

**UW-LA CROSSE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY & BIOCHEMISTRY**  
***Bylaws, Policies, and Procedures***

*Approved and adopted unanimously by the Department on:*  
**January 20, 2009**

Last update (typos, links, etc.): **2011.09.01**

# UW-LA CROSSE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY & BIOCHEMISTRY

## *Bylaws, Policies, and Procedures*

### Table of Contents

<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
<b>I. Title</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>II. Organization and Operation</b> .....	<b>4</b>
A. Preamble	
B. Meeting Guidelines	
C. Definitions of Departmental Membership & Voting	
D. Definitions of Quorum and Majority	
E. Changes to These Bylaws	
<b>III. Faculty/Staff Responsibilities</b> .....	<b>5</b>
A. Faculty	
1. Teaching	
2. Scholarship	
3. Service	
B. Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Responsibilities and Expectations	
1. Teaching	
2. Professional Development / Creative Activity / Scholarship	
3. Service	
C. Non Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations	
D. Student Evaluation of Instruction	
1. Ranked Faculty & SEIs	
2. IAS Renewal and Career Progression	
<b>IV. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)</b> .....	<b>8</b>
A. Evaluation Procedures & Criteria	
1. Faculty Annual (Merit) Review Criteria	
2. Instructional Academic Staff Annual (Merit) Review Criteria	
3. Non Instructional Academic Staff Process Overview & Criteria	
4. Annual (Merit) Review Procedures	
B. Distribution of Merit Funds	
C. Appeals	
<b>V. Faculty Personnel Review</b> .....	<b>15</b>
A. Retention (procedure, criteria, and appeal)	
1. Departmental Review Materials	
2. Dean's Review Materials	
3. Procedure	
4. Timeline	
B. Tenure Review and Departmental Tenure Criteria	
C. Post-Tenure Review	
D. Faculty Promotion Procedures (procedure, criteria, and appeal)	
1. Review Process	
2. Criteria	
3. Standards	
4. Reconsideration	
<b>VI. Instructional Academic Staff Review</b> .....	<b>20</b>
A. Annual Review	
1. Procedure	
B. Career Progression Procedures	
1. Criteria	
2. Standards	
C. Appeal Procedures	

<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>VII. Non-Instructional Academic Staff Review</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>VIII. Governance</b> .....	<b>25</b>
A. Department Chair	
1. Election of the Department Chair	
2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair	
B. Standing Departmental Committees	
1. Department Merit Evaluation Committee	
2. Faculty Retention/Tenure Review Committee	
3. Faculty Promotion Review Committee	
4. IAS Career Progression Committee	
5. IAS Annual Review Committee	
6. General Chemistry/General Education Committee	
7. Organic Chemistry Committee	
8. Biochemistry Committee	
9. Writing In the Major Committee	
10. Student Evaluation Committee	
11. Curriculum Committee	
12. Assessment Committee	
13. Public Outreach & Webpage Committee	
14. Major Purchases Committee	
15. Safety Committee	
16. Research Review Committee	
17. Building/Lab Spaces Committee	
18. Summer Session Committee	
19. Seminar Series Committee	
20. Bylaws Committee	
C. Departmental Programmatic Assessment Plan	
D. Additional Departmental Policies	
1. Salary Equity Policy	
2. Sick Leave & Vacation	
3. Faculty Request for Position/Time Release From Department Appointment	
4. Student Grievances–Grade Appeals	
5. Summer Session Course Offerings and Staff Assignments	
<b>IX. Search and Screen Procedures</b> .....	<b>32</b>
A. Tenure Track Faculty	
B. Instructional Academic Staff	
C. Contingency Workforce (Pool Search)	
D. Academic Staff	
<b>X. Student Rights and Obligations</b> .....	<b>33</b>
A. Complaint, Grievance and Appeal Procedures	
1. Grade Appeals	
2. Academic Non-Grade Appeals	
B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct	
C. Advising Policy	
<b>XI. Other</b> .....	<b>34</b>
<b>XII. Appendices</b> .....	<b>35</b>
Appendix A. Department Statement on Scholarship and Expectations for Scholarship During the Probationary Period	
Appendix B. Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) Form	
Appendix C. Search and Screen Committee and Procedures	

## I. UW-La Crosse Department of Chemistry Bylaws, Policies, and Procedures

### Notes:

- 1.) URLs in these by-laws are provided for convenience and should be reviewed regularly by the Bylaws Committee for accuracy.)
- 2.) **Green text** indicates that required by current University policy

## 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. UW-L policies and rules; 4. College policies and rules; 5. Shared governance by-laws and policies for faculty and academic staff; and 6. Departmental by-laws.

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

**B. Meeting Guidelines.** Meetings of the Chemistry Department and its Committees are conducted in accordance with *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised* (<http://www.robertsrules.com>) and *WI state open meeting laws* ([http://www.doj.state.wi.us/dls/OMPR/2010OMCG-PRO/2010\\_OML\\_Compliance\\_Guide.pdf](http://www.doj.state.wi.us/dls/OMPR/2010OMCG-PRO/2010_OML_Compliance_Guide.pdf), summary at <http://www.uwlax.edu/HR/employment/PeopleAdmin/Tools/OpenMeetingsRules-Summary.htm>). 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 all ranked (tenure-track or tenured) faculty (including those on leave or sabbatical who are in attendance), instructional academic staff members with at least a **50%** appointment, and non-instructional academic staff members with 100% appointments. Academic staff members with at least a **50%** appointment may vote in non-personnel departmental matters. Academic staff members with at least a **50%** appointment and an appointment beyond the current year have the right to vote in the election of the department chair. See section **VIII.A.1**.

**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 present.

**E. Changes to These Bylaws.** Amendments or additions to these bylaws may be adopted at any department meeting by a **two-thirds majority** vote of the faculty of the department, following a first reading of the proposed amendments or additions at a previous department meeting.

### 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 by-laws are available off the Senate webpage under "Senate Articles and By-laws" (<http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/>).

**1. Teaching.** Teaching is the primary mission of the faculty in the UW-La Crosse Department of Chemistry, 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 (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 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 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 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 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 (<http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/41st/3-29-07/IAS Appendix B.htm>).

**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 Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Career Progression and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse*, as approved by the UW-L Faculty Senate on 10/25/07 (<http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/42nd/FS Mtgs/10-25-07/IAS CPS Procedures.htm>). 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 Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Career Progression and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse*):

- 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 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 Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Career Progression and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse*) 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 Chemistry Department, (except research, independent study, and capstone 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 Chemistry Department Student Evaluation Instrument. (A copy of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) instrument is found in Appendix **XII.B**). The department will follow the UW-L SEI policy and procedure available off the Faculty Senate webpage (<http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/>).

**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, the minimum and maximum composite SEI for the department, and the candidate's rank in SEI scores relative to all departmental ranked faculty (tenure-track or tenured) for that term (e.g., 3 of 15).

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



## IV. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)

**A. Evaluation Procedures & Criteria.** Consistent with *UW-S 3.05* and *UW-L 3.05*, the performance of all faculty (as well as continuing full-time academic staff) in the Department of Chemistry 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 UW-L **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 review. **The results of these merit reviews for all ranked faculty who have completed at least one academic year at UW-L 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 his/her 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 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 Annual (Merit) Review Criteria.** The performance of all continuing, full-time Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) in the Department of Chemistry 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 UW-L **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 Merit Evaluation Committee meeting, the chair will notify each IAS member, in writing, of his/her 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 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 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 career progression 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 Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Career Progression and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse*.

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.

**v. Post-Tenure Review.** As required by **UW-S 3.05** and **UW-L 3.05** of the *Faculty Personnel Rules*, tenured faculty members no longer eligible for promotion also are evaluated in each of the primary areas of faculty responsibility. To meet these requirements for post-tenure review, all tenured faculty members are required to submit an Annual Faculty Activity Report and to participate fully in the evaluation process. This evaluation is based on the results of the most recent annual review, but reviews of the five preceding years also may be considered.

Tenured Professors and IAS Senior Lecturers of the Chemistry Department are assigned categorical Merit Category Designations and Performance Ratings using the same review criteria as for probationary faculty and IAS (see sections **IV.A.1** and **IV.A.2**).

In cases of unsatisfactory performance (defined here as a Performance Rating below the departmental performance standard of 1.5) in teaching and/or multiple areas of faculty responsibility, a listing of the primary areas of concern will be presented to the faculty member. The chair and the faculty member will meet to develop a written plan to correct the areas of concern within a specified time. Follow-up and re-evaluation of concerns will be conducted by the Annual (Merit) Review Committee after the agreed upon period has passed. This re-evaluation will be performed according to procedures described in the "Accountability" section of the *UW-L Tenured Faculty Review and Development* policy. The annual results of the post-tenure review, and any correction plans drafted, will be forwarded to the dean of the college.

**c. Notification of Faculty of the Annual (Merit) Review Results.** The chairperson shall 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 his/her 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 his/her 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:

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

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

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

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

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

where:

**P** = the total dollars of the extra merit pool

**S<sub>i</sub>** = 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 his/her 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 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 his/her 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 *UW-L Faculty Rules*, and the *UW-L 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 <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/rules/Fac.htm>. The department will follow policies guiding part-time appointments for faculty and tenure clock stoppage available on the Human Resources website.

Tenure/retention decisions will be guided by the criteria established in the by-laws 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 by-laws should be applied to faculty with a contract date after **July 1, 2009**.

### 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. 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 by-laws. The chair will remind each probationary faculty member to submit a recent copy of his/her **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 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 his/her 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, he/she 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 **UW-L 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**

As required by **UW-S 3.05** and **UW-L 3.05** of the *Faculty Personnel Rules*, tenured faculty members no longer eligible for promotion also are evaluated in each of the three areas of faculty responsibility described in section **III.A**. To meet these requirements for post-tenure review, all tenured faculty members are required to submit an Annual Faculty Activity Report and to participate fully in the evaluation process. This evaluation, which is carried out by the Annual (Merit) Review Committee, is based on the results of the most recent annual review, but reviews of the five preceding years also may be considered.

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

The department will follow the guidelines and schedules regarding faculty promotion, which are available at <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/promo-resources.htm>.

**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 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 Promotion Recommendation Committee(s) 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 Promotion Recommendation Committee(s). 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 Promotion Recommendation 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 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.** Within **two weeks** of receiving notice of a negative decision by the Promotion Recommendation Committee, a candidate may request, by writing to the 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**).

## VI. Instructional Academic Staff Review

Academic Staff appointments may take many forms. Those most usually used in academic departments are the Lecturer, Laboratory Manager, Research Associate, Visiting Scholar, and Faculty Associate. Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Lecturers in the Department of Chemistry 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 III.B), their teaching load is usually larger than that of the tenure track faculty. Any special expectations of a member of the academic staff are stated in the contract letter.

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 Faculty Personnel rules **UWS 3.05 - 3.11** and **UWL 3.08**, academic staff will be evaluated annually. The Individual Development Plan (IDP) form will accompany the department's evaluation. IDP Form: [http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/idp/IDP\\_UnClassified/IAS\\_IDP\\_2.doc](http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/idp/IDP_UnClassified/IAS_IDP_2.doc). **Evaluations of instructional academic staff will occur in the spring semester.** 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 IAS Report-Individual (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 Distinguished and Senior Lecturers of the Department of Chemistry (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 IAS 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. Career Progression Procedures.** Policies and procedure guiding career progression for IAS are available at <http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate/committees/ias/pages/CareerProgression.html>. The Department of Chemistry follows the *Guide to Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Career Progression and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse*, approved by the UW-L Faculty Senate on 10/25/07. Candidates for career progression must conform their application portfolio to the guidelines given therein.

The departmental committee for Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Career Progression 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 Career Progression Review committee as needed. The department chair will chair this committee. The committee chair shall establish the date for the career progression consideration meeting in accordance with established university deadlines for the IAS career progression 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 progression candidate. At least a **two-thirds majority** is necessary for a positive career progression recommendation. The results of the vote shall be recorded by the committee chair, and entered on the committee's portion of the "Department IAS Career Progression 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 Career Progression 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 progression file to the dean.

When a candidate is not recommended for progression by the department, no further consideration shall occur nor shall the candidate's file be forwarded to the dean. The career progression 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 progression to a higher title, IAS must meet the minimum university criteria as stated in the *Guide to Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Career Progression and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse* as approved by the UW-L Faculty Senate on 10/25/07. Departmental expectations for IAS are described in section **III.B**

For the rank of **Lecturer**, a candidate must have completed 8 full-time semesters teaching in higher education or other appropriate experience with at least 2 full-time semesters teaching 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 **Senior Lecturer**, a candidate must have completed 12 full-time semesters teaching in higher education or other appropriate experience with at least 6 full-time semesters teaching 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**.

For the rank of **Distinguished Lecturer**, a candidate must have completed 20 full-time semesters teaching in higher education or other appropriate experience with at least 10 full-time semesters teaching at UWL. The candidate should have a sustained record of *excellence* in teaching and should be generally recognized as having made significant contributions in professional development / creative activity / scholarship and/or service

**2. Standards.** In keeping with the IAS Career Progression guidelines put forth by the Faculty Senate, the criteria used to evaluate IAS for progression 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, progression recommendations shall be based on the following standards:

#### **Distinguished Lecturer**

Earned doctorate in chemistry or related field

Evidence of extensive teaching experience and advanced knowledge and skills

An IAS member whose expertise is commonly recognized by peers and whose reputation for that expertise extends beyond the program or department (in addition to the qualities noted below)

Recognition for significant contributions in professional development / creative activity / scholarship and/or service

#### **Senior Lecturer**

Advanced degree in chemistry or related field

Evidence of extensive teaching experience and subject matter expertise

An IAS member who has gained a reputation among peers for demonstrably sustained superior teaching contributions (in addition to the qualities noted below)

Continued involvement in professional development / creative activity / scholarship and/or service activities

#### **Lecturer**

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 progression 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 career progression 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**

In accordance with Faculty Personnel rules **UWS 3.05 - 3.11** and **UWL 3.08**, academic staff will be evaluated annually. The Individual Development Plan (IDP) form will accompany the department's evaluation. IDP Form:

[http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/idp/IDP\\_UnClassified/NIAS\\_IDP\\_Template1.doc](http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/idp/IDP_UnClassified/NIAS_IDP_Template1.doc). The expectations of non-instructional academic 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 By-Laws (revised 2006), <http://www.uwlax.edu/facultysenate>, 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 Faculty Handbook ([http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/docs/2008\\_UW-L\\_Handbook.pdf](http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/docs/2008_UW-L_Handbook.pdf)).

**1. Election of the Department Chair.** Any tenured faculty member of the department, at the rank of assistant professor or above and on staff at this university for at least three semesters, is eligible to serve as department chair. The term of office is three years. All faculty members and academic staff with faculty status, and with a continuing appointment extending at least one year beyond the date of the election, are eligible to vote in the election for the department chair.

In brief, the procedures for electing the department chair are as follows: 1) elections shall be held during the month of February; 2) the dean shall send nominating ballots, containing the names of all members of the department eligible to serve as chairperson to each member of the department eligible to vote; 3) each person receiving a ballot shall nominate one person and return it to the dean, who shall tabulate the results; 4) the dean shall determine whether or not the two persons receiving the highest number of nominations are willing to serve if elected; however, if one person has received nominations from 60 percent, or more, of the eligible voters, that person shall be declared elected; 5) if a chairperson has not been selected in the nomination balloting, the dean shall place the names of the two persons receiving the highest number of nominations on a ballot and send it to the eligible voters for an election; 6) each person receiving the ballot shall vote for one person and return it to the dean; 7) the dean shall tabulate the results of the election and submit the name of the nominee receiving the most 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.

**2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair.** A thorough listing of the chair's responsibilities is contained in the Faculty Senate By-Laws 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. Standing Departmental Committees

**1. Department Merit Evaluation 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 Career Progression Review Committee.** See section VI.B.

**5. IAS Annual Review Committee.** See section VI.A

**6. General Chemistry/General Education Committee.** Responsible for coordination of the General Chemistry program, its compliance with University General Education requirements and assessment efforts, and the selection of texts to be used in CHM 103/104.

**7. Organic Chemistry Committee.** Responsible for coordination of organic chemistry courses and selection of texts to be used in CHM 300, 303, 304, and 305.

**8. Biochemistry Committee.** Responsible for coordination of the Biochemistry major program and selection of texts to be used in CHM 325, 407, 417/517, and 418/518.

**9. Writing In the Major Program (WIMP) Committee.** Responsible for regular review and maintenance of the departmental WIMP, according to established university policy.

**10. Student Evaluation Committee.** Responsible for organizing and conducting student evaluations in all courses (except research, independent study, and capstone courses) each semester according to established department policy.

**11. Curriculum Committee.** Responsible for review of all curriculum proposals and eventually forwarding recommendations to the department for approval.

**12. 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.

**13. Public Outreach & 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.

**14. 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.

**15. 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.

**16. Research Review Committee.** Reviews research proposals as required by Wisconsin Environmental Policy Act to evaluate any environmental implications of the research activities.

**17. Building/Lab Spaces Committee.** Responsible for reviewing departmental laboratory and office space usage and for making recommendations to the chair for space assignments.

**18. Summer Session Committee.** See section VIII.D.5.

**19. Seminar Series Committee.** Responsible for scheduling and promoting seminars for departmental majors and faculty by speakers from other institutions; hosting the speakers.

**20. 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.

**C. Departmental Programmatic Assessment Plan.** The Chemistry Department Assessment Committee and/or Departmental 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 chemistry department 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 chemistry department will be assessed in alignment with UW-L's general education program assessment procedures.

#### D. Additional Departmental Policies

**1. Salary Equity Policy.** The following Salary Equity Policy provides for the identification of salary inequities within the Department of Chemistry 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 his or her 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.

**2. Sick Leave & Vacation.** Department members will account for sick leave in adherence to the most current UW System guidelines, <http://www.uwsa.edu/hr/benefits/leave/sick.htm>. 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 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 himself/herself 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, he/she 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.

#### **5. Summer Session Course Offerings and Staff Assignments.**

**a. Purposes of Summer Session.** Consistent with the Faculty Senate action of April 12, 1979, and the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, the Department of Chemistry adopts the following "Purposes of Summer Session."

**i. Instructional Service.** The primary purpose of the summer session is to provide instructional service. The department shall:

- Provide the offerings best meeting the needs of our programs and summer session students.
- Recommend qualified staff for instructional positions.
- Give preference in instructional assignments to those with the earned doctorate.

**ii. Professional Development.** The summer period provides an opportunity for professional development. The department shall encourage faculty to:

- Engage in professional development and to seek extramural support for such activity.
- Pursue higher academic degrees.

**b. Policies for Determining Course Offerings and Staff Assignments**

**i. It is the responsibility of the department chairperson with the approval of the department Summer Session Committee to:**

- Recommend summer session offerings.
- Recommend individual staff members to fill the instructional summer session positions allocated to the department and determine the appropriate level of support for each assignment.

Summer session appointments shall be made by the Chancellor on recommendations from the Vice Chancellor and the Dean of the College of Arts, Letters and Science.

**ii. Policies to be followed in formulating recommendations for summer session appointments:**

- As of the department action of December 12, 1978, all full time instructional academic staff is granted full faculty status for purposes of department governance and operation. Therefore, the words “faculty” and “staff” as used in this document are to be interpreted to include faculty and instructional academic staff.
- Qualified faculty shall be assigned instructional responsibilities. In cases where the qualifications of faculty members to teach courses to be offered are relatively equal, preference shall be given as follows in making recommendations for summer session appointments.
  - **First Priority**
    - Full-time faculty with earned doctorates in chemistry who have completed a minimum of one and one-half years of service in the department by the onset of the summer session in question.
    - All full time faculty within three years of announced retirement (See section VII.D.5.v).
  - **Second Priority**
    - Non-doctorates.
    - Doctorates with less than one and one-half years of service in the department.
    - Part-time faculty.
- Accepting a summer session appointment is contingent on accepting an appointment for the next academic year.

**iii. System of Rotation for Determining Summer Session Assignments.** The department shall use a point system that has been in use (with minor modifications) since 1969 to determine priorities for instructional assignments. Points shall be awarded to First Priority staff annually during the meeting of the Summer Session committee, if applicable, or by the department chair in the following manner:

- **Ph.D. in chemistry** = 0.2 point.

- **Rank** (as of the annual Summer Session committee meeting):
  - Professor = 0.3 point.
  - Associate Professor = 0.2 point.
  - Assistant Professor = 0.1 point
  - In a case involving academic staff, the “rank point allocation” shall be determined by the Summer Session Committee at the time of employment. This allocation shall be based on qualifications and experience of the staff member and shall be fixed and not subject to change during the period of appointment as academic staff.
- **Merit Evaluation.** The department Merit Evaluation Committee shall assign merit points for the evaluation year. Maximum range: +0.4 to –0.4 points. Faculty qualifying for full base merit (see Department of Chemistry Merit Evaluation system) shall be awarded points within the range of +0.4 to zero points.

Total points awarded individual faculty members each year shall be normalized against the instructional positions allocated the department the previous summer session using the following equation:

$$\frac{\text{Total SS positions previous SS – dept. chair allocation}^*}{\text{Total points awarded}} = \text{normalization factor}$$

*\*refers to any department instructional summer session position awarded the chairperson which is not subtracted from his/her total points (see **section VIII.D.5.iv**)*

Summer session positions (or fractions thereof) assigned to staff members shall be subtracted from their total points.

Points may be carried into future years. (Exception: no more than 2.0 points shall be carried forward.)

Since points are awarded and priorities for summer session employment are determined 18 months in advance of a given summer, staff members must have completed three semesters of service before eligible for a First Priority summer session appointment. (Exception: case where a new staff member has the unique expertise required for a summer session offering.)

Faculty requesting consideration for summer session employment shall be considered for an appointment.

- Staff with required qualifications shall be assigned to special courses.
- The remaining summer session assignments shall be made by offering those with the greatest number of points, first choice of summer session course offerings and the position fractions assigned to the course.

Second Priority staff shall be considered for summer session assignments if courses and positions are available after considering requests of all First Priority staff. Eligibility for available appointments shall be determined by a review of qualifications, prep code, rank, and merit evaluations over the most recent three-year period. The department Summer Session Committee shall make this review and recommend staff as necessary.

**iv. Consideration for the Department Chairperson.** Since the chairperson must be available to serve the administrative needs of the department during the summer session and since no position allocation is provided for this service, it is expected that the chairperson be assigned an instructional appointment.

The chair shall be allowed a maximum 0.40 instructional position per summer session that shall not be subtracted from accumulated points. In the event that the chairperson receives a summer session position appointment for department administration, that

position (or fraction thereof) shall not be subtracted from his/her points, but shall reduce the 0.40 instructional position allocation by an amount equivalent to the administrative appointment.

**v. Consideration for Retiring Faculty.** To the extent possible, the department guarantees full-time staff a maximum of 1.0 summer session position over the three summers prior to the last full academic year of service before retirement.

- This guarantee applies to all full-time staff regardless of priority classification or priority points.
- Any summer session positions assigned to the retiree, at his/her request, the two summers prior to this period shall be subtracted from this guarantee.
- The chairperson must be notified, in writing, of an anticipated retirement three summers prior to the last academic year before retirement. Once notice is served, retiring faculty members shall be included in the First Priority for summer session employment. The chairperson, in consultation with the Summer Session Committee, and the retiree shall arrange for summer session employment.
- Summer session appointments to retiring staff shall be subtracted from summer session priority points.
- This guarantee becomes void in the event that retirement policies change so that retirement benefits are no longer affected by summer employment.

**vi. Other.**

- Positions other than those allocated the department or related unit (mathematics, medical technology, etc.) for summer session instructional assignments, to which staff may be appointed, shall not be subtracted from accumulated points.
- Transfer of summer session priority points between faculty is prohibited.



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

The department will follow hiring procedures prescribed by the University's Office of Human Resources (HR) in conjunction with AAOD and UW System and WI state regulations. See Appendix **XII.C** for sample Search & Screen documentation and procedures.

**A. Tenure-track Faculty.** The approved UW-L tenure track faculty recruitment and hiring policy and procedures are found at  
<http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin/Forms/S&S-Planning&Procedures-Faculty.doc>.

Additionally, UW-L's spousal/partner hiring policy can be found at  
<http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/current/Policy/Spouse-HirePOL.pdf>.

**B. Instructional Academic Staff.** Hiring policy and procedures are found at  
<http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin/Forms/S&S-Planning&Procedures-IAS-NIAS-Admin.doc>.

**C. Contingency Workforce (Pool Search).** Hiring policy and procedures are found at  
<http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin/Pools/Pool-S&S-Procedures.doc>.

**D. Academic Staff.** Hiring policy and procedures are found at  
<http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/employment/PeopleAdmin/Forms/S&S-Planning&Procedures-IAS-NIAS-Admin.doc>.

## X. Student Rights and Obligations

### A. Complaint, Grievance and Appeal Procedures

**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 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**.

**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 Eagle Eye Student Handbook ([http://www.uwlax.edu/studentlife/eagle\\_eye.htm](http://www.uwlax.edu/studentlife/eagle_eye.htm)).

**B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct.** Students who enroll in courses offered by the Department of Chemistry 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 [http://www.uwlax.edu/StudentLife/academic\\_misconduct.htm](http://www.uwlax.edu/StudentLife/academic_misconduct.htm) and <http://www.uwlax.edu/StudentLife/nonacademic-misconduct.htm>, respectively.

**C. Advising Policy.** Each student who majors in a program offered by the Department of Chemistry 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, 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 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**  
**Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) Form**

**UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-LA CROSSE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY**  
**STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION**

This course evaluation is an important means for you to express your view of your classroom experience. Although we assess the quality of instruction in many ways, we place great value on student input because of the unique perspective you have on what occurs in the classroom throughout the semester. Thus **you are important partners** in the process of making the course more effective, the instructor more attuned to his or her strengths and weaknesses, and the university a better place to learn. As such we ask you to treat the process professionally, seriously, sensitively, and collegially. Carefully consider the questions and answer truthfully. Your responses are one important factor in decisions affecting the career of your instructor. Instructors will not have access to course evaluations until after grades have been posted. We will treat the evaluation forms as the confidential documents that they are. These general guidelines also should be followed: You should be given a minimum of 10 minutes to complete the evaluation. The instructor, as well as any teaching assistants, should not be present when you are completing the evaluation. The designated representative should deliver completed evaluations promptly to the proper office. **Also, please supply thoughtful answers to the questions on page 2.**

Please use a #2 (or softer) pencil to mark your answers on the computer answer sheet, and completely blacken the circle of your choice. Do not write on page 1. Please write your answers to the narrative questions directly on page 2. Thank you.

**QUANTITATIVE SURVEY**

1. Student classification (if you have "special student" status, please leave blank).  
A = Freshman      B = Sophomore      C = Junior      D = Senior      E = Graduate
2. Reason for taking this course.  
A = General Education  
B = Core requirement  
C = Major requirement  
D = Minor requirement  
E = Elective
3. Grade you expect in this course: (if this is not a graded class, please leave blank)  
A = A/AB      B = B/BC      C = C      D = D      E = F

**Rate your instructor according to each of the numbered statements below using the following scale:**  
**A = Strongly Agree      B = Agree      C = Neutral      D = Disagree      E = Strongly Disagree**

4. I was looking forward to taking this course.
5. The instructor was helpful to students
6. The instructor was well prepared.
7. The instructor communicated the subject matter clearly.
8. I learned a great deal from this instructor.
9. Overall, this instructor was excellent.
10. The instructor demonstrated enthusiasm for the subject.
11. The course objectives and expectations were made clear.
12. The grading policy for the course was made clear.
13. The instructor encouraged you to reason.
14. Tests and assignments were returned in a timely manner.
15. The instructor challenged you and motivated your learning in the course.
16. The instructor was prompt and regular in meeting with the class.
17. The instructor was respectful of students and receptive toward questions and comments.
18. In comparison with other university instructors, how would you rate this instructor's overall teaching ability?  
A = Excellent      B = Good      C = Acceptable      D = Poor      E = Unacceptable

## NARRATIVE SURVEY

Instructor Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Course Number and Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Year: \_\_\_\_\_

(Circle One) **Fall ~ Spring ~ Summer**

1. Did you find the assignments for this course useful? Please suggest changes in assignments, course materials, text, class operation, etc., that would enhance your learning in this course.
  
2. Briefly describe the most meaningful and least meaningful experiences for you in this course. Please include why you feel these have been significant.
  - a.) most meaningful ...
  
  - b.) least meaningful ...
  
3. Were there teaching techniques that enhanced or detracted from your learning? (For example, were there presentation styles, questioning skills, teaching aids, body language, or humor used by the instructor that enhanced or detracted from your learning?)
  - a.) enhanced ...
  
  - b.) detracted ...
  
4. Please offer any additional comments or constructive criticisms for this instructor ...

## Appendix C Search and Screen Committee and Procedures

The Department of Chemistry is committed to recruiting and hiring the best faculty to meet the campus mission of providing a high quality university education for a diverse population. The hiring process itself should be one that enables the university to reach these decisions with a minimum of delay. Attaining diversity in hiring is best promoted when job offers can be made expeditiously. The department utilizes the *La Crosse Faculty Recruitment & Hiring Guidelines* recommended by the Faculty Senate to the Chancellor for approval and approved in 2001 (*Updated 3-23-2007*) as a base template for departmental search and screens. Changes to the *La Crosse Faculty Recruitment & Hiring Guidelines* are indicated by strikethroughs, underscores, and red text.

### **The Recruitment and Hiring Procedures for Tenure Track Faculty (including Search and Screen Procedures)**

*(Note: Changes to these procedures must be clearly indicated to HR and AAO – and be approved by the dean, the AAO, and HR)*

**There are 5 steps involved in searching for a faculty position:**

- [Step 1: Approval to Recruit and Advertise](#)
- [Step 2: Receiving and Processing Applications](#)
- [Step 3: Screening Applicants and Interviewing Applicants](#)
- [Step 4: The Hiring Process](#)
- [Step 5: The Closing of a Search](#)

### **STEP 1: Approval to Recruit and Advertise**

#### **1. Confirmation of FTE (position) and Salary (available resources for the position)**

Prior to creation of a SS Committee or SS documents, the dean must have verification from the PVC of the availability of the position and the replacement salary for the position. The SS chair (or department), dean, Business Services, PVC, and HR will utilize the electronic tracking system (FAST) that was developed by HR to improve tracking in the recruitment process. To initiate the recruitment, the dean will direct the chair to begin the process.

The department chair will download a copy of the [Authorization to Recruit for Faculty Position](#) (Form L-1347 – Faculty) and print it on pink paper.

- The chair will request a recruitment number from HR (this is the position identifier throughout the recruitment process) by sending an email request to [recruit@uwlax.edu](mailto:recruit@uwlax.edu) or by calling HR.
- The chair will complete sections 1 and 2 (the departmental components) of the *Authorization to Recruit for Faculty Position* (Form L-1347). The “pink sheet” includes a field for the recruitment number provided by HR.
- Directions for completing *Authorization to Recruit Form* are available at [http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/recruit/Faculty\\_Recruitment/DIRECTIONS.FOR.AUTH.TO.RECRUIT-FAC-2002.htm](http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/recruit/Faculty_Recruitment/DIRECTIONS.FOR.AUTH.TO.RECRUIT-FAC-2002.htm).

The chair will then record the position and its status in FAST and forward the form to the dean's office. Upon initiating the routing of the pink sheet, the chair may initiate the processes and paperwork associated with #2 and #3 outlined below.

The dean will complete his/her part of the form, record the position status in FAST, and forward the form to Business Services for review of FTE availability and replacement salary. Upon verification of FTE and salary, Business Services will sign the original form, record the position status in FAST, and return the form to the PVC who will review the form, sign it if appropriate, and forward it to HR. HR will notify the dean and the chair when the pink sheet has been received by their office and indicate if any changes have been made on the form.

## 2. Organization of Departmental Search and Screen Committee

The department will organize a search and screen committee utilizing the following processes:

- Search and screen committee (SS committee) membership shall include all permanent Chemistry Department faculty and instructional academic staff members with at least 0.50 position appointment. The department chair may appoint a subcommittee to conduct the initial and semi-final screening leading to the finalist group, however any eligible faculty and instructional academic staff members may elect to serve on this subcommittee.
- The SS chair and department chair are responsible for reviewing current UW-L hiring procedures. The SS chair is responsible for briefing the SS committee on the SS procedures including the confidentiality requirements.
- The chair of the department or a SS committee member designated as the convener will convene the first meeting. The first meeting will include the selection of a SS chair, a recorder (if applicable), a review of position description, and discussion of search and screen process.
- By a simple majority vote, the SS committee will elect the SS committee chair (hereafter "SS chair"). The SS chair will be responsible for posting a notice of meetings through the *Campus Connection* (or outside the HR Office if unable to get in *Campus Connection*) in compliance with open meetings statutes. Unless a recorder is elected, the SS chair will be responsible for taking official minutes of meetings for the record. Minutes must comply with open meeting rules.
- A simple majority of SS committee members constitute a quorum necessary to conduct SS committee business. Changes to these procedures require approval of a two-thirds majority of the SS committee members present and approval of the dean, HR and the AAO. Members may not vote by proxy but may participate and vote by teleconference with advance notice to the SS chair. The SS chair is a voting member of the SS committee. All voting shall be done by show of hands unless a roll-call vote is requested by any member of the SS committee. The SS chair shall maintain a record of all votes by indicating the number of yeas, nays, and abstentions. Roll-call votes shall be used if a member is attending via teleconference.
- All deliberations of the SS committee and the names of nominees and applicants are confidential. Public statements are to be made only by the SS chair, and all questions relating to the business or progress of the SS committee are to be referred to the SS chair for reply.
- The SS chair, in compliance with open meetings rules, will post notice of all SS meetings – noting if any meeting will go into a closed session and whether a meeting that will go into a closed session will subsequently go into an open session.
- Evaluation meetings for the purpose of discussing individual applicants shall be closed by majority vote of those SS members in attendance (taken by roll call and recorded in the minutes as a roll call). The SS chair will announce s/he will entertain a motion "to convene in a closed session to consider personal history information about applicants for the position [list the position title, such as 'assistant professor in English Department'] as provided in section 19.85(1)(f) of Wisconsin Statutes." Upon completing business in a closed session, the SS committee may not reconvene in an open session within 12 hours, unless notice of the subsequent open session was included in the original meeting notice.
- SS committee members, their spouses, family members, or partners cannot be applicants for the position, so that there can be no possibility of nepotism.
- The SS chair shall be the custodian of all application materials and shall be responsible for their maintenance and making them available to the SS committee. The SS chair shall maintain a file of SS committee documents and records as required by the HR Office. The SS chair will keep a list of all applicants, including those who withdraw at a later stage. Applicants requesting confidentiality may be identified on such a list by an applicant number.
- During the recruitment, search and screen, and hiring processes, the search and screen committee members may have access to confidential information including, but not limited to, personal information, education history and employment history of applicants. This information and all discussions and voting outcomes conducted in a closed meeting must remain confidential both during the search and after the completion of the search process. Search and screen committee members may discuss this information only with other members of the search committee or with the authorized ex officio individuals – the dean, the HR director, and the AAO. Members must not permit any unauthorized person to access documents in their possession that contain applicant or search and screen information.



### 3. Submission of Recruitment and Hiring Materials to the Dean

Upon notification that HR has received the [Authorization to Recruit for Faculty Position](#) (Form L-1347) signed by the dean, Business Services, and the PVC, the SS chair will transmit the following forms to the dean's Office for approval by the Dean, AAO, and HR.

- [Faculty Recruitment Routing Slip](#)
- [Recruitment Efforts Form L-1747](#)

On the Recruitment Efforts Form, the SS committee will state proposed recruitment methods including:

  - (1) Where the position will be advertised (e.g., professional journals, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, the Internet, etc.). One advertisement must be in a national professional print journal that lists the rank and exact title, a full description of qualifications, and a full description of duties of the position. NOTE: An ad that directs applicants to additional information (aka a "pointer ad") will not meet this requirement.
  - (2) Other contacts (e.g., letters to presidents/chancellors, deans, director, alumni).
- [Position Vacancy Form L-1348](#) (yellow form)

On the Position Vacancy Form, the SS committee will state essential application information that will be incorporated into the national print ad.

  - (1) Application deadline: a minimum of four weeks after appearance of the first ad for a national search,
  - (2) The application procedure, including what constitutes a complete application,
  - (3) The name and address of the contact individual at UW-L,
  - (4) The AA/EEO and accommodation statements.
- [Position Description Form \(L-1813\)](#)

A position summary with major duties outlined.
- [Selection Criteria](#)

A form indicating the selection criteria identifying how applicants will be evaluated against the criteria – a sample is available on-line through HR.
- Search and Screen Committee Procedures (*The "UW-L Tenure-Track Faculty Recruitment & Hiring Policy and Procedures" document represents the accepted template for search and screen committee procedures. If these procedures are not the ones used by the SS committee, changes made to the template must to be clearly identified and then approved by the Dean, HR, and AAO.*)
- A copy of the component of the most current departmental by-laws pertaining to search & screen procedures (if applicable); *i.e., procedures for constituting a within department search & screen committee.* All department search and screen policies will be consistent with the body of search and screen guidelines in the "[UW-L Tenure-Track Faculty Recruitment & Hiring Policy and Procedures](#)" document.

### 4. Dean Review

After reviewing and approving the packet, the Dean's Office will deliver it to AAO indicating the transfer in the (FAST) electronic tracking system.

### 5. AAO Review

Upon approving the packet, AAO will send copies of the [Equal Employment Opportunity \(EEO\) Information Request \(FORM L-1353\)](#) to the SS chair. AAO will forward the packet of forms to the HR indicating the transfer in the (FAST) electronic tracking system.

### 6. HR Review

HR will review the materials and will electronically notify the AAO, the dean, the chair, and the SS chair that the recruitment has been approved. If changes have been made in the text of the advertisement form, HR will communicate revisions to the dean and SS chair so advertising can begin. HR will create the official recruitment file and place the position on the UW-L Vacancy page.

## 7. Placing the Advertisement

Upon receipt of the approval notice, the SS chair or department chair will place the faculty position advertisements promptly and **without modification**. All of the advertisements regardless of form must include the official University affirmative action statement: "UW La Crosse is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer. Women, persons of color, and individuals with a disability are encouraged to apply. If you have a special need/accommodation to aid your participation in our hiring process, please contact the SS chair above to make appropriate arrangements." This statement may be modified (expanded or shortened) with advance approval of AAO.

- One advertisement must be in a print professional journal and include the title, duties, and qualifications in full.
- An electronic version of the complete ad (including all of the information from the [Position Vacancy Form](#) and a complete description of the duties and title) must be sent to HR at [recruit@uwlax.edu](mailto:recruit@uwlax.edu).

Advertisements placed *in addition* to the full advertisement in a print journal may be shortened (if reviewed and approved by AAO) and placed in discipline-specific journals. These position descriptions must note that the full description is available on the UW-L at <http://www.uwlax.edu/vacancies>.)

## STEP 2: Receiving and Processing Applications

The SS chair will secure and manage the applicant files throughout the process.

The SS chair will transmit to each applicant or nominated individual an acknowledgment letter [http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/Faculty Recruitment/FAC.acknowledgement.PDF](http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/Faculty%20Recruitment/FAC.acknowledgement.PDF) (*samples on the web*) that includes the disability accommodation phrase and a statement regarding mandatory criminal background checks. In addition, the following inserts should be included – available at <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/fac.recruit.html>.

- The [Equal Employment Opportunity \(EEO\) Information Request form \(Form L-1353\)](#) which the SS committee has completed by adding a unique tracking number for each applicant
- A [Confidentiality Statement Form](#) (L-1824)
- An [Informational Programs and Disclosure Information Insert](#) – a statement of crime statistics and drug abuse policy (also referred to as the Clery Act statement).

Within two (2) working days (Monday through Friday, except legal holidays) after the deadline for receiving materials (or if there is no deadline, within two working days of the initial review date listed in the advertisement), the SS chair will complete the [List of All Nominees and Applicants Who Did Not Request Confidentiality \(Form L-1737\)](#) and deliver it to HR (electronically to [recruit@uwlax.edu](mailto:recruit@uwlax.edu)) in compliance with Wisconsin law. This is an open record. If there is no specific deadline, the list must be updated as new applications are received.

## STEP 3: Screening Applicants and Interviewing Applicants

### 1. Initial Screening

Each member of the SS committee will review files of the entire pool of applicants and make an initial assessment (yes/no) of each candidate to determine whether each applicant should be considered further – this should be based on (1) whether the candidate meets the selection/qualifications criteria. The committee will then meet and discuss each candidate. ~~If any committee member believes that a candidate deserves further consideration (based on the selection/qualifications criteria), that candidate will be placed in the "pool of applicants" to receive further consideration.~~ **To be retained, an applicant must receive support from a majority of the members in attendance. At this point, any member may request a revote on any removed applicant. A removed applicant can be brought to a revote only once.**

Applicants deemed unacceptable for the position during the initial screening will receive no further review and will comprise Tier 3 following the process delineated below. The SS committee should list the individuals in alpha order and assign one of the reason codes for non-selection ([refer to the back of form L-1349](#)) to each Tier 3 applicant.

## 2. **Semi-Final Screening**

The SS committee shall vote to cluster the remaining applicants into two “tiers” listed alphabetically in each tier. A two-thirds vote of those present is required to place an applicant into the top tier (pre-Tier 1). These pre-Tier 1 applicants shall include those the committee believes should be advanced to the telephone interview and reference check stage. The total number of in this tier will typically include 6-8 applicants.

The second tier (Tier 2) shall include the remaining applicants who the SS committee believes would be suitable for consideration into finalist status if the top tier applicants are determined to be unacceptable after telephone interviews and reference checks.

## 3. **Additional Screening Leading to a Finalist Group**

The SS committee may solicit additional material from [pre-Tier 1](#) applicants. ~~retained for further consideration.~~ Applicants may be asked to provide additional materials via written communication, telephone, or videoconference in support of their application, to respond to any specific questions developed by the SS committee (and approved by the dean, AAO, and HR), and/or to provide additional references.

- When telephone or electronic interviews are conducted, a common list of core questions ([samples on the web](#)) will be asked of all persons interviewed. Each member of the committee should review UW-L's [Brief Guidelines for Contemporary Employment Interviewing](#). The use of standard questions does not prevent the SS committee from asking follow-up questions as may be deemed appropriate.
- If unsolicited materials are received, the SS chair retains the materials and does not share them with the SS committee until such time (if ever) that similar materials are required of all candidates.
- The SS committee will conduct telephone reference checks on each of the [pre-Tier 1](#) applicants still under consideration. Calls will be made by one or more SS committee members as assigned by the SS chair (or SS committee) and will use a standard set of questions that have been reviewed and approved by the dean, AAO, and HR. For each call, a written record will be maintained. A sample form is provided ([Telephone Reference Conversation Record L-1827](#)).
- The SS committee retains the right to make off-list phone calls. Off-list phone calls are reference calls to individuals not on the applicant's list of references. Given that confidentiality requests by the applicants are still respected during this phase of the process, all applicants must be informed prior to any off-list phone calls being made, and a provision must be provided for the applicant to specifically identify any individuals s/he does not wish to have called. SS committee members making telephone reference checks shall verbally share the information obtained with the SS committee. The SS chair or designee may seek further information about each semifinalist as needed, while respecting the semifinalist's need for confidentiality. A written record must be maintained for each call.

## 4. **Determining the Finalist Group**

After review of reference check and telephone interview materials, the SS committee shall discuss and vote on each [pre-Tier 1](#) applicant to select those to be moved to finalist status. A [two-thirds](#) vote of those present is required to advance an applicant. Applicants not advanced to finalist status on the initial vote can be brought to a re-vote only once. Any SS committee member may request a re-vote.

Those applicants receiving a two-thirds vote will be placed into Tier 1. The top tier (Tier 1) shall include applicants the committee believes should be invited to interview on campus. [Note: The

dean in consultation with AAO will decide upon the total number of applicants to be interviewed (normally 2-4).]

The second tier (Tier 2) shall include the remaining applicants who the SS committee believes would be suitable for the position if the top tier applicants are determined to be unacceptable after an interview or are unavailable/decline an offer.

At this point, any committee member may request a revote on any Tier 2 candidate to move them to pre-Tier 1. If a candidate is moved to pre-Tier 1 then reference checks and telephone interviews will be performed before voting to move that applicant to finalist status. At this stage any additional applicants not advanced to Tier 1 or Tier 2 shall be included with the original Tier 3 applicants and all shall be listed alphabetically and assigned a "reason code" on Form 1349 (Faculty Applicant/Interview List).

Reason codes should also be assigned to Tier 2 applicants. In most cases Tier 2 applicants could be assigned the non-selection reason code of E-1 ("Candidate is well qualified for the position, but the quality of teaching, scholarship, and/or experience is higher in other candidates").

Unless otherwise designated in departmental by-laws, the SS committee will present its tiers of applicants with its recommendations for interviews to the department. The department shall vote on the recommendation of the SS committee. A majority of the department voting is required to approve the list of finalists. If paper ballots are used, each ballot must be signed and stored for 7 years.

## 5. Authorization to Interview

The department will forward [Faculty Applicant/Interview List \(Form L-1349\)](#) to the dean requesting approval to interview. This form will have the Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 applicants listed as indicated in #3 and #4 above. Upon review (possibly resulting in revision after consultation with the department), the dean will forward the *Faculty Applicant/Interview List* to the AAO. Based on returned EEO Forms, the AAO in consultation with the dean will make one of the following decisions:

- (1) approve the existing applicant pool,
- (2) require an extension of the application deadline,
- (3) cancel the search,
- (4) require other appropriate remedies.

The SS chair must receive approval (e-mail) from the dean and the AAO, copied to HR at [recruit@uwlax.edu](mailto:recruit@uwlax.edu), before scheduling interviews. If questions arise, the dean and AAO will consult before e-mailing the SS chair.

At this time, at the discretion of the SS chair and SS committee, a letter can be sent to the Tier 3 applicants indicating they are no longer under consideration. Otherwise all applicants from the original pool will receive correspondence after the position has been filled (as described below in Step 5).

Within two days after determining the applicants who have accepted an invitation to a campus interview, the SS chair will forward an [Alphabetical Listing, by Last Name, of Finalists \(Form L-1738—Faculty\)](#) as required by Wisconsin Statute 19.36(7) to HR for public release if requested. This is an open record to be released by HR upon request.

## 6. Interviewing

The SS chair and chair will complete a [Faculty Pre-Approval for Reimbursement of Interview Expenses Form \(L-1350-Faculty\)](#) following the [Business Services procedure](#) and deliver it to the dean for approval of anticipated expenses before extending any invitations to interview on

campus. This form is retained by the dean for audit purposes. This would also be the appropriate time to ask the applicant if she/he needs accommodations for a disability.

A list of core questions will be prepared and asked of all applicants brought to campus for interviews. The SS chair will review both lists of questions with AAO and HR and will provide the final (agreed upon) lists to HR for the official recruitment file. A paper copy of this list of core questions will also be kept by the SS committee.

Each member of the committee should review UW-L's [Brief Guidelines for Contemporary Employment Interviewing](#) and be apprised that interview guidelines regarding illegal questions apply to all conversation with the interviewee in both formal and informal settings. The SS committee may also choose to make off-list phone calls regarding finalists during this part of the process.

After the committee has interviewed all of the finalists, the committee shall discuss each candidate and vote on the candidates' acceptability. In the event that none of the finalists are found acceptable, the department shall seek approval to interview candidates from tier II.

#### **STEP 4: The Hiring Process**

##### **1. Consulting with the Dean**

After gathering information, interviewing, etc., the SS committee and/or departmental members authorized by the department by-laws shall discuss the applicants and provide a non-ranked list of acceptable applicants to the dean with supporting information on strengths and weaknesses (as they relate to the selection criteria). The dean may choose to make additional reference checks. Then, in accord with departmental by-laws and policies, the department or authorized representative(s) will consult with the dean to collaboratively agree on recommendation(s) for hire.

##### **2. Making the Offer**

Offers for hire must be agreed upon by the department or authorized representative(s) and the dean. Departmental by-laws and policies may be written to determine this process of consultation with the dean. If after appropriate consultation, the dean and the department or authorized representative(s) do not agree on a hiring decision, the following alternatives may be used: an additional applicant or applicants from the pool may be interviewed, an extension of the search may be authorized, or the search may be terminated by the department or authorized representative(s), or the dean.

The dean will formally request via e-mail approval to hire from the AAO and the PVC ([recruit@uwlax.edu](mailto:recruit@uwlax.edu) is copied). Once authorization is received, the chair or the Dean will contact the applicant to extend the job offer. The terms of the offer are developed by the dean after consultation with the chair.

If the applicant(s) declines to accept the offered position (verbally or in writing), the department may request permission to offer the position to another interviewed applicant. Alternately, the department may request permission to interview additional applicants from the identified pool of qualified applicants, may request an extension of the search, or may close the search.

#### **STEP 5: The Closing of a Search**

##### **1. Acceptance of the Offer**

Upon acceptance of the offer by the applicant, the dean will forward the following documents to the PVC for review and approval and indicate the transmittal in FAST:

- The completed [Faculty Personnel Action Form PAF](#) printed on pink paper.
- Resume/vitae.
- Official transcripts (with university seal or other indication of being an original document).

If a search ends *without* hiring an applicant, the dean must formally notify (via e-mail or hardcopy memorandum) the SS chair, department chair, PVC, AAO, and HR, and the necessary documentation must be provided to HR for the official search file.

## 2. Issuing the Contract

After granting approval, the PVC will forward the materials to HR, and HR will issue the contract letter and a CBC form. HR will enter into FAST the date the letter is sent, the return deadline, and the date the contract is returned to HR.

## 3. Receiving the Signed Contract

After the signed contract has been received and the criminal background check has been completed, HR will notify the dean, AAO, chair, and SS chair. The department chair will request the SS chair to send letters to the all remaining applicants notifying them that the position has been filled (sample on the web at the HR website). Within two weeks of this notice, the SS chair will compile the information necessary to close the file as listed on the Routing Slip for Completion of [Faculty Recruitment \(Form L-1828—faculty\)](#). The SS chair will deliver the packet to the department chair for review and signature. The department chair will deliver the packet to the dean who will review, sign to indicate approval, and deliver the packet to HR. The flow of this documentation will be tracked on FAST. HR will create an official employee file for the new hire and will complete the official recruitment file for the search process. This process should be completed within two weeks after the notice of the hire.

**Foreign Nationals:** If a foreign national is hired, the SS Chair and/or department chair and the dean will assist HR with the necessary collection of documents to pursue an authorization to work. HR will submit petitions on behalf of UW-L for foreign national hires in compliance with federal, state, UW System, and UW-L rules, regulations, policies, and procedures.

## 4. Authorized to Work

New hires will be authorized to begin work *only* after HR has the necessary documents, including but not limited to I-9, signed contract letter, and a satisfactory CBC. HR will notify the dean and the department chair via email when the new hire is authorized to begin work.

## 5. Storage and Disposal of Search-Related Materials

The SS chair and all SS committee members shall shred any *informal* notes and/or worksheets from the search. The department will retain search and screen applicant files in a secure location for six years. Thereafter, the department should contact HR for verification that the files can be destroyed. Upon verification, the files may be shredded or burned.

### ***The following documents are used in a faculty search***

[Faculty & IAS Recruitment Routing Slip](#)

[L-1347 Authorization to Recruit](#)

[L-1747 Recruitment Efforts](#)

[L-1348 Vacancy/Position Announcement](#) (used for print and web advertising)

[L-1813 Position Description](#)

[L-1825 Confidentiality Request Form/Letter Insertion](#)

[L-1737 Alpha Listing of All Applicants & Nominees](#) (without those requesting confidentiality)

[L-1349 Faculty Applicant Interview List](#)

[L-1738 Alpha List of Finalists](#) (Applicants who have accepted a campus interview)

[L-1350 Pre-Approval for Reimbursement of Interview Expenses](#)

[L-1827 Telephone Reference Conversation Record](#) (SAMPLE)

[Personnel Action Form](http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/Faculty_Recruitment/L-1347.Pers.Act.FAC.pdf) [http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/Faculty\\_Recruitment/L-1347.Pers.Act.FAC.pdf](http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/Faculty_Recruitment/L-1347.Pers.Act.FAC.pdf)

[L-1828 \(Faculty\) Checklist/Coversheet for Documentation](#)

and

[EEO forms](#) from AAO