50% or more Redbooked IAS)*

Employee Name: _____

Department: _____

2. All duties contained in the position description are being performed satisfactorily.

YES NO (If no, must be reflected in a letter).

3. If applicable based on accreditation: professional licensures, certifications, and/or productivity guidelines appropriate to the department or program have been discussed during this review.

Not applicable YES NO

4. Merit – Semester completed _____
Merit Designation _____

5. Reassigned time (if applicable) % _____
Brief Description _____
(Supervisors need to provide a letter and PD for reassigned time outside the department.)

Department (or Committee) Chair Signature

Date: _____

Employee signature

Date: _____

The signature of an employee on this annual review form indicates that the review has occurred and that the information contained on this form represents the feedback that has been discussed with the IAS member under review. It does not necessarily indicate agreement with the results of the review.

CHAIRS – Submit a copy of this form and a letter (required for all 50% or higher IAS who are Redbooked) to the IAS, the Dean’s Office and HR.

Employee Name:	Employee ID:
Title:	Department:

IAS ANNUAL REVIEW FORM OPTIONAL ELEMENT: Feedback on potential promotion readiness
- (Table 2 completed by Employee)

This form is designed to provide guidance and structure to a process that is meant to be developmental in nature. Emphasis is placed on the quality of the activities rather than the quantity or breadth across activities.

INSTRUCTIONS TO IAS: IAS who have been at UWL for several semesters who are interested in seeking potential promotion are encouraged to consider how to best construct a compelling promotion portfolio based on the university’s criteria. Below is a non-exhaustive list of traditional promotion aspects. PLEASE JUDICIOUSLY INDICATE THAT YOU WOULD LIKE FEEDBACK ON AN ELEMENT BY CHECKING THE APPROPRIATE BOX FOR WHICH YOUR PORTFOLIO CLEARLY PROVIDES EVIDENCE.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CHAIRS (or departmental committee): Please discuss feedback on the elements checked by IAS members with the individual and attend to any specific goals or directions in the accompanying letter.

TABLE 2: TEACHING	Examples (non-exhaustive)	COMPLETED BY: IAS
Assignments and assessments address learning outcomes as articulated in course syllabi		<input type="checkbox"/> I’ve provided evidence in my portfolio and would like feedback on this element.
Direct and indirect measures of student learning	(e.g., pre-posttests, selected exam components, fieldwork observations, writing examples coded for specific objectives obtained, student assessment of learning gains, focus groups or exit interviews)	<input type="checkbox"/> I’ve provided evidence in my portfolio and would like feedback on this element.
Teaching excellence (in addition to required elements)	(e.g., grants to support teaching improvement, inclusive excellence activities, community engagement activities, teaching awards)	<input type="checkbox"/> I’ve provided evidence in my portfolio and would like feedback on this element.
Teaching innovations	(e.g., development of new teaching materials, innovations in curriculum, evidence-based teaching improvements, innovative use of technology in teaching, inclusive excellence activities, community engagement activities)	<input type="checkbox"/> I’ve provided evidence in my portfolio and would like feedback on this element.
Teaching development activities	(e.g., conferences, workshops, CATL events)	<input type="checkbox"/> I’ve provided evidence in my portfolio and would like feedback on this element.
Leadership roles in teaching	(e.g., leadership role in enhancing the curriculum, directed student research)	<input type="checkbox"/> I’ve provided evidence in my portfolio and would like feedback on this element.
Other		<input type="checkbox"/> I’ve provided evidence in my portfolio and would like feedback on this element.

Employee Name:	Department:
-----------------------	--------------------

TABLE 2: Professional Development/ Creative Activities/Scholarship and Service	Examples (non-exhaustive)	COMPLETED BY IAS MEMBER
Service at UWL	(e.g., student advising, peer mentoring, department service, college service, university service) - leadership roles should be noted	<input type="checkbox"/> I've provided evidence in my portfolio and would like feedback on this element.
Service outside of UWL	(e.g., membership in professional organizations, professional service, discipline-related community service) - leadership roles should be noted	<input type="checkbox"/> I've provided evidence in my portfolio and would like feedback on this element.
Professional and Research Activities	(e.g., continuing professional education, conference/workshop attendance, publications, presentations, works in progress, grants)	<input type="checkbox"/> I've provided evidence in my portfolio and would like feedback on this element.
Other: (Please specify)		<input type="checkbox"/> I've provided evidence in my portfolio and would like feedback on this element.

CHAIRS – Submit a copy of this form and a letter (required for all 50% or higher IAS who are Redbooked) to the IAS, the Dean's Office and HR. Table 2 (pp. 4-5) need only be included if the IAS member completed the table and requested feedback.

C Faculty Merit Evaluation Scoring and Distribution

C.1 Score Sheet

See next page.

C.2 Distribution

The number of faculty in each merit category will be distributed to all tenured and probationary faculty along with that faculty's individual merit score.

Score Sheet for the Annual Merit Report

Annual Merit Reports, SEI-Scores and Faculty Goals for individual faculty members for the previous academic year have been distributed. We need peer evaluation merit scores for merit evaluation for the year. Materials and activities should only include the time period June 1 – May 31 of the previous academic year. Report **points** for each person (except yourself) in each of the three areas. The three areas are Teaching (T), Research (R) and Service (S) as listed in the Faculty Goals. The **points** reported for each person in each category should not exceed those indicated. The average number of **total points** for the various faculty members should be 14/20.

<u>Faculty</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Total</u>
Name 1:	__/12	__/4	__/4	00/00	__/20
Name 2:	__/12	__/4	__/4	00/00	__/20
Name 3:	__/12	__/4	__/4	00/00	__/20
Name 4:	__/12	__/4	__/4	00/00	__/20
Name 5:	__/12	__/4	__/4	00/00	__/20
Name 6:	__/12	__/4	__/4	00/00	__/20

Sign and return to Department Office by _____

Signature _____ Date _____

.....

<u>Faculty</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Total</u>
Chair Name:	__/8	__/2	__/2	__/8	__/20

Cut along the dotted line, sign and return to _____ by _____

Signature _____ Date _____

D Faculty Promotion Guidelines and Forms

Current UWL guidelines and forms for promotion can be found at UWLs Faculty Promotion Resources website, which as of October 2016 is at the following location.

<http://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Faculty-Promotion-Resources/>

E IAS Promotion Guidelines and Forms

Current UWL guidelines and forms for promotion can be found at UWLs Faculty Promotion Resources website, which as of October 2016 is at the following location.

<https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/ias-promotion-resources/>

F Strategic Planning Committee Bylaws

The Strategic Planning Committee will serve to evaluate and assess existing programs in the Department of Physics, as well as conduct itself in an advisory role, guiding the Department of Physics in the upcoming years.

The Committee must be formed a minimum of once every five years and a maximum of once every year. The Committee shall receive a charge, consistent with its purpose, from the Department Chair and the Committees powers shall be limited to executing its charge. All recommendations endorsed by the Committee will be presented to the Department of Physics for approval. For Committee recommendations that are not unanimous, the majority and dissenting opinions will be presented to the Department.

Membership

The Physics Department Chair shall request volunteers from the Physics faculty with which to form the Strategic Planning Committee. Members shall be chosen to provide representation from within the Department of Physics and shall include suitable representation of both probationary and tenured faculty members. Committee members shall be chosen for one-year terms and elect a Chair and Secretary of the Committee. The Department Chair shall serve as a non-voting ex officio member of the Committee.

Meetings

A quorum shall consist of a majority of its voting members and will be required whenever it is necessary to vote on any matter before the Committee.

Any voting member failing to attend three meetings during any academic year (barring medical reasons or professional obligations) will have vacated the position.

Duties and Responsibilities

The Committee Chair shall

- prepare the agenda for all Committee meetings
- arrange the time and place for meetings
- notify all members of the meetings
- conduct meetings of the Committee
- in the absence of the Secretary, appoint a temporary one
- communicate Committee activities and request approval of recommendations through the Department of Physics and

- report the status of all recommendations made to the Department.

The Secretary shall prepare the minutes of the meetings and see that they are distributed to all members.

Approval

The Strategic Planning Committee is a committee that functions under the direction of the Department Chair and under the by-laws of the Department of Physics.

G Statement on School of Education Affiliated Faculty Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

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 (UWL 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 therefore may choose to pursue scholarship that is focused on Discipline-Based Education Research (DBER), PK-12 education, preparing future teachers, and/or Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). The Department of Physics considers these areas of inquiry in its definition of scholarship as those activities that either contribute to, or apply, the body of scientific knowledge in physics, physics education, teacher education, or related areas through systematic experimental or theoretical inquiry (section 8.2). Expectations and evidence for scholarship and creative activities are outlined in the JPC Guide to Faculty Promotions section 5.1.1.2.

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.