

**UW-LA CROSSE  
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY**

**Bylaws, Policies and Procedures**

*Latest revisions approved by the Department January 18, 2007*

UW-LA CROSE  
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY  
**BYLAWS, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

## Table of Contents

<b><u>TOPIC</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
<b>0. Organization and Operation.....??</b>	
0.1 Preamble	
0.2 Robert's Rules of Order	
0.3 Quorum Definition	
0.4 The Use of Proxies	
0.5 Changes to These Bylaws	
<b>1. Students Rights and Obligations.....??</b>	
1.1 Evaluation of Teaching	
1.2 Complaint, Grievance and Appeal Procedures	
1.3 Advisement	
1.4 Expectations/Responsibilities	
<b>2. Faculty Responsibilities.....??</b>	
2.1 Teaching Expectations	
2.2 Scholarship Expectations	
2.3 Service Expectations	
<b>3. Academic Staff Expectations.....??</b>	
3.1 Appointments	
3.2 Faculty Status	
<b>4. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review).....??</b>	
4.1 Evaluation Process	
4.2 Criteria	
4.2.1 Teaching	
4.2.2 Scholarship	
4.2.3 Service	
4.3 Distribution of Merit Funds	
4.4 Appeals	
4.5 Continuing Academic Staff	
4.6 Post-Tenure Review	
<b>5. Retention and Tenure Recommendations.....??</b>	
5.1 Review Process	
5.2 Criteria	
5.3 Reconsideration	
<b>6. Promotion Recommendations.....??</b>	
6.1 Review Process	
6.2 Criteria	
6.3 Reconsideration	

**7. Governance.....??**

- 7.1 Selection of the Chair
- 7.2 Responsibilities and Rights of the Chair
- 7.3 Standing Departmental Committees
  - 7.3.1 Department Merit Evaluation Committee
  - 7.3.2 General Chemistry Committee
  - 7.3.3 Major Purchase Committee
  - 7.3.4 Curriculum Committee
  - 7.3.5 Public Relations Committee
  - 7.3.6 Research Review Committee
  - 7.3.7 Safety Committee
  - 7.3.8 Student Evaluation Committee
  - 7.3.9 Summer Session Committee
  - 7.3.10 Retention/Tenure Committee
  - 7.3.11 Promotion Committee

**8. Appendices.....??**

- 8.1 Student Evaluation of Instruction, Evaluation Form
- 8.2 Policy for Handling Student Grievances -- Grade Appeals
- 8.3 Definition: Scholarly Activity
- 8.4 Eligibility to Vote for Department Chair -- Academic Staff
- 8.5 Policy: Merit Evaluation of Faculty
- 8.6 Faculty Report for Extra Merit Consideration
- 8.7 Policy & Procedures: Tenured Faculty Review & Development
- 8.8 Procedures: Renewal of Probationary Faculty Appointments and Granting of Tenure
- 8.9 Promotion Procedures & Criteria
- 8.10 *Additional Department Policies/Procedures*
  - 8.10.1 Procedures & Criteria for Review of Academic Staff for Continuation and Reappointment
  - 8.10.2 Policy: Faculty Request for Position/Time Release from Department Appointment
  - 8.10.3 Policy: Faculty & Academic Staff Equity Adjustments
  - 8.10.4 Policy: Expenditures of 102 Funds for Faculty Travel
  - 8.10.5 Policy: Summer Session Course Offerings and Staff Assignments

## 0. Organization and Operation

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

**0.2.** Meetings of the Chemistry Department and its Committees are conducted in accordance with *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised*.

**0.3.** For meetings of the Department and its Committees, a **quorum** is defined as the majority of the entire membership eligible to participate. Within a meeting, a majority is a majority of those present.

**0.4. Proxy votes** are permitted in meetings of the Department and its Committees, only as specified in these *Bylaws*.

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

## 1. Student Rights and Obligations

**1.1 Evaluation of Teaching.** In each of the courses offered by the Chemistry Department, (except independent study courses) students will have an opportunity to evaluate their instructors. This evaluation will take place during the last three weeks of the classes using the Chemistry Department Student Evaluation Instrument. (A copy of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) instrument is found in **Appendix 8.1**).

### 1.2. Complaint, Grievance and Appeal Procedures

**1.2.1. Grade Appeals.** Students who believe that the grade they received for a course does not reflect their performance in that course may appeal the disputed grade. This appeal must take place before the end of the semester immediately following the semester in which the grade was recorded. The student should first discuss this difference with the instructor. If a student-instructor meeting is not possible, or if such a meeting does not result in 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 **Appendix 8.2**.

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

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

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

## 2. Faculty Responsibilities

**2.1 Teaching.** Faculty of the Chemistry Department is expected to keep current in their subject matter area and to work to improve student learning. They are further expected to offer additional time to address student questions by holding office hours. Office hours and other course details should be part of the course syllabus shared with students at the beginning of a course. In addition, faculty is 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 independent study courses).

**2.2 Scholarship.** Faculty of the Chemistry Department is expected to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship. The Department's Definition of Scholarly Activity (See **Appendix 8.3**) includes publishing papers or books in the discipline, in applications of the discipline, or in education for the discipline. Presentations in these areas at professional meetings, and in other appropriate forums, also constitute scholarship. In addition, writing successful grant proposals to support any of these activities is an important area of scholarship.

**2.3 Service.** Faculty of the Chemistry Department is expected to serve the institution, the public and their profession. This service can take the form of participating on departmental and university committees, offering specialized advice to off-campus groups and joining and participating in the activities of professional societies in their discipline.

### 3. Academic Staff Expectations

**3.1 Appointments.** Academic Staff appointments may take many forms. Those most usually used in academic departments are the Lecturer, Laboratory Manager, Research Associate and Faculty Associate. Academic Staff Lecturers in the Chemistry Department are held to the same teaching expectations as faculty. (See **2.1** above). Because Lecturers do not have the full range of faculty responsibilities, their teaching load is usually larger than that of faculty. Any special expectations of a member of the academic staff are stated in the contract letter.

**3.2. Faculty Status.** 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 **Appendix 8.4**.

#### 4. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)

**4.1. Evaluation Process.** Consistent with **UWS 3.05** and **UWL 3.05**, the performance of all faculty (as well as continuing academic staff) in the Chemistry Department will be reviewed annually. The areas of review shall include teaching, scholarship and service. During the first week of May, the department chair shall provide each individual with a copy of an annual faculty evaluation form (Faculty Report for Extra Merit Consideration – See **Appendix 8.6**). Faculty and continuing academic staff shall submit their completed annual faculty evaluation form, containing a description of activities for the previous summer and the current academic year, to the chair by the end of spring semester. This form shall serve as a vehicle for self-evaluation, which with student and peer evaluation will form the basis for the annual review.

Early in the fall semester, the department chair, working with the Department Merit Evaluation Committee (See **Appendix 8.5**), will use the completed annual faculty evaluation form, student evaluation information and peer evaluation information from the previous year to evaluate a department member's performance in each of the three areas of faculty responsibility (teaching, scholarship and service) based on the criteria as specified in the Department of Chemistry Policy for Merit Evaluation (**Appendix 8.5**). Within the context of this Department Merit Evaluation Policy, the department chair is responsible for all of the other department members' merit ratings. Within seven days of the review, the chair shall notify each member in writing of his/her merit rating including an assessment of performance in each of the areas of faculty responsibility. This assessment shall offer an opportunity for future goal setting and improvement as necessary.

Faculty members who are on professional leave are expected to submit a completed annual faculty evaluation form at the end of the spring semester describing their leave and other professional activities. 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.

The dean, working with the Department Merit Evaluation Committee, will review the department chair using criteria as specified in the Department Merit Evaluation Policy and criteria established by the dean to judge a chair's administrative performance. The dean, in consultation with the Department Merit Evaluation Committee, is responsible for the chair's merit rating.

**4.2. Criteria.** The criteria used in the Chemistry Department to evaluate a faculty member's annual performance are designed to promote effective teaching and quality scholarship and service. In ranking the importance of the areas of faculty responsibility, teaching is of greatest importance.

**4.2.1. Teaching.** In the area of teaching, faculty are expected to motivate and challenge students to learn by using various pedagogical devices or techniques and by setting well-defined expectations. It is assumed that student assignments and examinations will be reviewed and graded in a timely manner, and that student achievement will be appropriately assessed. Faculty members are expected to keep current in their subject matter areas, to update the curriculum, to assess the effects of their teaching techniques and to work to continually improve their knowledge of the subject matter and their teaching effectiveness. Efforts and accomplishments to these ends are to be reported on the Faculty Report Form for Extra Merit Consideration.

Teaching effectiveness will also be judged using student evaluations given in each course taught, except for independent study 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 Section 5.1).

**4.2.2. Scholarship.** As stated in Section 2.2, faculty is expected to maintain an active program of scholarship. Efforts in this area of responsibility include preparing, presenting and/or publishing papers on a topic of basic or applied research. Expository and educational topics are also significant areas for scholarly work. Writing grant proposals to support teaching, scholarship or service is itself an important area of scholarly activity. See **Appendix 8.3** for the Department Definition of Scholarly Activity. Faculty members are expected to report their scholarly activities and accomplishments on the annual faculty evaluation form.



**4.2.3. Service.** The service component of a faculty member's responsibility may take many forms: service to the program or major, the department, the university, the profession, or the general public. Examples of appropriate service activities include drafting program or policy documents, serving on committees, serving as an officer in a professional society and consulting with external agencies. Faculty members are expected to report their service activities on the annual faculty evaluation form.

**4.3. Distribution of Merit Funds.** See **Appendix 8.5**, Department of Chemistry Policy: Merit Evaluation of Faculty for Distribution of Merit Salary Dollars.

All faculty members annually are reviewed for "Base Merit" and "Extra Merit" by the Department Merit Evaluation Committee.

Base Merit is meeting the basic responsibilities of teaching, scholarly activity, department service, and some professional activity.

Extra Merit is determined by an evaluation of the annual faculty evaluation form, Faculty Report for Extra Merit Consideration (**Appendix 8.6**), submitted by each faculty member. Extra Merit activities include research and other forms of scholarly activity, professional and public service, contributions to the university, and notable teaching activities such as new curriculum development and high SEI scores. Faculty members are also invited to identify "other contributions" which they would like considered for Extra Merit. The Extra Merit evaluation of faculty results in a numerical rating normalized to fit a ten-point scale.

For the purpose of distribution of annual merit salary dollars, all faculty members evaluated as receiving 100% Base Merit receive 75% of the total merit adjustment distributed across the board as a percentage of their salary base. The balance, 25% of the merit adjustment dollars (and any dollars not awarded, due to persons receiving less than full base merit), shall supply an Extra Merit pool from which funds will be distributed based on the Extra Merit evaluation of faculty members using a fixed dollar value per Extra Merit evaluation point (as determined by the ratio of total Extra Merit dollars to total Extra Merit points awarded.)

**4.4. Appeals.** A faculty member may request a reconsideration of his/her annual performance rating. The Department Merit Evaluation Committee will reconsider a faculty member's merit evaluation upon receiving, in writing, a request for a hearing. This written request must be submitted to the department chairperson within one week of notification of the faculty of merit evaluation results. The Merit Evaluation Committee will meet to reconsider its action. The resulting recommendation will be presented to the faculty member, in writing, within one week of the hearing.

At the Department level, the reconsideration recommendation of the Merit Evaluation Committee is considered final.

The Department Chair may likewise present reconsideration of his/her merit evaluation by submitting a written request to the Dean of the College, within one week of notification of merit evaluation results.

Appeals beyond the departmental level may be presented to the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals and Academic Freedom Committee. (See **Section I. E.** of the *Faculty Senate Bylaws*.)

**4.5. Continuing Academic Staff.** The annual evaluation process for continuing academic staff is similar to that of faculty. The expectations, areas of responsibility and their relative importance will be communicated to continuing academic staff by the department chair. The chair, in consultation with the Department Merit Evaluation Committee, will evaluate continuing members of the academic staff based on the conditions of their appointment. The pool of merit funds for academic staff is separate from the faculty pool. (See **Appendix 8.5**.)

**4.6. Post-Tenure Review.** Each year, the performance of each tenured faculty member is reviewed by the Department Merit Evaluation Committee and the chair to determine whether his/her performance is satisfactory in each of the areas of faculty responsibility. This review is based on the results of the annual review but may consider reviews of the five preceding years. See **Appendix 8.7** Department Policy & Procedures: Tenured Faculty Review and Development.

In cases of unsatisfactory performance, a list of areas of concern will be presented to the faculty member. The chair and faculty member will meet to develop a written plan to correct the areas of concern over a specified period of time. Each year the results of the post-tenure review, and any correction plans, will be forwarded to the dean.

## 5. Retention and Tenure Decisions

**5.1 Review Process.** The Retention/Tenure Review Committee shall consist of all tenured members of the Chemistry Department. 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. For each probationary faculty member, the Committee chair shall select two members of the Committee to serve as a classroom mentor/evaluator. Each semester, the classroom mentor/evaluator will observe at least one class taught by the probationary faculty member. 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.

Retention reviews are usually conducted in the fall semester. Exceptions: first year faculty who begin in the fall are reviewed in the spring, and second year faculty are reviewed in both the fall and the spring. At least 20 days prior to the annual retention review, the department chair will notify each probationary faculty member, in writing, of the time and date of the review meeting. The chair will also remind each probationary faculty member to submit a recent copy of his/her **annual faculty report form** (completed the previous spring semester), **a current vita**, and **any supplemental materials** deemed appropriate to the Retention/Tenure Review Committee at least seven days prior to the date of the review. The department chair will supply the results of student evaluations 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.

Using the criteria in **Section 5.2** below, the Retention/Tenure Review Committee shall evaluate each probationary faculty member's performance based on the completed annual faculty report form, *vita*, annual Department Merit Evaluation Committee data, classroom mentor/evaluator reports, student evaluations and any other information, written or oral, presented to the Committee. (See **Appendix 8.8**). Votes shall be cast by a show of hands on a motion to retain. A recommendation for reappointment and/or for granting of tenure must receive the support of the **majority** 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 retained by the Committee chair until requested by the probationary faculty member.

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

**5.2 Criteria.** The members of the Retention/Tenure Review Committee shall use the submitted self, peer and student evaluation information to judge each probationary faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. Of these areas of responsibility, teaching is most important.

In addition to establishing a record of successful teaching, a program of continued scholarship is necessary for retention and, ultimately, a positive tenure recommendation. (See **Appendix 8.3** Definition of Scholarship.)

Service is also an important faculty responsibility. For probationary faculty a service record should be established in addition to demonstrated success in teaching and scholarship.

**5.3 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 procedure for the reconsideration meeting is detailed in **UWL 3.07 (4), (5), and (6)**.

## 6. Promotion Recommendations

**6.1. 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. During the first week of classes 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 dean to department chairs. These lists will be reviewed for accuracy by the chair. At this time, the department chair will notify, in writing, the faculty members who are eligible of their eligibility and, upon request, will provide a Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report Form, copies of the University and Department regulations on promotion, and information on the provisions of the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law. (See **Appendix 8.9** Promotion Procedures & Criteria).

During the second week of classes of the fall semester, the names of those individuals on the list 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).

After discussion of a candidate's performance with respect to the criteria in **Section 6.2** 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 on the Committee's portion of the Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report Form. The committee shall prepare written reasons for each of its recommendations, and it shall rank the candidates who are recommended for promotion to a given rank.

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 on behalf of the Committee as part of the Faculty Promotion Evaluation Form. With these materials, the department chair shall also transmit in writing a recommendation to the dean. A copy of this letter shall be provided to the candidate at least one day prior to the submission of the promotion file to the dean.

**6.2. Criteria.** To be considered for promotion to a higher rank, faculty must meet the minimum University criteria as stated in the Employee Handbook, as well as the minimum departmental criteria (See **Appendix 8.9**).

For the rank of Associate Professor a candidate must provide evidence of teaching excellence and the establishment of a program of scholarship. Evidence of teaching excellence shall include the results of self, peer and student evaluation of instruction. Scholarship shall be consistent with the department's definition of scholarly activity (See **Appendix 8.3**). 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. Significant scholarly productivity is judged using department criteria for scholarly activity (**Appendix 8.3**). Substantial service activity will include service to the department, the institution and the profession.

**6.3. Reconsideration.** Candidates who are not recommended for promotion may request the reasons for the non-promotion recommendation. This request must be submitted in writing to the department chair within seven days of the notice of the Committee's recommendation. Within two weeks of receiving the written reasons, a candidate may request, by writing to the department chair, reconsideration by the Promotion Recommendation Committee. The faculty member will be allowed an opportunity to respond to the written reasons using written or oral evidence and witnesses at the reconsideration meeting. Written notice of the reconsideration decision shall be forwarded to the dean within seven days of the reconsideration meeting.

## 7. Governance

**7.1. Selection of the Chair.** Specific details of the selection process are contained in Faculty Senate Bylaw VII: The Selection of Department Chairperson. Any tenured faculty member of the department is eligible to serve as chair. The term of office is three years. All faculty members, and continuing members of the academic staff (as defined in Section 3.2), are eligible to vote in the election for a chair.

**7.2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Chair.** A thorough listing of the chair's responsibilities is contained in *Faculty Senate Bylaws VI: The 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.

### 7.3. Standing Department Committees.

7.3.1. Merit Evaluation Committee. See Department Merit Evaluation Procedures, **Appendix 8.5**.

7.3.2. General Chemistry Committee. Responsible for coordination of General Chemistry program and selection of texts to be used in CHM 103/104.

7.3.3. Major Purchase Committee. Responsible for updated lists and prioritization of equipment needs – units costing more than \$2,000.

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

7.3.5. Public Relations Committee. Responsible for department *News/letter*, Chemistry Major Handbook and brochure used by Admissions Office.

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

7.3.7. Safety Committee. Responsible for periodic review of department safety equipment and safety procedures.

7.3.8. Student Evaluations Committee. Committee function and responsibility: to conduct student evaluations each semester according to established department policy.

7.3.9. Summer Session Committee. See **Appendix 8.10.5**.

7.3.10. Retention/Tenure Committee. See **Section 5.1** of *Chemistry Department Bylaws*.

7.3.11. Promotion Committee. See **Section 6.1** of *Chemistry Department Bylaws*.

**Appendix 8.1**

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

**STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION (SEI): EVALUATION FORM**

## **Appendix 8.2**

### **DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY**

#### **POLICY FOR HANDLING STUDENT GRIEVANCES**

**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. The recommendation will be forwarded to the dean of the college.

**B. Cases when the instructor is on campus and available**

The student grievance is a matter to be considered in conference by 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.



### Appendix 8.3

Approved by the tenure track faculty on October 06, 2006

Adopted by the full department on November 17, 2006

#### DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

#### DEFINITION: SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

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) 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) 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 8.3—OLD TEXT

Replaced by the preceding text on November 17, 2006.

### DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

#### DEFINITION: SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

In response to the Faculty Senate action of April 26, 1990, the faculty members of the Department of Chemistry, from the perspective of professional chemists and educators, submit the following definition for "scholarly activity".

Scholarly activity is professional development involving the study of chemistry, its relationship to society and the communication of the results of such studies with students and nonscientists as well as with scientist peers.

The range of scholarly activity is broad. Examples include but are not limited to the following:

- \_\_\_\_\_ A. Activities relating to peer communication:

\_\_\_\_\_ Research and the subsequent sharing of the results of research with other scientists is a scholarly activity. This research may be in the areas of basic science, applied science, or science education. Communications may be in the form of publication of articles in professional journals, authored books or reviews, or papers presented in appropriate form.

\_\_\_\_\_ A less recognized, but very significant, scholarly activity is the pursuit of professional development by the reading of, and listening to, scientific communications. To be current in one's field, professional reading is essential, as is the learning that takes place when one attends professional meetings, workshops, short courses, and seminars.
- \_\_\_\_\_ B. Activities relating to student communication:

\_\_\_\_\_ The pursuit of effective communication with students is a scholarly activity that is more demanding than the effective communication with peers. Examples of tangible evidence of this activity are authorship of textbooks or laboratory manuals, or portions thereof, continued curriculum development, directing student research, and study to expand one's area of expertise. Successful teaching is the end product of effective communication with students.
- \_\_\_\_\_ C. Activities relating to community communication:

\_\_\_\_\_ Societal dependence on chemistry is growing as societal interest and understanding of the physical sciences is declining. As a result, scientists have a responsibility and a wealth of opportunities available to inform and to assist the public. Speaking to groups about current science-based social issues, conferring with and assisting decision-makers, consulting for business and industry, and serving as scientific authorities in the courtroom are examples of scholarly activities, which often require not only extensive study, but also special effort to communicate with the nonscientists involved.

\_\_\_\_\_ Too often scholarly activity in the natural sciences has been measured only in terms of professional development that results in communication with peers. As a result, we have created an elitist body of scientists and have encouraged scientific illiteracy in society. Our professional societies have sounded the alarm—we need to direct more scholarly endeavor to communicating with students and the public. We need to develop, to relate and to communicate our knowledge of science to a world of nonscientists. As educators this responsibility falls squarely on our shoulders.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other examples of scholarly activities that could have been, but were not, included in the preceding text are:

  - \_\_\_\_\_ • Membership on professional panels and boards
  - \_\_\_\_\_ • Membership and participation in professional societies
  - \_\_\_\_\_ • Writing and procuring grants
  - \_\_\_\_\_ • Reviewing professional publications and texts
  - \_\_\_\_\_ • Activities associated with sabbatical and faculty development or other leaves of absence
  - \_\_\_\_\_ • Invited lectures, seminars, and workshop presentations

#### Appendix 8.4

February 10, 1982

TO: Dean Robert C. Voight  
College of AL&S

FROM: C.R. Kistner, Chairperson, Department of Chemistry

SUBJECT: Selection of Department Chairpersons – Eligibility to Vote – Academic Staff

At the February 5, 1982 meeting of the ranked faculty of the Department of Chemistry, the following action was taken in response to the *Senate Bylaw* change **Section VII.A.1**.

M/S/P that academic staff with faculty status and with continuing appointment extending at least one year beyond the date of the election shall be eligible to vote for the department chairperson.

CRK/sb

**Appendix 8.5**  
September 29, 1987

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

**POLICY STATEMENT: MERIT EVALUATION OF FACULTY\* FOR DISTRIBUTION OF MERIT SALARY DOLLARS**

**INTRODUCTION**

On August 25, 1977, the faculty and academic staff of the Department of Chemistry approved a plan for the merit evaluation of faculty and the distribution of merit salary dollars. That plan was accepted by the Dean of the College of Arts, Letters, & Sciences and has been employed continuously through Academic Year 1986-87.

In the fall of 1987, and at the request of the Dean of the College, the department reviewed its policies/procedures for the merit evaluation of faculty and the distribution of merit salary dollars. As a result of that review it was concluded that the 1977 plan needed some editing and modification, but it should not be changed in substance. The following merit evaluation policies and procedures were approved by the faculty and academic staff of the department at a department meeting on September 29, 1987.

**A. Statutory UW-System, and/or Local Requirements**

1. Department faculty members shall be evaluated annually for merit and the distribution of merit salary dollars shall be based on this evaluation. The evaluation shall consider:

- a. Teaching
  - 1. Student evaluation
  - 2. Peer evaluation
- b. Research and scholarly activity
- c. Professional and public service
- d. Contribution to the department and to the University

2. The annual merit evaluation of faculty must differentiate between levels of merit.

3.. A salary differential by rank must be maintained and protected.

**B. Allocation of Merit Salary Dollars**

Annually, the department may be allocated merit monies as determined by the action of the legislature, the Board of Regents and/or the UW-System Administration) as a percent of the department total salary base. These monies shall be distributed to faculty members based on an annual merit evaluation, which considers the aforementioned areas of professional activity (**Section A. 1. a-d**). The procedures for that annual evaluation and distribution of merit salary dollars are described in the following sections.

**C. Base Merit and Extra Merit**

All faculty members shall be reviewed annually by the department Merit Evaluation Committee. (Section E).

Faculty members are expected to perform at a satisfactory level, the basic responsibilities of teaching and department service and to participate in some professional activity. All faculty judged by the Merit Evaluation Committee to be meeting these basic responsibilities shall be allocated 75% of the total merit adjustment, distributed across the board, as a percent of salary base. This merit adjustment shall be considered Base Merit.

The balance, 25% of the merit adjustment dollars, shall be used to supply an Extra Merit pool\* from which funds will be distributed as determined by a peer evaluation considering both the participation, and the quality of participation, in the following Extra Merit activities:

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.

1. Teaching (examples follow)
  - a. Extraordinary contributions to curriculum development.
  - b. Outstanding student and/or peer evaluation of teaching
  - c. Contributing to or authoring a text
2. Research and Scholarly Activity (examples follow)
  - a. Ongoing research
  - b. Publications
  - c. Research grant proposals submitted and/or funded
  - d. Papers presented
3. Professional and Public Service (examples follow)
  - a. Offices in professional societies at national, state, or local level
  - b. Special responsibilities in professional organizations
  - c. Other professional and public service activities
  - d. Lectures and presentations of a public service nature
  - e. Consulting
4. Contributions to the University (examples follow)
  - a. Contributions to the department considered being above the norm.
  - b. University committees, boards, etc.
  - c. System level committees, task forces, etc.
  - d. Institute and workshop proposals submitted and/or funded
  - e. Grant proposals (other than research) submitted and/or funded
5. Other  
Any activities/accomplishments not included in points **C. 1-4** and not considered part of Base Merit.

To receive full Base Merit, faculty members must perform their teaching responsibilities at a satisfactory level as determined by students and peers and accept and meet their basic departmental and professional responsibilities. The department Merit Evaluation Committee shall annually review each faculty member and should it be determined that persons are not performing at a satisfactory level, the committee by its action may reduce ones Base Merit as it deems appropriate.

It is possible that Base Merit may be reduced even if one qualifies for Extra Merit in considering and evaluating activities listed In **Section C. 1-5**. Any funds removed from an individual's Base Merit shall be added to the department Extra Merit pool.

Faculty on approved leave shall be considered for Base Merit and may be considered for Extra Merit.

#### **D. Application for Extra Merit**

Faculty applying for Extra Merit consideration must complete and submit the department approved "Faculty Report for Extra Merit Consideration" form (attached). This form does not provide for a reporting of activities considered a part of Base Merit, but considers only those Extra Merit activities identified In C. 1-5 of this document.

Non-tenured faculty and/or those seeking promotion must complete and submit, each year, a "Faculty Report for Extra Merit Consideration". Tenured faculty not seeking a promotion shall not be required to apply for Extra Merit consideration, but in such cases, those persons forfeit their right to consideration in the distribution of Extra Merit dollars.

#### **E. Department Merit Evaluation Committee**

Each year a Merit Evaluation Committee consisting of three faculty members including the department chairperson shall be formed. Faculty members shall be elected by the department faculty, from those who have applied for Extra Merit consideration. This committee shall evaluate all faculty members with the exception of the department chairperson. Members of the Merit Evaluation Committee shall not participate in their own evaluation. Responsibilities of the committee include:

1. Committee members shall meet to review the Faculty Report for Merit Consideration forms, submitted by department faculty members, to collectively review and discuss the Merit Evaluation Policies and Procedures, to review information not included in the submitted reports (e.g., student evaluation data), and to consider standards for the determination and evaluation of Base Merit and Extra Merit.
2. The committee shall conduct the Base Merit review of all faculty and identify any faculty members not performing at a level consistent with agreed upon standards of Base Merit. In such cases, the committee shall determine the appropriate Base Merit reduction and make a written record of the reasons for these actions.
3. Considering only the activities listed in **Section C. 1-5**, the committee shall evaluate all faculty applying for Extra Merit. These faculty members shall be rated on an agreed upon scale with the results eventually normalized to a ten point scale. It is the committee's responsibility to rigorously evaluate faculty, maximizing the spread to the greatest extent possible.

#### **F. Evaluation of the Elected Representatives on the Merit Evaluation Committee**

Members of the Merit Evaluation Committee shall not participate in their own evaluation. Each elected member on the committee shall be evaluated for Base Merit and Extra Merit by the department chairperson and the other elected member. This determination shall be conducted in the absence of the faculty member being evaluated using the same standards agreed upon by the committee.

#### **G. Evaluation of the Chairperson**

The two elected representatives on the Merit Evaluation Committee shall appoint a third faculty member (one who applied for extra merit consideration) to sit with them for the purpose of evaluating the chairperson. With the exception of the results of the evaluation of the third faculty member, all materials, information and results of the annual merit evaluation of department faculty shall be made available to this third faculty member. These three faculty members shall evaluate the chairperson, in his/her absence, using the same standards agreed upon by the committee. The committee will notify the chair and the Dean of their recommendation for the evaluation of the chair.

#### **H. Notification of Faculty of Merit Evaluation Results**

The chairperson shall notify, in writing, all faculty members of their Base Merit and Extra Merit evaluation within one week of the action of the Merit Evaluation Committee. Persons not receiving full Base Merit shall be notified, in writing, of the reasons for this action. Persons applying for Extra Merit consideration shall be notified of the Extra Merit points they were awarded and the total points awarded by the Merit Evaluation committee. Additional information may be made available by the chairperson at the request of a faculty member.

The department chairperson shall be notified, in writing, of his/her Base Merit and Extra Merit evaluation by the three persons elected/appointed to conduct this review.

#### **I. Distribution of Extra Merit Salary Dollars**

The distribution of Extra Merit salary dollars shall be based on the individual evaluation of faculty members using a fixed dollar value per Extra Merit evaluation point (as determined by the ratio of total Extra Merit dollars to total Extra Merit points awarded).

#### **J. Appeals**

The department Merit Evaluation Committee will reconsider a faculty member's merit evaluation upon receiving, in writing, a request for a hearing. This written request must be submitted to the department chairperson within one week of notification of the faculty of merit evaluation results. The request must include reasons for the hearing.

After reconsideration, action of the evaluation committee is considered final.

As in all processes involving the evaluation of personnel, mechanisms for merit evaluation appeals, beyond the departmental level, are established on this campus. Your attention is directed to the U.S. System Administrative Code, the UW-L Local Faculty Rules, and the Faculty Handbook.

\*The word faculty as used throughout this document includes all continuing faculty and teaching academic staff.

The preceding policy was modified by the Department action of 11-5-93 – approval of Policy & Procedures: Tenured Faculty Review & Development (See **Appendix 8.7**).

**Appendix 8.6**

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

**FACULTY REPORT FOR EXTRA MERIT CONSIDERATION**



## Appendix 8.7

Department Approved 11/5/93

### DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

#### POLICY & PROCEDURES: TENURED FACULTY REVIEW & DEVELOPMENT

Following review of the UW-L policy on Tenured Faculty Review & Development, the faculty\* of the Department of Chemistry were in agreement that we currently are conducting such a review each year. With minor changes/additions to our current procedures, we will be in full compliance with the requirements of the UW-L policy on Tenured Faculty Review and Development. Those changes/additions are underlined in the following narrative and were approved as department policy, November 5, 1993.

Each year, every faculty member of the department shall participate in the department merit evaluation process. This evaluation is conducted according to the department policy "Merit Evaluation of Faculty for Distribution of Merit Dollars". The process includes a review of each faculty member including student evaluations of teaching (review of SEI scores taken every semester) and peer evaluation in each of the following four areas: teaching, research & scholarly activity, professional and public service, and contribution to the university. Persons are reviewed for Base Merit – meeting the basic responsibilities of a faculty member. Criteria for Base Merit are outlined in the aforementioned department merit evaluation policy. Persons also are reviewed for Extra Merit – an evaluation of activities and performance in addition to Base Merit. Faculty members apply for Extra Merit by submitting a "Faculty Report for Extra Merit Consideration".

This report form and the criteria for Extra Merit are included in our department merit evaluation policy.

It is the requirement that each year all non-tenured personnel and tenured faculty eligible for promotion must apply for Extra Merit by completing and submitting the Faculty Report for Extra Merit Consideration. Tenured faculty members not eligible for promotion may elect not to apply for Extra Merit (however this has never happened). To meet the requirements for post-tenure review, all tenured faculty, each year, will be required to submit a Faculty Report for Extra Merit Consideration and to participate fully in the evaluation process.

The department merit evaluation policy states criteria for Base Merit and Extra Merit, identifies the procedure for selection of the Department Merit Evaluation Committee and outlines the evaluation process. Following this annual review, all faculty members are:

- a. Informed, in writing, of their overall evaluation in the form of a numerical rating. These records are maintained in department files.
- b. Informed of their evaluation by area of faculty responsibility; teaching, research and scholarly activity, professional and public service, and contributions to the university.
  1. As required in our department policies, "Procedures for Renewal of Probationary Faculty Appointment & the Granting of Tenure", "Evaluation Procedures for Continuation & Reappointment of Academic Staff" and "Promotion Procedures & Criteria", non-tenured personnel & tenured faculty members eligible for a future promotion are evaluated in each of the above noted areas using a 0 to 4.0 point scale with 1.5 being considered average performance in that area. This evaluation information is presented, in writing, to each faculty member. These evaluations also are maintained in department files and used in personnel reviews and decisions.
  2. As required by UWS and UWL 3.05 of the Faculty Personnel Rules, tenured faculty members not eligible for promotion also are evaluated in each of the above noted areas. They are rated by area as being "above average", "average" or "below average. The results of these evaluations are presented, in writing, to each faculty member. This information also is maintained in department files.

- c. Informed of any concerns identified by the Department Merit Evaluation Committee.

To be in compliance with UW-L Faculty Review & Development, any concerns identified shall be communicated, in writing, to the faculty member involved. Following communication of concerns of a faculty member, the Department Merit Evaluation Committee, through the department Chair, will work with the faculty member to develop and write a plan to eliminate the concerns within a reasonable period of time. Follow-up and reevaluation of concerns will be conducted by the Department Merit Evaluation Committee after the agreed upon period of time has passed. This reevaluation will be done according to procedures described in the "Accountability" section of the UW- L Tenured Faculty Review and Development policy.

The results of the annual review of all faculty will be forwarded to the dean of the college.

\*The word faculty, as used throughout this document, includes all continuing faculty and instructional academic staff members except when used as "tenured faculty".

## Appendix 8.8

### DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

#### PROCEDURES FOR RENEWAL OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND GRANTING OF TENURE

##### A. Review for Reappointment and Granting of Tenure

1. The committee for the review shall be the tenured faculty of the Department of Chemistry.
2. The committee shall formulate its recommendation according to procedures described in section B of this document. The committee shall review and consider:
  - a. Student evaluations of teaching.
  - b. As requested, faculty evaluations as determined by the department Merit Evaluation Committee the beginning of each calendar year.
  - c. Annual merit evaluation reports submitted by faculty under review.
  - d. Any written and/or oral information provided the committee by the faculty member under review.
  - e. As requested, merit evaluation data for all years preceding the review.
  - f. The expertise of the faculty member under review and the need for this expertise in support of department programs.
3. To obtain a recommendation for reappointment, the probationary faculty member's performance must be judged to be satisfactory and must show potential for continued professional growth.
4. To obtain a recommendation for granting of tenure, the faculty member under review must have demonstrated performance comparable to that of tenured peers and have potential for promotion to the upper ranks.
5. A recommendation for reappointment and/or for granting of tenure must receive the support of the **majority** of the committee.
6. In the case of a recommendation non-renewal, the committee shall maintain a written record of reasons.
7. Procedures regarding notice and reconsideration shall be in accordance with those described in **UWS 3.06** and **3.07** of the *Faculty Personnel Rules*.

##### B. Weighting of Areas of Review

It is expected that all faculty will direct some effort to all areas of faculty responsibility; however, considering the varying interests and talents of faculty, it is not expected that all persons "balance" their efforts in these areas.

The tenured faculty of the Department of Chemistry considers excellence in undergraduate instruction our primary mission. As a result, teaching (student and peer evaluations) is considered most important of the criteria considered in the evaluation of faculty and is most heavily weighted.

In addition to establishing a record of successful teaching, a program of continued scholarship is necessary for retention and, ultimately, a positive tenure recommendation. (See **Appendix 8.3**. Definition of Scholarship.) Service is also an important faculty responsibility. For probationary faculty, a service record should be established in addition to demonstrated success in teaching and scholarship.

During the review of faculty for reappointment and/or granting of tenure, the tenured faculty of the department shall consider student evaluation data and department extra merit faculty reports. Based on those reports, the committee shall determine numerical peer evaluations for the candidate according to the following scale:

<b>Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEI)</b>	<b><u>Point Range</u></b>
Teaching	1-5 (the annual student evaluation)
<b>Peer Evaluations*</b>	
Teaching	0-4
Research	0-4
Prof. & Pub. Service	0-4
Contribs. to University	0-4

\* In each category of peer evaluation the range is 0-4 points. A score of 1.5 in each category is to be considered the average of department faculty excluding the person being evaluated and any faculty who did not apply for extra merit consideration during the previous faculty evaluation period.

A probationary faculty member may be denied:

- a. reappointment for a second year if awarded fewer than 3 points.
- b. reappointment if awarded fewer than 10 points.
- c. tenure if awarded fewer than 12 points.

In addition to and regardless of the results of the above evaluation, a probationary faculty member may be denied reappointment and/or granting of tenure for any of the following:

- a. Student evaluations of teaching area below 3.50 (scale of 1-5).
- b. Peer evaluations of teaching are below 1.50 (scale of 0-4).
- c. The expertise of the faculty member under review is not needed in support of Department programs.

Also, a recommendation for granting of tenure may be denied if:

- a. The faculty member did not apply for annual extra merit consideration. (See Department Merit Evaluation Policy).
- b. The faculty member does not meet the Department criteria for promotion to the upper ranks. (See Department Promotion Policy.)

## **Appendix 8.9**

### **DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY**

#### **PROMOTION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA**

##### **A. Promotion Procedures**

1. Public notice of promotion consideration meetings shall be made at least ten days prior to the meeting.
2. Faculty members meeting the minimum standards for promotion as prescribed by the Board of Regents, the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, and the Department of Chemistry shall be given at least ten days notice of the promotion consideration meeting. Notified faculty members will be informed of their rights under the Wisconsin Open Meeting Law.
3. 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 procedures described in the memo to department chairpersons from the Dean of the College of Arts, Letters & Science dated January 12, 1976.
4. The membership of promotion consideration committees consists of all department faculty at the rank or higher rank than the faculty rank to which a promotion is being considered.
5. After discussion, the consideration committee votes on a motion to promote. A record of this vote becomes a part of the department recommendation.
6. A member of the committee (usually the department chairperson) summarizes the promotion consideration discussion and includes this in the department recommendation.

The written recommendation is reviewed by committee members prior to its submission to the Dean of the College.

7. The chairperson informs all faculty reviewed by promotion committees of the department recommendation regarding their promotion.

##### **B. Promotion Standards**

According to the "Promotion Rules" adopted by the Faculty Senate, November 1975, the criteria for promotion of faculty are to be based on performance in the areas of teaching, research, professional and public service and contributions to the university. Considering the mission of the university, the role of the Department of Chemistry within the university and the nature of the discipline, the criteria that are used to evaluate faculty in this department shall be:

1. Teaching
2. Research and scholarly activity
3. Professional service and to a lesser extent public service
4. Contributions to the department and the university

The first category, teaching, is most important in an undergraduate program stressing quality instruction. The other categories are considered equal in importance.

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

##### **Professor**

Earned doctorate in field of principal responsibility. Must have a consistently above average to outstanding department evaluation in three of the four categories of faculty evaluation. The candidate must be judged by colleagues as being able to maintain this level of performance.

**Associate Professor**

Earned doctorate in field of principal responsibility. Must have a consistently above average to outstanding department evaluation in two of the four categories of faculty evaluation.

**Assistant Professor**

Earned doctorate. Must have a consistently average to above average overall performance record in recent evaluation periods.

**Instructor**

Must meet university requirements for instructor and be dedicated to quality instruction and contribute to the department and the university.

\* Average evaluation is defined as average within the department.

\*\* In order to determine the rank assignment of new faculty members, documentation of the candidate's past record or the candidate's potential to meet rank standards will be used to determine the rank assignment at hiring.

\*\*\* In the usual case, where strong justification exists, the department reserves the right to submit a recommendation for promotion on behalf of a candidate who may not have met all department standards for promotion to the next higher rank.

## Appendix 8.10.1

### DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

#### PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF ACADEMIC STAFF FOR CONTINUATION AND REAPPOINTMENT

##### A. Annual review of all academic staff

1. The committee for the review shall be the **tenured faculty** of the Department of Chemistry.
2. The committee shall formulate its recommendation according to the procedures described in **Section B** of this document. The committee shall review and consider:
  - a. Student evaluations of teaching.
  - b. If requested, the most recent evaluations as determined by the department Merit Evaluation Committee.
  - c. Annual merit evaluation reports submitted by academic staff under review.
  - d. Any written and/or oral information provided the committee by the academic staff member under review.
  - e. If requested, the merit evaluation data for all years preceding the review.
  - f. The expertise of the academic staff member under review and the need for this expertise in support of department programs.
3. To obtain a recommendation for continuation or reappointment, the academic staff member's performance must be judged to be satisfactory.
4. A recommendation for continuation or reappointment must receive the support a **two-thirds majority** of the committee.
5. In the case where continuation or reappointment is denied, the committee shall maintain a written record of reasons.
6. Procedures regarding notice and reconsideration shall be in accordance with those described in **UWS 10.05** of the *Academic Staff Personnel Rules*.

##### B. Weighting of areas of review

It is expected that all academic staff direct some effort to the areas of teaching, **research**, professional and public service, and university service; however, considering the varying interests, talents and assignments of academic staff, it is not expected that all persons "balance" their efforts in these areas.

The tenured faculty of the department of Chemistry considers excellence in undergraduate instruction our primary mission. As a result, teaching (student and peer evaluation) is considered most important of the criteria considered in the evaluation of academic staff and is most heavily weighted.

The other areas of evaluation, **research**, professional and public service and contributions to the university are weighted equal to each other. It is not expected that academic staff appointees pursue each of these areas with equal vigor, but to excel in the area(s) of greatest interest and those most pertinent to their particular appointment.

During the review for continuation or reappointment, the tenured faculty of the department shall consider student evaluation data and department extra merit reports. Based on those reports, the committee shall determine numerical peer evaluations for the candidate according to the following scale:

	<u>Point Range</u>
Student Evaluations	
Teaching	1-5 (the annual student evaluation)
Peer Evaluations*	
Teaching	0-4
<del>Research</del>	<del>0-4</del>
Professional & Public Service	0-4
Contributions to the University	0-4

\* In each category of peer evaluation the range is 0-4 points. A score of 1.5 in each category is to be considered the average of Department faculty and academic staff, excluding the person being evaluated.

An academic staff member may be denied:

- a. continuation or reappointment for a second year if awarded fewer than 8 points.
- b. continuation or reappointment for subsequent years if awarded fewer than 10 points.

In addition to and regardless of the results of the above evaluation, an academic staff may be denied continuation or reappointment for any of the following:

- a. Student evaluations of teaching are below 3.50 (scale of 1-5).
- b. Peer evaluations of teaching are below 1.50 (scale of 0-4).
- c. The expertise of the faculty member under review is not needed in support of department programs.
- d. The candidate did not apply for annual extra merit consideration (see department Merit Evaluation Policy).

In addition to and regardless of the results of the above evaluation, an academic staff member who does not have a Ph.D. degree in chemistry normally will not be considered for a fifth year appointment.



## **Appendix 8.10.2**

May 13, 1983

### **DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY**

#### **POLICY STATEMENT: FACULTY<sup>1</sup> REQUEST FOR POSITION/TIME RELEASE FROM DEPARTMENT APPOINTMENT**

The Department encourages faculty to participate in professional development activity 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:

- a. result in a replacement position awarded the department during the faculty member's absence or
- b. 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 released time for professional development. However, it may be necessary for the department to refuse such a request,

- a. 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.
- b. 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 faculty<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> The word faculty as used in this document includes all faculty and teaching academic staff.

<sup>2</sup> In this instance, the word faculty refers only to faculty.

### **Appendix 8.10.3**

February 1994

#### **DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY**

#### **POLICY ON FACULTY & ACADEMIC STAFF EQUITY ADJUSTMENTS**

On May 13, 1993, the Faculty Senate approved a "Policy on Faculty & Teaching Academic Staff Equity Salary Adjustments" which, with modifications, was approved by the Chancellor, August 24, 1993. The following policy statement is the response of the Department of Chemistry to the requirement that we have a policy for the identification of salary inequities and procedures for recommending equity adjustments to the dean of the college.

**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.

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 include supporting documentation and rationale.

- **a faculty member**

A faculty member may request an equity adjustment in one's 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/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.

## **Appendix 8.10.5**

### **DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY**

#### **SUMMER SESSION POLICY**

##### **I. 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."

###### **A. Instructional Service**

The primary purpose of the summer session is to provide instructional service.

The Department shall:

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

###### **B. Professional Development**

The summer period provides an opportunity for professional development.

The department shall encourage faculty to:

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

##### **II. Policies for Determining Course Offerings and Staff Assignments**

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

1. Recommend summer session offerings.
2. 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.

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

1. 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.
2. 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.

- a. First Priority

i. 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.

ii. All full time faculty within three years of announced retirement (See section E.)

b. Second Priority

i. Non-doctorates.

ii. Doctorates with less than one and one-half years of service in the department.

iii. Part-time faculty.

3. Accepting a summer session appointment is contingent on accepting an appointment for the next academic year.

#### C. System of Rotation for Determining Summer Session Assignments

The department shall use a point system in use (with minor modifications) since 1969 to determine priorities for instructional assignments.

1. Points shall be awarded First Priority staff annually during the February evaluation of faculty.

2. Point distribution – First Priority staff

a. Ph.D. in chemistry – 0.2 point.

b. Rank (as of the February evaluation)

i. Professor – 0.3 point.

ii. Associate Professor – 0.2 point.

iii. Assistant Professor – 0.1 point

iv. 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.

c. 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.

d. Total points awarded individual faculty members each year shall be normalized against the instructional positions allocated the department the previous summer session.

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

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

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

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

5. 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.)

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

a. Staff with required qualifications shall be assigned to special courses.

b. 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.

7. 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.

#### D. 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.

#### E. 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.

1. This guarantee applies to all full-time staff regardless of priority classification or priority points.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. Summer session appointments to retiring staff shall be subtracted from summer session priority points.

5. This guarantee becomes void in the event that retirement policies change so that retirement benefits are no longer affected by summer employment.

F. Other

1. 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.

2. Transfer of summer session priority points between faculty is prohibited.