

Department of Biology

Bylaws, Policies, and Procedures

(Amended 1999, 2004, 2009, 2014, 2017, 2019, 2024, 2025)

Table of Contents

0.	Organization and Operation	1
0.0	Preamble.....	1
0.1	Meeting Guidelines.....	1
0.2	Definitions of Quorum and Majority.....	1
0.3	Proxy Votes.....	1
0.4	Changes to Bylaws.....	1
1.	Student Rights and Obligations.....	2
1.1	Evaluation of Teaching.....	2
1.2	Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures.....	2
1.2.1	Grade Appeals.....	2
1.2.2	Academic Non-Grade Complaints, Grievances, and Appeals	2
1.3	Advising	2
1.4	Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct.....	2
2.	Faculty Responsibilities.....	3
2.1	Teaching.....	3
2.2	Scholarship.....	3
2.3	Service.....	3
3.	Academic Staff and Adjunct Faculty Responsibilities and Expectations	3
3.1	Academic Staff.....	3
3.1.1	Appointments and Expectations.....	3
3.1.2	Voting Rights.....	3
3.2	Adjunct Faculty.....	3
3.2.1	Appointments.....	3
3.2.2	Privileges and Responsibilities.....	4
4.	Annual (Merit) Review.....	4
4.1	Annual Reports and Evaluation Criteria.....	4
4.1.1	Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff.....	4
4.1.2	Evaluation Criteria.....	4
4.2	Evaluation Process.....	4
4.2.1	Non-instructional Academic Staff.....	5
4.3	Distribution of Merit Funds.....	5
4.4	Appeals.....	6
5.	Retention and Tenure Decisions.....	6
5.1	Review Process.....	6
5.2	Evaluation Criteria.....	7
5.3	Reconsideration of Retention and Tenure Recommendations.....	7
5.4	Academic Staff Retention.....	7
6.	Post-tenure Review	7

7.	Promotion Recommendations.....	8
7.1	Review Process.....	8
7.2	Evaluation Criteria.....	9
7.3	Reconsideration of the Promotion Recommendation.....	9
8.	Governance	9
8.1	Election of the Department Chair and Associate Department Chair.....	9
8.2	Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair.....	10
8.3	Vacancies in the Positions of Department Chair or Associate Department Chair.....	10
8.4	Standing Departmental Committees.....	11
8.4.1	Assessment Committee	11
8.4.2	Biology 105 Lecture Coordination.....	11
8.4.3	Budget Committee.....	11
8.4.4	Core Curriculum Committee	11
8.4.5	Curriculum Committee.....	11
8.4.6	Evaluation of Lab Managers	11
8.4.7	Graduate Committee.....	11
8.4.8	Greenhouse Committee	11
8.4.9	Library Liaison	11
8.4.10	Mentoring New Faculty and IAS	11
8.4.11	Merit Review Committees.....	11
8.4.12	Museum Oversight Committee	11
8.4.13	Nutrition Minor Committee.....	11
8.4.14	Planning and Goals Committee	11
8.4.15	Promotion, Tenure, Salary Committee.....	11
8.4.16	Promotion Recommendation Committee	11
8.4.17	Retention & Tenure Review Committee.....	11
8.4.18	Room Use and Renovation Committee.....	11
APPENDIX A.	STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION	12
APPENDIX B.	ANNUAL (MERIT) REVIEW PROCEDURES	12
APPENDIX C.	EVALUATION OF TEACHING BY PROBATIONARY FACULTY AND NEWER IAS.....	23
APPENDIX E.	POLICIES ON REASSIGNMENT TIME	27
APPENDIX F.	SUMMER SCHOOL POLICIES	28
APPENDIX G.	TEACHING BY ADJUNCT FACULTY	29
APPENDIX H.	SALARY EQUITY ADJUSTMENT POLICY	30
APPENDIX I.	PROCEDURE FOR SELECTING THE BIOLOGY SENIORS OF THE YEAR	31
APPENDIX J.	HIRING PROCEDURES	31

0. Organization and Operation

0.0 Preamble

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 bylaws. The bylaws in this document were adopted by the members of the Department of Biology in accordance with the above regulations.

0.1 Meeting Guidelines

Meetings of the Department and its Committees are conducted according to the most recent edition of *Robert's Rules of Order* and Wisconsin state open meeting laws.

Department meetings and meetings of committees such as the Retention & Tenure Committee, Promotion Committee, and Search & Screen Committees will be conducted in accordance with Wisconsin Open Meeting Laws. These meetings may be converted to "closed session" if matters of a confidential nature are to be discussed. Section 19.85(1) of Wisconsin Statutes contains procedural requirements for convening in closed session. The following steps **must** precede a closed session.

- a. The body **must** first convene in open session.
- b. A motion is made that the body convene in closed session. The motion should state the nature of the business to be considered in closed session.
- c. The Chair **must** (1) announce that if the motion is passed, the body will convene in closed session, (2) state the nature of the business to be considered in closed session, and (3) cite the relevant provision of sec. 19.85(1) which is the authority for the closed session.
- d. The contents of the announcement should be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.
- e. The motion must be passed by a majority vote of those present. The vote of each member on the motion to close the session **must be ascertained and recorded** in the meeting minutes, or if the vote is unanimous, the minutes should so state.
- f. Only business relating to the matters stated in the Chair's announcement may be taken up at the closed session.

Furthermore, sec. 19.85 (2) prohibits a governmental body from commencing a meeting, convening in closed session, and then reconvening again in open session within 12 hours after completion of the closed session UNLESS notice of the subsequent open session was given at the same time and in the same manner as the notice for the open session prior to the closed session.

0.2 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 (faculty on sabbatical/official leave are considered not eligible). Within a meeting, a majority or other proportion of votes required to pass a motion is based on the number of Members voting in the affirmative and negative and does not include Members abstaining from voting.

0.3 Proxy Votes

Proxy votes are not permitted in meetings of the Department and its Committees.

0.4 Changes to Bylaws

Amendments or additions to these bylaws may be adopted at any Department meeting if supported by two-thirds of the eligible members 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 Department during the fall and spring semester (except seminars, forums, capstone, internships, service learning and independent study courses), students will have an opportunity to evaluate their instructors and learning environment. This evaluation will take place online at the end of the semester.

1.2 Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures

1.2.1 Grade Appeals.

Enrolled students are afforded an opportunity to seek redress of perceived grievances concerning the assignment of final course grades by instructors. Grievances only will be considered for final course grades and must involve one or more of the following factors.

1. An error was made in grade computation.
2. The grade was based on factors contrary to those stated in the course syllabus or a reasonable interpretation of it.
3. The grade includes a penalty for actions involving the freedom of written or spoken classroom expression.
4. The grade involved a breach of federal or state constitutional protections, laws, Universities of Wisconsin or UW-La Crosse policies.

Preliminary Procedures

- The student must attempt an informal resolution of the problem with the instructor no later than the 10th working day of the next regular semester (Fall/Spring). The instructor may require a written request from the student.
- If the informal process with the instructor does not resolve the problem, the student should communicate, using their UWL email, with the Department Chair within five working days. The Chair may either attempt informal resolution of the problem or inform the student in writing of formal grievance policies within five working days. Communications from this point forward should use all parties' UWL email accounts.

Formal Procedures

1. Chair Procedures

- If the Chair decides an informal resolution is inappropriate or unattainable, they should inform the student within five working days the student may request a formal review of the matter by the Department Grade Appeals Committee. This request must be received by the Chair within five working days of the notification of the failure of the attempt at mediation. The student's petition must be in writing and include the nature of the grievance and its basis from the four factors listed in the "Policy" section above, a brief description of the attempt at informal resolution, the desired outcome the student wishes, and all supporting evidence. The Chair will, within five working days, arrange for the engagement of the committee to hear the student's appeal.
- At the same time, the Chair will acknowledge the student's petition and inform the course instructor. If the instructor, upon seeing the petition, wishes to respond, this must be done within five working days.
- Upon receipt of the student's petition and the potential response from the instructor, the Chair will convene the committee within five working days and deliver all written documents concerning the case, including a written account of the Chair's attempt at mediation, if applicable.

2. Grade Appeals Committee

- The Chair will assemble an *ad hoc* committee of three (3) department faculty not including the

instructor or the Chair.

- The committee will review the materials presented, including the student petition and other evidence provided by the instructor or Chair. It may ask for clarifying information from either the student or the instructor via written inquiry and may call for an oral presentation from either. Each person will be given an opportunity to respond if further evidence is presented to the committee.
- Following review and consideration of the evidence, the committee will render a formal recommendation and communicate that recommendation to the Chair and the instructor within ten days of the committee's first meeting. The report will include the committee's findings of fact, its recommendation, and its rationale for the recommendation.
- Unless they are no longer a UWL instructor, the course instructor retains the right to accept or reject the recommendations of the Department Grade Appeals Committee. If the instructor is no longer a UWL instructor, the Chair (or their designee) will assume the instructor's role. The instructor's decision at the end of this process will be considered final with no further appeal possible.

3. Further Action

- Grievances related to course grades cannot be appealed except through the instructor and the department procedures described above. The assignment of final course grades involves the professional judgment of qualified instructors in a particular field of study. Administrative officers at the College or University level are assumed to not have relevant academic expertise and bear no responsibility for the determination of course grades.
- If the student believes the grade appeal process, stated in the by-laws, was not appropriately followed they can pursue a grievance through the Office of Student Life. However, an appeal to the Office of Student Life cannot involve the department or instructor's decision on the grade.

Conditions

- At all review levels the burden of proof is the student's responsibility.
- The term "working days" refers to days when classes are scheduled.
- Grievance petitions must be individually filed

1.2.2 Academic Non-Grade Complaints, Grievances, and Appeals. Students may initiate and resolve complaints regarding faculty and staff behavior. Unless otherwise stated in the (*Eagle Eye*) Student Handbook, complaints should be lodged in writing with the Department Chair or Dean of the College of SAH within 90 days of the last occurrence.

1.3 Advising

Each student who majors in a program offered by the Biology Department will be assigned an advisor in the Department. Students may be required to meet with their advisor at least once each semester to discuss their academic progress, career interests, and course schedules.

1.4 Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct

Students who enroll in courses offered by the Biology Department are expected to attend and participate in these classes. They are expected to devote sufficient non-class time to complete all class assignments in a timely manner and to undertake additional study of the material as necessary to demonstrate satisfactory mastery of the material. Academic misconduct by students will not be tolerated. Types of misconduct and associated penalties are presented in UWS Chapter 14. Disciplinary action will follow the Academic Misconduct Guide for Instructors (Office of Student Life).

2. Faculty Responsibilities

2.1 Teaching

Faculty of the Biology Department are expected to keep current in their subject matter area and to work to improve student learning (see Appendix B for examples of teaching activities). They are further expected to offer additional time to address student questions by holding office/student 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 are expected to grade and return student assignments, including examinations, in a timely fashion. Finally, faculty are expected to allow student evaluation of instruction in each course they teach (except as noted in section 1.1).

2.2 Scholarship

Faculty in the Biology Department are expected to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship. The Department's definition of scholarship (Appendix B) 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 competitive grant proposals to support any of these activities is an important area of scholarship.

2.3 Service

Faculty of the Biology Department are expected to serve the University, the public and their profession. This service can take the form of participating on Departmental, College, University and UW System committees, offering specialized advice to off-campus groups, and joining and participating in the activities of professional societies in their discipline (see Appendix B for examples of service activities).

3. Academic Staff and Adjunct Faculty Responsibilities and Expectations

3.1 Academic Staff

3.1.1 Appointments and Expectations. Academic Staff appointments may take many forms, including instructional, non-instructional, and combined instructional/non-instructional appointments. Appointments usually used in academic departments are the Teaching Professor series and Laboratory Manager series. Instructional Academic Staff in the Biology Department are held to the same teaching expectations as faculty (see 2.1 above). Instructional Academic Staff responsibilities will differ from that of faculty members in accordance with the University Workload Policy. Instructional Academic Staff are expected to maintain an active program of professional development and also engage in some service activities (see Appendix B for examples of professional development and service activities). Any special expectations of a member of the Academic Staff are stated in the Position Description.

3.1.2 Voting Rights. Instructional Academic Staff with at least a 50% appointment and who have worked in the Department for at least a year have the right to vote in all departmental matters including the election of the Department Chair and Associate Chair, but excluding retention, tenure, and faculty promotion.

3.2 Adjunct Faculty

3.2.1 Appointments. The Department of Biology can invite individuals not employed by the University to become Adjunct Faculty Members. The individuals are asked to submit to the Chair of the Department Graduate Committee a vita and letter of application stating their reasons for seeking Adjunct Faculty status. The Graduate Committee reviews the request and in the case of a favorable review forwards a motion to approve the request to the Department. The Department acts on the motion, which if passed is forwarded to the Dean of SAH. If approved, the Dean writes a letter of appointment to Adjunct Faculty status to the

individual. The appointment may include Adjunct Graduate Faculty status if the individual meets the requirements for graduate faculty.

3.2.2 Privileges and Responsibilities. Adjunct Faculty may teach and/or team-teach courses that have been approved by the Department Curriculum Committee (Appendix G, Teaching by Adjunct Faculty). Adjunct Faculty may also co-advise (with a member of the Department) undergraduate research (BIO 499) and serve as thesis committee members (including co-major advisor) to M.S. graduate students in Biology. Adjunct Faculty must have Graduate Faculty status to qualify for teaching slash and 700-level courses and for serving on thesis committees.

4. Annual (Merit) Review

4.1 Annual Reports and Evaluation Criteria

4.1.1 Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff. Consistent with UWS 3.05-3.11, UW L 3.05 and UWL 10.06, the performance of all Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff in the Biology Department will be reviewed annually. Exceptions are: 1) New Faculty who begin 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. 2) New Instructional Academic Staff do not undergo Annual (Merit) Review in their first year.

All Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff have a June 1st deadline for entering teaching, scholarship, professional development and service activities into the electronic portfolios system (Digital Measures) for activities from the prior year June 1st – May 31st. The Department Chair will then run a Digital Measures annual (merit) report for each faculty member. This report and student evaluations will constitute the basis of the annual (merit) review and serve as a vehicle for self-evaluation. Furthermore, the annual (merit) review shall offer an opportunity for future goal setting and improvement as necessary. In the case of Probationary Faculty and newer Instructional Academic Staff, peer evaluation of teaching (see section 5.1 of the Bylaws and Appendix C, Evaluation of Teaching by Probationary Faculty and Newer Instructional Academic Staff) may also be used in the annual (merit) review. Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff members who are on professional leave are expected to enter into the electronic portfolios system by June 1st a description of their leave and other professional activities.

Retiring Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff are not reviewed for their last academic year, but are asked to enter their accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, professional development and service into the electronic portfolio system for incorporation into the Annual Departmental Report to the Dean.

4.1.2 Evaluation Criteria. The criteria used in the Biology Department to evaluate the annual performance of each Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff Member are designed to promote effective teaching and enhance the quality of scholarship, professional development and service. Of the areas of responsibility, teaching is weighted as the most important for both Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff. Faculty are evaluated in each of the areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Service, while Instructional Academic Staff are evaluated in the areas of teaching and Professional Development/Scholarship/Service. Instructional Academic Staff are not expected to perform scholarship, but any efforts in this area should be included in the electronic portfolio for annual (merit) review purposes. Criteria for evaluating teaching, scholarship, professional development and service are enumerated in Appendix B, Section 1.1.1. The evaluation criteria for Non-Instructional Academic Staff are based on each individual's job description and are designed to promote effective performance of the job responsibilities. The evaluation criteria will be contained in the evaluation guidelines established for each individual.

4.2 Evaluation Process

Early in the fall semester, the Department Chair, working with the Merit Review Committees, will use the electronic portfolios annual report, Student Evaluation Information, and Peer Evaluation Information (when applicable in the case of Probationary Faculty and newer Instructional Academic Staff) from the previous year to evaluate each Department Member's performance. Performance will be evaluated in each of the areas specified in section 4.1.2 based on the Evaluation Criteria specified in Appendix B.

According to the Annual Evaluation Procedures of the Department of Biology (Appendix B), the Department Chair will separate the Department Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff into three Merit Review Committees, with an attempt to have all sub-disciplines within the Department represented in each committee. Each member of each Merit Review Committee will evaluate all members of the other two Merit Review Committees and will provide a Performance Rating (U = Unsatisfactory, S = Satisfactory, G = Good, or E = Exceptional) and a Merit Category Designation (1 = No Merit; 2 = Meritorious; 3 = Significantly Meritorious; or 4 = Exceptionally Meritorious) for each member evaluated. The Chair of each of the three Merit Review Committees will transmit the evaluations of their Committee to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will then summarize the evaluations and determine the Merit Category Designation for each member of the Department according to Departmental Annual Evaluation Procedures. Within seven days of the review, the Department Chair shall notify (in writing) each Department Member of their Merit Category Designation, including Performance Ratings in each of the areas of faculty responsibility. This assessment shall offer an opportunity for future goal setting and improvement as necessary.

The Chair of the department will be evaluated by the method prescribed by the College of Science and Health. ~~The Merit Review Committees, with substantial input from the Dean, are responsible for evaluation of the Department Chair. The Chair shall be evaluated like other Department Faculty. In addition, the Dean will assess the performance of the Chair with regard to communication, cooperation, and ability to work with the Administration. The Dean will assign a final Merit Category Designation from the same numerical scale (1, 2, 3, 4) used for all other Department Faculty, and the Dean's evaluation will be weighted at 50% of the evaluation from the Department (i.e., 33% of the total evaluation). The Chairs of the Merit Review Advisory Committees, working with the Dean, will, within seven days of the review, notify the Chair in writing of their Merit Category Designation and Performance Ratings in each area of evaluation.~~

4.2.1 Non-instructional Academic Staff. Consistent with UWL 10.06, the performance of all Non-Instructional Academic Staff in the Biology Department will be reviewed annually. The annual evaluation process for Non-Instructional Academic Staff is different from that of Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff and will be conducted by a Special Merit Review Committee appointed by the Department Chair. A specific set of evaluation guidelines/criteria will be established for each Non-Instructional Academic Staff Member by the Department Chair in consultation with the Non-Instructional Academic Staff member. The guidelines/criteria should contain evaluation categories conforming to each individual's job description. The Special Merit Review Committee will evaluate Non-instructional Academic Staff based on the specific guidelines established for each individual. For each individual being evaluated, members of the Special Merit Review Advisory Committee(s) will assign (1) a Performance Rating (U = Unsatisfactory, S = Satisfactory, G=Good, or E = Exceptional) for each evaluation category in each individual's specific guidelines and (2) a Merit Category Designation (1= Non-meritorious, 2 = Meritorious, 3 = Significantly Meritorious, 4 = Exceptionally Meritorious). The Chair of the Special Review Committee will transmit the results of the evaluation to the Department Chair who will, within seven days of the review, notify (in writing) each Non-instructional Academic Staff Member of their Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designation.

4.3 Distribution of Merit Funds

Unless mandated otherwise by the University System Administration, the entire pay package for each individual will

be distributed according to policies in the Annual Evaluation Procedures (Appendix B) to all Department members who earned Merit Category Designations of 2, 3, or 4 (Meritorious, Significantly Meritorious, or Exceptionally Meritorious). The pool of merit funds for Academic Staff is separate from the faculty pool.

4.4 Appeals.

All Department members may request a reconsideration of their Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designation. This request must be made in writing to the Department Chair within one week of the distribution of Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designation by the Department Chair. Appeals will be adjudicated by the process described in Appendix B.

5. Retention and Tenure Decisions

5.1 Review Process

The Retention & Tenure Review Committee shall consist of all tenured members of the Biology Department. In cases where the Committee consists of fewer than three Faculty Members, the Department Chair shall work with the Dean to establish an appropriate committee, which will use the Biology Department Guidelines. The Department Chair shall serve as Chair of the Retention & Tenure Review Committee. If the Department Chair is a candidate for retention or tenure, the Department Retention & Tenure Review Committee shall elect one of its tenured members as Chair of the Retention & Tenure Review Committee. For Probationary faculty, the Department Chair shall appoint two faculty members (at least one of which must be tenured) to serve as classroom evaluators (Peer Evaluators). For new Instructional Academic Staff (those with fewer than 11 semesters of service to the Biology Department), the Department Chair shall appoint two faculty/IAS members (at least one of which must be tenured) to serve as classroom evaluators (Peer Evaluators). At least one classroom visitation should be conducted per semester for Probationary faculty and newer Instructional Academic staff. Peer Evaluators will be responsible for producing the Peer Evaluation Information required for Probationary Faculty and newer IAS in Section 4.1 and Appendix B, Section 1 of these Bylaws.

Peer Evaluators will present an assessment of classroom experiences they observed in a written report submitted to the Probationary Faculty Member and to the Chair of the Retention & Tenure Review Committee (see Appendix C. Evaluation of Teaching by Probationary Faculty and Newer IAS).

Retention reviews are usually conducted fall semester. Exceptions are: (1) first-year faculty who begin in fall semester are reviewed in spring semester and (2) second-year faculty are reviewed in both semesters. 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 Department Chair will also instruct candidates to submit an electronic copy of their Annual Activity Report and Retention Report to the Chair of the Retention & Tenure Review Committee at least seven days prior to the date of the review. The Chair of the Retention & Tenure Review Committee will supply the results of student evaluations and peer evaluation of teaching (if appropriate) 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 meetings; however, the meeting may be converted to a closed session (see section 0.1 Meeting Guidelines).

Using the criteria in Section 5.2 of these Bylaws, the Retention & Tenure Review Committee shall evaluate each Probationary Faculty Member's performance based on all submitted information. After discussion of a candidate's performance, votes shall be cast by a show of hands on a motion to retain/tenure the candidate. At least a two-thirds majority is necessary for a positive retention/tenure recommendation. The results of the vote shall be recorded by the Chair of the Retention & Tenure Review Committee. In the case of a recommendation for non-renewal, the

Committee shall prepare written reasons for its decision. These reasons shall be retained by the Chair of the Retention & Tenure Review Committee in case they are requested by the Probationary Faculty Member. Within seven days of the review meeting, each Probationary Faculty Member shall be informed in writing (via university email) by the Committee Chair of the results of the retention review. Even in the case of a recommendation for retention/tenure, the written notice may include concerns identified by the Committee and suggestions formulated by the Committee for improvement.

5.2 Evaluation Criteria

Members of the Retention & Tenure Review Committee shall use all submitted information to judge each Probationary Faculty Member's performance in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Service (see Appendix B for activities to be considered in these areas). Of these areas of responsibility, Teaching is most important and must be weighted at least 50%; however, Service and a program of continued Scholarship are necessary to earn recommendations for retention and, ultimately, for tenure.

5.3 Reconsideration of Retention and Tenure Recommendations

If a recommendation for non-renewal 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 notification of the recommendation for non-renewal. The Chair of the Retention & Tenure Review Committee shall supply these reasons in writing within 10 days of the request. The reasons then become part of the personnel file of the Probationary Faculty Member.

If the Probationary Faculty Member wishes a reconsideration of the initial recommendation, they must request such a meeting in writing within two weeks of the receipt of the recommendation for non-renewal. The procedure for the reconsideration meeting is detailed in UWL 3.07 (4), (5), and (6).

5.4 Academic Staff Retention

Academic staff retention and non-renewal procedures will be administered as put forth in UWS and UW-L Chapter 10.

6. Post-tenure Review

This section of the Biology Department bylaws is subject to the Faculty Senate policy on post-tenure review as approved by the Board of Regents.

6.1 Post-tenure Review Committee

The post tenure review committee will be composed of all tenured faculty not up for post-tenure review that year.

6.2 Material for Consideration by the Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee

Seven calendar days prior to the committee meeting, the faculty member under consideration for post-tenure review needs to provide to the committee via its chair, at minimum, an electronic report from the electronic faculty activity portfolio system (e.g., annual activity report with hyperlinks) drawn from the last date of tenure (use January 1 of the tenure year if first post-tenure review) or last post-tenure review to the date of the committee review, and the faculty member must ensure that the report is up-to-date on 5 years of activities and includes the following materials:

- hyperlinks to at least one syllabus for each course (not each section of each course, or each term of each course) taught in the past five years
- hyperlinks to evidence of scholarly activities associated with the specific entry (e.g., publication, grant, exhibition, presentation)

- hyperlinks for service are not required

Seven calendar days prior to the committee meeting, the Department Chair must provide to the committee faculty LENS scores for each semester being evaluated.

Seven calendar days prior to the committee meeting, the Department Chair must provide to the committee faculty composite annual merit scores for each year being evaluated.

6.3 Criteria to Meet Expectations

Continued teaching excellence is measured by the results of self-evaluations, peer evaluations, and/or student evaluations. Service activity is measured by Department, University, and/or Professional committee work. Scholarly productivity is measured by the quality and quantity of presentations, publications, grant submissions, and grant acquisitions. Both disciplinary and SOTL scholarly work are valued equally. A faculty member that meets two of these three criteria “meets expectations”.

An individual with a merit score of 1 in at least one year and a 1 or 2 in at least 3 of the 5 years will be considered to “not meet expectations”.

Faculty with an unsatisfactory evaluation must develop a 3-year plan in consultation with the department chair to improve their merit scores. This plan must be approved by 2/3 of the tenured faculty. Faculty exceeding these criteria “meet expectations” and do not need further review.

7. Promotion Recommendations

7.1 Review Process

Before the end of spring semester each year, lists of faculty and IAS who will meet the minimum University eligibility requirements for promotion in the coming academic year are distributed by the Dean to the Department Chair. These lists will be reviewed for accuracy by the Department Chair. At this time, the Department Chair will notify in writing (via university email) department members who are eligible for promotion and refer them to the Guide to Faculty Promotions (Human resources webpage) or the Guide to Instructional Academic Staff Promotion (IAS webpage), as appropriate. The Department Chair will also provide information on the provisions of the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law upon request.

The Promotion Recommendation Committee shall consist of all tenured faculty in the Department of Biology when considering cases of faculty promotion. The Promotion Recommendation Committee shall consist of all tenured faculty in the Department and all Instructional Academic Staff at or above the rank being requested in the Department of Biology when considering cases of IAS promotion. In cases where the Committee consists of fewer than three faculty members, the Department Chair shall work with the Dean to establish an appropriate Committee. The Department Chair will serve as Chair of the Promotion Recommendation Committee unless they are being considered for promotion. If the Department Chair cannot serve as Chair of the Promotion Recommendation Committee, they shall convene the Committee during the first week of classes in fall semester to elect (by simple majority) a chair for a one-year term.

During the second week of classes in fall semester, the Department Chair will forward the names of individuals eligible for promotion to the Chair of the Promotion Recommendation Committee (if the Chair of the Promotion Recommendation Committee is not the Department Chair). At this time, the Department Chair will also re-notify in writing (via university email) department members who are eligible for promotion and of the date of the promotion consideration meeting (which must be at least 20 days in the future).

Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff who are eligible and wish to be considered for promotion must submit a completed electronic Promotion Report to the Department Chair at least seven days prior to the date of the promotion consideration meeting. The Department Chair will make these materials and student evaluation information available to members of the Promotion Recommendation Committee prior to the promotion consideration meeting. The requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meeting law shall apply to this meeting (see Section 0.1 Meeting Guidelines).

At the meeting, a faculty member selected by the Department Chair will present an oral summary of the candidate's performance with respect to the Evaluation Criteria in Section 4.1 and Appendix B. After further discussion, votes shall be cast as a show of hands on a 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.

Within seven days of the promotion consideration meeting, the Department Chair shall notify each candidate of the Committee's recommendation and the reasons for that recommendation. For positive recommendations, the Committee Chair shall include a letter of recommendation on behalf of the Committee as part of the electronic Promotion Report. A copy of this letter shall be provided to the candidate at least one day prior to the submission of the promotion file to the Dean.

7.2 Evaluation Criteria

To be considered for promotion, faculty and Instructional Academic Staff must meet the minimum University criteria as stated in the Employee Handbook. The biology department places no further restrictions on eligibility for promotion other than those imposed by the university governance bodies.

For faculty, the evaluation criteria involve Teaching, Scholarship, and Service--of these, Teaching is most important and must be weighted at least 50%. For the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must provide evidence of teaching excellence, service, and the establishment of a program of scholarship (see Appendix B for activities recognized by the Department in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service). Evidence of teaching excellence shall include the results of self-evaluations, peer evaluations (when applicable in the case of Probationary Faculty), and student evaluations. To be promoted to the rank of Professor, a faculty member must show evidence of continued excellence in teaching, substantial service activity, and significant scholarly productivity. Continued teaching excellence is measured by the results of self-evaluations, peer evaluations (in the case of Probationary Faculty), and student evaluations. Substantial service activity will include service to the Department, the University, and the Profession. Examples of significant scholarly productivity include the quality and quantity of presentations, publications, and grant acquisitions.

Instructional academic staff must meet the minimum University criteria as stated in the UWL Instructional Academic Staff titling series. The evaluation criteria involve Teaching and Professional Development/Scholarship/Service--of these, Teaching is most important and must be weighted at least 50%. For the rank of Associate Teaching Professor, a candidate must demonstrate a strong record of accomplishment in Teaching and evidence of Professional Development/Scholarship/Service (see Appendix B for activities recognized by the Department in the areas of Teaching, Professional Development, Scholarship, and Service). Evidence of accomplishments in teaching shall include the results of self-evaluations, peer evaluations (when applicable), and student evaluations. To be promoted to the rank of Teaching Professor, an instructional academic staff member must demonstrate a sustained record of accomplishment in teaching and professional

development/scholarship/service. Sustained teaching accomplishments are measured by the results of self-evaluations, peer evaluations (when applicable), and student evaluations.

7.3 Reconsideration of the Promotion Recommendation

Within two weeks of receiving the written reasons for non-promotion, a candidate may request, by writing to the Department Chair, reconsideration by the Promotion Recommendation Committee. The candidate will be allowed an opportunity to respond to the written reasons (1) by the individual presenting written or oral evidence and/or (2) by another department member speaking on the individual's behalf at the reconsideration meeting.

8. Governance

8.1 Election of the Department Chair and Associate Department Chair

Specific details of the selection process are contained in Faculty Senate Policy V: The Selection of Department Chairpersons. Any tenured faculty member of the Department is eligible to serve as Chair or Associate Chair. The term of office is three years. All Faculty and continuing Instructional Academic Staff (as defined in Section 3.1.2) are eligible to vote in the election of the Chair and Associate Chair.

8.2 Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair and Associate Department Chair

A thorough listing of the Chair's responsibilities is contained in Faculty Senate Policy 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 Departmental committees; appointing search and screen activities for Departmental vacancies; arranging and coordinating the annual evaluation of Department staff (including Faculty, Instructional Academic Staff, Non-instructional Academic Staff, and Classified Staff); preparing the Department's annual report; and representing the Department in various University matters and activities. The contractual duties of the Department Chair extend throughout the year.

The Associate Chair's chief responsibility is to assist the Department Chair in the performance of their duties, as directed by the Chair. In addition, the Associate Chair is authorized to act on behalf of the Department Chair whenever the Chair is unavailable to perform the duties of their office.

8.3 Vacancies in the Positions of Department Chair or Associate Department Chair

Short term vacancies (defined as no greater than one month) in either the Department Chair or Associate Department Chair position due to disability (or for other reasons) require no action to replace the absent administrator. However, longer vacancies or repeated short-term vacancies in either position (due to disability, resignation, etc.) require the remaining Chair or Associate Chair to (1) consult with the Dean and (2) convene a special meeting of the Department to address the issue and to begin the process of filling the vacated position if determined to be necessary. This special meeting should include all members of the Department who have standing to vote in elections for the Chair or Associate Chair positions, and should be announced at least seven days ahead of time. The remaining Chair or Associate Chair should lead this meeting or request that a tenured member of the faculty do so. The vacating Chair or Associate Chair should address the meeting if possible, but should then leave the meeting in order to facilitate discussion.

If the Department determines at this meeting that the Chair or Associate Chair is unable or unwilling to resume their duties reliably, then an election should be held to fill the vacant position for the remainder of the existing, three-year term for that office. Guidelines for eligibility and electoral procedures are to be adhered to as closely as possible, under the direction of the remaining Chair or Associate Chair and in consultation with the Dean, in order to fill the vacant position within a month of the special meeting.

It is possible that this election may produce a secondary vacancy if, for example, an Associate Chair chooses to become a candidate for the vacant Chair position and is elected to it. If this occurs, then a second election should be held to fill the Associate Chair position during the month following the first, again adhering to guidelines regarding eligibility and process. The limits of the original three-year terms of office should be followed in all cases.

8.4 Standing Departmental Committees

Any committee action that is to be presented to the Department in the form of a motion must be made known (by posted announcement) to the rest of the Department at least 48 hours prior to the Department meeting at which the vote will be taken. At this time, a summary of the motion and general supporting rationale must also be made available electronically for review by all Department Faculty. This 48-hour rule can be waived at the Department meeting if a motion is made and the result of the vote is unanimous.

- 8.4.1 Assessment Committee
- 8.4.2 Biology 105 Lecture Coordination
- 8.4.3 Budget Committee
- 8.4.4 Core Curriculum Committee
- 8.4.5 Curriculum Committee
- 8.4.6 Evaluation of Lab Managers
- 8.4.7 Graduate Committee
- 8.4.8 Greenhouse Committee
- 8.4.9 Library Liaison
- 8.4.10 Mentoring New Faculty and IAS
- 8.4.11 Merit Review Committees
- 8.4.12 Museum Oversight Committee
- 8.4.13 Food and Nutritional Sciences/Nutrition Minor Committee
- 8.4.14 Planning and Goals Committee
- 8.4.15 Promotion, Tenure, Salary Committee
- 8.4.16 Promotion Recommendation Committee
- 8.4.17 Retention & Tenure Review Committee
- 8.4.18 Room Use and Renovation Committee

APPENDIX A. STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION USING THE LENS SURVEY

The Biology Department will follow the UWL Learning Environment Survey (LENS) policy and procedure available on the Faculty Senate webpage. Results from the Faculty Senate approved LENS questions are required for retention, tenure, post-tenure review, and promotion for ranked faculty and for renewal and promotion of Instructional Academic Staff in the form of the LENS summary report. The LENS summary report contains student response frequencies for target responses to LENS items for courses taught within the last six semesters. Probationary ranked faculty will be expected to provide LENS summary reports since date of hire as assistant professors for retention and tenure decisions. LENS summary reports will be electronically accessible to personnel/merit review committees who have been granted the authority to access them. Instructors are also encouraged to informally conduct their own formative assessments of teaching methods and student learning.

APPENDIX B. ANNUAL (MERIT) REVIEW PROCEDURES

1. Evaluation Process

1.1 Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff

Consistent with UWS 3.05-3.11, UW L 3.05 and UWL 10.06, the performance of all Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff in the Biology Department will be reviewed annually. Exceptions are: 1) New Faculty who begin 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. 2) New Instructional Academic Staff do not undergo Annual (Merit) Review in their first year.

All Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff have a June 1st deadline for entering teaching, scholarship, professional development and service activities into the electronic portfolios system (Digital Measures) for activities from the prior year June 1st – May 31st. The Department Chair will then run a Digital Measures annual (merit) report for each faculty member. This report and student evaluations will constitute the basis of the annual (merit) review and serve as a vehicle for self-evaluation. Furthermore, the annual (merit) review shall offer an opportunity for future goal setting and improvement as necessary. In the case of Probationary Faculty and newer Instructional Academic staff, peer evaluation of teaching (see section 5.1 of the Bylaws and Appendix C, Evaluation of Teaching by Probationary Faculty and newer Instructional Academic staff) may also be used in the annual (merit) review. Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff members who are on professional leave are expected to enter into the electronic portfolios system by June 1st a description of their leave and other professional activities.

Retiring Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff are not reviewed for their last academic year, but are asked to enter their accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, professional development and service into the electronic portfolios system for incorporation into the Annual Departmental Report to the Dean.

1.1.1 Evaluation Criteria. The criteria used in the Biology Department to evaluate the annual performance of each Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff Member are designed to promote effective teaching and enhance the quality of scholarship, professional development and service. Of the areas of responsibility, teaching is weighted as the most important for both Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff.

Teaching.

Definition: Teaching includes a broad array of activities that take place both inside and outside the classroom and laboratory. Although there is no universally accepted definition of good teaching, the primary aim of all teaching is to stimulate, promote and advance students' learning and educational development.

Expectations: Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff 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 and Instructional Academic Staff are expected to keep current in their subject matter areas, to update the curriculum, to assess the effects of their teaching techniques, and to continually improve their knowledge of the subject matter and their teaching effectiveness. Efforts and accomplishments to these ends are to be reported in their electronic portfolio.

Evidence: Evidence of teaching quality is provided from three distinct sources: (1) student evaluation of instruction, (2) peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness, and (3) additional information on teaching methods, efforts, and effectiveness provided by individual Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff.

Student evaluations will be given every semester in each of the courses taught and will be used, in part, to judge teaching effectiveness. Peer evaluations based on classroom visitations will be submitted by the Peer Evaluators to the person who was evaluated and to the Chair of the Retention & Tenure Review Committee (which will be the Department Chair unless they are being considered for retention or tenure) (see Section 5.1 and Appendix C, Promotion and Tenure Procedures). At least one classroom visitation should be conducted per semester for

Probationary faculty and newer Instructional Academic staff. For Probationary faculty, the Department Chair shall appoint two faculty members (at least one of which must be tenured) to serve as classroom evaluators (Peer Evaluators). For new Instructional Academic Staff, the Department Chair shall appoint two faculty/IAS members (at least one of which must be tenured) to serve as classroom evaluators (Peer Evaluators).

Additional information about teaching methods, efforts, and effectiveness include, but are not limited to

- New courses created and added to the curriculum
- Innovative pedagogy
- Grants or contracts for instruction, equipment, or facilities
- Undergraduate research supervision
- Graduate research supervision and service on graduate student committees

Scholarship.

Definition: As stated in Section 2.2 of the Department Bylaws, Faculty are expected to maintain an active program of scholarship. While Instructional Academic Staff are not required to perform scholarship, any efforts in this area should be included in the electronic portfolio for annual review purposes. The Department defines scholarship as any creative endeavor that results in original contributions to the biological sciences within the areas of teaching, research, and professional service. Furthermore, in conjunction with the views of the University's Joint Promotion Committee, scholarly activities are further characterized as those having value to a biological discipline(s) and, in most cases, having been subjected to external peer review.

Scholarly activity may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Basic and applied research
- New applications of existing knowledge
- Integration of knowledge
- Creative endeavors
- Development and/or analysis of pedagogical methods
- Mentoring of research trainees (especially graduate students)

Expectations: The Department of Biology expects that successful candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion as well as for meritorious performance evaluations have a record of ongoing scholarly activity and evidence that external peer review has judged it to be of value. However, the nature of scholarly activities varies and not all activities deemed as scholarly need to have been subject to peer review. Quality, rather than quantity, of scholarly activity shall be the major criteria for assessing a faculty member's record of scholarly activity.

Evidence: Evidence of scholarship varies considerably and is dependent to a large extent on the type of program of scholarship that a faculty member has chosen to pursue. The quality of scholarship will be evaluated based on the success of activities in primary and secondary activities. Activities are not required in all areas of scholarship, but activities in primary areas of scholarship are of greater significance than those in secondary and tertiary areas.

Primary Areas of Scholarship are those that are highly competitive and subject to rigorous peer review by individuals or organizations external to the University. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- Publication of research manuscripts in scholarly, peer-reviewed journals
- Publication of monographs by recognized academic publishers
- Submission of applications for grants to federal, state, or private agencies for research, equipment or innovative teaching methodologies.
- Publication of articles on innovative teaching methods in peer-reviewed journals

- Invited presentations on creative or original works at professional meetings, conventions, conferences.
- Obtaining a patent

Secondary Areas of Scholarship are those that are subject to less rigorous peer review by individuals or organizations external to the University or are subject only to University peer review on campus. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- UW-L Faculty Research Grants and other UW-L grants
- UW-System Grants
- Publication of manuals, book reviews, technical reports, and laboratory manuals.
- Presentation of contributed papers on creative or original work at professional meetings, conventions, or other colleges and universities.
- Application of research
- Mentoring research trainees (especially graduate students)

Tertiary Areas of Scholarship are those that are not subject to peer review. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- Participation in institutes, short courses, seminars, workshops, and professional meetings
- Refereeing and reviewing original manuscripts
- Engaging in self-study or a professional growth plan to enhance professional competence.
- Publication of monographs at the author's expense
- Presentations before on-campus or general audiences
- Conducting a program assessment for an external organization

Faculty are expected to report their scholarly activities and accomplishments in their electronic portfolio.

Professional Development.

Definition: As stated in Section 3.1.1 of the Department Bylaws, Instructional Academic Staff are expected to maintain an active program of professional development. The Department defines professional development as any activity that enhances knowledge or a skill related to the academic staff member's instructional and service responsibilities, as well as scholarly activities that contribute to the knowledge base of the individual's discipline. These activities may also be required for certification and/or accreditation – either for the individual instructor or for the entire program.

Expectations: Instructional Academic Staff are particularly encouraged to engage in professional development related to curriculum development and/or educational pedagogy. Moreover, Instructional Academic Staff are encouraged, but are not required, to engage in research in biology or educational pedagogy, which may include publication of research results, presentations on research at professional meetings, and writing grant proposals. Lack of research activity will not negatively affect merit evaluations.

Evidence: Evidence of professional development varies considerably and may include, but is not limited to:

- Engaging in self-study or professional growth to enhance competence in instructional areas (for example, formal coursework or continuing education)
- Participation in institutes, short courses, seminars, workshops, and professional meetings
- Applying for and/or receiving educational grants and awards

- Presentations of creative and/or original curriculum development or research by means of lectures, paper presentations, or seminar presentations at various professional meetings, conventions, conferences, or at other colleges and universities
- Publishing the results of original curriculum development or research
- Applying for and/or receiving grants or awards
- Publishing original works such as manuals, textbooks, monographs and book reviews
- Creation and organization of symposia, workshops, and short courses designed to bring current information and/or techniques to members of the scientific community
- Research activity (independent or with undergraduate and/or graduate students)
- Mentoring
- In-service training
- Clinical and/or practitioner experience.
- Professional certification.

Instructional Academic Staff are expected to report their professional development activities and accomplishments in their electronic portfolio.

Service.

Definition: Service by Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff is the fulfillment of professional responsibilities, including educational responsibilities outside the classroom, active participation in professional organizations, committee work or other assignments within the Department of Biology, the College, and/or the University.

Expectations: The Department expects that Faculty will actively fulfill service responsibilities commonly expected of all faculty members within the Department, including advising. The Department also expects Faculty to actively engage in additional service activities for the Department, College, University, discipline, or community. The Department expects that Instructional Academic Staff engage in some service activities for the Department, College, University, discipline, or community.

Evidence: The service component of a Faculty or Instructional Academic Staff member's responsibility may take many forms, such as service to the program or major, the Department, the College, the University, the profession, or the general public. Service activity recognized by the Department may include, but is not limited to, the following lists.

Departmental and College

- Graduate Student Committees
- Standing and *ad hoc* committees
- Student services
- Curriculum advising
- Career counseling
- Internship supervision
- Club advising

University

- University and/or faculty committees
- Interdepartmental committees
- Faculty Senate
- University clubs
- Foundation committees

Public and Professional- Public service must be related to the Department Member's professional training

- Information resource
- Speaking engagements
- Governmental agency committees
- Testimony for hearings and courts
- Local, regional and national society service
- Memberships in scientific societies
- Committees of scientific societies
- Organizing scientific conferences, lecture series, institutes, workshops, etc.
- K-12 outreach

Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff are expected to report their service activities in their electronic portfolio.

1.1.2 Evaluation Criteria for Non-Instructional Academic Staff. The evaluation criteria for Non-Instructional Academic Staff are based on each individual's job description and are designed to promote effective performance of the job responsibilities. The evaluation criteria will be contained in the evaluation guidelines established for each individual.

2. Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designations

Expectations are different for Instructional Academic Staff and Faculty and are based on the evaluation criteria for each.

Performance Ratings. The performance of each Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff Member will be evaluated for each evaluation criterion. Faculty are evaluated in each of the areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Service, while Instructional Academic Staff are evaluated in the areas of Teaching and Professional Development/Scholarship/Service. Each individual being evaluated will be assigned a Performance Rating of E (exceptional), G (good), S (satisfactory), or U (unsatisfactory) for each evaluation criterion. Performance Ratings are defined as follows:

E = *Exceptional*--Department Member has made an exceptional contribution in an area of performance.

G = *Good*--Department Member has a good contribution in an area of performance

S = *Satisfactory*--Department Member has made a satisfactory contribution in an area of performance.

U = *Unsatisfactory*--Department Member has made an unsatisfactory contribution in an area of performance.

Failure to record an entry in any of the evaluation criteria in their electronic portfolio will result in an Unsatisfactory (U) Performance Rating for that criterion.

Merit Category Designations. The Department recognizes four Merit Category Designations. As a result of the Annual Merit Review, each Department Member will be assigned one of the Merit Category Designations. Definitions of the Merit Category Designations are as follows:

Category 1--*No Merit*. Individuals who have been judged delinquent in their duties, or have not submitted an evaluation form.

Category 2--*Meritorious*. Individuals who have fulfilled responsibilities in teaching, as well as having made contributions in the areas of Scholarship and Service.

Category 3--*Significantly meritorious*. Individuals who have made a contribution beyond those judged meritorious. To qualify for this category, one must have made a significant contribution in one or more areas of Teaching, Scholarship, Professional Development, and Service.

Category 4--*Exceptionally meritorious*. Individuals who have made exceptional contributions beyond those accomplishments required for category 3.

2.1 Merit Review Committees

The Department Chair will separate the Department Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff into three Merit Review Committees, with an attempt to have all sub-disciplines within the Department represented in each committee. The membership of each Merit Review Committee shall be established during the first part of the fall semester. To participate on a Merit Review Committee, an individual must be on staff at the time of evaluation and have been employed one semester prior to the annual evaluation process. Each Merit Review Committee shall elect a Chair to be responsible for supervising the meetings and recording data.

2.2 Annual Review Process

Early in the fall semester, the Merit Review Advisory Committees will use the Annual Report from the electronic portfolios system, Student Evaluation Information, and Peer Evaluation Information (in the case of Probationary Faculty and newer Instructional Academic Staff) from the previous year to evaluate each Department Member's performance based on the evaluation criteria specified in section 1.1.1 of this Appendix.

Each member of each Merit Review Committee shall review the Annual Reports of all other Instructional Academic Staff and Faculty of the Department. Each member of the committee shall determine for each Member of the Department (1) a Performance Rating for each of the evaluation criteria and (2) a Merit Category Designation.

Each Merit Review Committee member shall submit to the committee Chair their Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designations for each member of the other two Merit Review Committees. Committee members shall not submit Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designations for Members of their own committee. If a member of the committee evaluates a Department Member's performance to be unsatisfactory, the evaluating member must provide to the committee Chair a written and signed rationale for the U.

Each Merit Review Committee Chair will develop a matrix of Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designations of the Department Members evaluated by the committee. The matrix data will be randomized to ensure anonymity for the evaluators. The rationale for any U Performance Ratings will be presented to the committee by the committee Chair if requested by any member of the committee.

At the Merit Review Committee meeting, the Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designations for each member of the other two Merit Review Committees will be displayed to the committee. The committee will discuss the Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designations of each Department Member being evaluated. When the committee has concluded its discussions, a Committee Member will have one working day to change evaluations and resubmit them to the Committee Chair. If at this time any committee member changes a Merit Category Designation to 1, the committee must reconvene to discuss the rationale for this type of change, i.e., a change of a Merit Category Designation to 1 must be made known at a meeting of the Merit Review Committee. The Chair of each Merit Review Committee will transmit the evaluations of their committee and the signed, written rationale for any Performance Ratings of Unsatisfactory to the Department Chair **by September 15th**. All discussions and the evaluations determined by the Merit Review Committee are to remain confidential.

The Department Chair will then summarize the evaluations and determine the Merit Category Designation for each Member of the Department according to the following guidelines. To receive a Merit Category Designation of 1, a Department Member must have received that Merit Category Designation from 60% of the total evaluating members (two Merit Review Committees) or have not submitted an evaluation form. To receive a Merit Category Designation of 3, a Department Member must receive a Merit Category Designation of 3 or 4 from 60% of the total evaluating members. To receive a Merit Category Designation of 4, a Department Member must receive that Merit Category Designation from 60% of the evaluating members. All other Department Members that have been evaluated will receive a Merit Category Designation of 2.

Within seven days of the review, the Department Chair shall notify (in writing) each Department Member of their Merit Category Designation, including Performance Ratings in each of the areas of faculty responsibility. The Department Chair will transmit to any Department Member who received a U the written rationale for the determination of the U--the confidentiality of the evaluator will be maintained. Department members who have questions about their merit scores may contact the Department Chair for additional information.

2.3 Appeals

A Faculty or Instructional Academic Staff Member may request a reconsideration of their Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designation. This request must be made in writing to the Department Chair within one week of the distribution of Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designation by the Department Chair. The Chairs of the appropriate two Merit Review Committees will convene a meeting to consider the appeal within one week after notification of the appeal. The Committees shall transmit their findings to the Department Chair who will transmit the appeal decision to the appellant within three working days after the reconsideration meetings. To change the original Merit Category Designation, at least 60% of the votes of both committees combined must be in favor of the change.

If the appellant is not satisfied with the outcome of the reconsideration by the Merit Review Committees, they may appeal to the Department of Biology acting as a Committee-of-the-Whole (defined here as all Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff, excluding the appellant). The appeal must be made in writing to the Department Chair within one week after notification by the Chair of initial appeal rejection. The Department Chair will convene a meeting of the Committee-of-the-Whole within one week after notification of the appeal. To change the original Merit Category Designation, at least 60% of the votes (by show of hands) of the Committee-of-the-Whole must be in favor of the change. The Department Chair will transmit the results of action by the Committee-of-the-Whole to the appellant within one working day after this meeting.

Appeals beyond the Departmental level may be presented to The Complaints, Grievances, Appeals and Academic Freedom Committee (see Section II.F of the Faculty Senate Bylaws).

3. Department Chair

The Merit Review Committees, with substantial input from the Dean, are responsible for evaluation of the Department Chair. The Chair shall submit an Annual Report and be evaluated on the same evaluation criteria (Teaching, Scholarly Activity, and Service) by two of the three Merit Review Committees like other Department Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff (see section 1.1 of this Appendix). In addition, the Dean will assess the performance of the Chair with regard to communication, cooperation, and ability to work with the Administration. The Dean will assign a final Merit Category Designation from the same numerical scale (1, 2, 3, 4) used for all other Department Faculty, and the Dean's evaluation will be weighted at 50% of the evaluation from the Department (i.e., 33% of the total evaluation). The Chairs of the Merit Review Committees, working with the Dean, will, within seven days of the review, notify the Department Chair in writing of their Merit Category Designation and Performance Ratings in each area of evaluation.

3.1 Appeal

The Department Chair may request a reconsideration of their Merit Category Designation. The appeal must be made in writing to the Chair of the Department PTS Committee within one week after the distribution of the Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designation from the Merit Review Committees and the Dean. The Chair of the Department PTS Committee will convene a meeting of the Committee-of-the-Whole (defined in the preceding section) and the Dean within one week after notification of the appeal. To change the original Merit Category

Designation, at least 60% of the votes (by show of hands) of the Committee-of-the-Whole and the Dean must be in favor of the change. The Dean's vote will be weighted at 33% of the vote of the Committee-of-the-Whole (i.e., 25% of the total vote). The Chair of the Department PTS Committee will transmit the results of the action of the reconsideration meeting within one working day after this meeting.

Appeals beyond the Departmental level may be presented to The Complaints, Grievances, Appeals and Academic Freedom Committee (see Section II.F of the Faculty Senate Bylaws).

4. Non-Instructional Academic Staff

Consistent with UWL 10.06, the performance of all Non-Instructional Academic Staff in the Biology Department will be reviewed annually. The annual evaluation process for Non-Instructional Academic Staff is different from that of Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff and will be conducted by a Special Merit Review Committee appointed by the Department Chair. A specific set of evaluation guidelines/criteria will be established for each Non-Instructional Academic Staff Member by the Department Chair in consultation with the Non-Instructional Academic Staff member. The guidelines/criteria should contain evaluation categories conforming to each individual's job description. The Special Merit Review Committee will evaluate Non-Instructional Academic Staff based on the specific guidelines established for each individual. For each individual being evaluated, members of the Special Merit Review Committee will assign (1) a Performance Rating (U = Unsatisfactory, S = Satisfactory, G = Good, or E = Exceptional) for each evaluation category in each individual's specific guidelines and (2) a Merit Category Designation (1 = No merit, 2 = Meritorious, 3 = Significantly Meritorious, 4 = Exceptionally Meritorious). The Chair of the Special Merit Review Committee will transmit the results of the evaluation to the Department Chair who will, within seven days of the review, notify (in writing) each Non-Instructional Academic Staff Member of their Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designation. To receive a Merit Category Designation of 1, a Department Member must have received that Merit Category Designation from 60% of the total evaluating members or have not submitted an evaluation form. To receive a Merit Category Designation of 3, a Department Member must receive a Merit Category Designation of 3 or 4 from 60% of the total evaluating members. To receive a Merit Category Designation of 4, a Department Member must receive that Merit Category Designation from 60% of the evaluating members. All other Department Members that have been evaluated will receive a Merit Category Designation of 2.

4.1 Appeals

Non-Instructional Academic Staff Members may request a reconsideration of their Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designations. This request must be made in writing to the Department Chair within one week of the distribution of Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designation by the Department Chair. The Chair of the appropriate Special Merit Review Committee will convene a meeting to consider the appeal within one week after notification of the appeal. The Committee shall transmit its findings to the Department Chair who will transmit the appeal decision to the appellant within one working day after the reconsideration meeting.

If the appellant is not satisfied with the outcome of the reconsideration by the Special Merit Review Advisory Committee, they may appeal to the Department of Biology acting as a Committee-of-the-Whole (defined previously). The appeal must be made in writing to the Department Chair within one week after notification by the Chair of appeal rejection. The Department Chair will convene a meeting of the Committee-of-the-Whole within one week after notification of the appeal. To change the original Merit Category Designation, at least 60% of the votes of the Committee-of-the-Whole (by show of hands) must be in favor of the change. The Department Chair will transmit the results of action by the Committee-of-the-Whole to the appellant within one working day after this meeting.

5. Staff with Split Appointment

Staff with combined instructional and non-instructional appointments will be evaluated both as Instructional and Non-Instructional Academic Staff. The Merit Evaluation will be a composite of the scores they receive as Instructional and Non-Instructional Academic Staff with relative weighting of the scores dependent upon the percentage appointment in each Academic Staff category.

5.1 Appeals

An Academic Staff Member with a split appointment may request a reconsideration of their Merit Category Designation. The appeal must be made in writing to the Department Chair within one week after the distribution of the Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designation from the Department Chair. The Department Chair will convene a meeting of the Committee-of-the-Whole (defined previously) within one week after notification of the appeal. To change the original Merit Category Designation, at least 60% of the votes (by show of hands) of the Committee-of-the-Whole must be in favor of the change. The Department Chair will transmit the results of the action of the reconsideration meeting within one working day after this meeting.

6. Money Distribution

Unless mandated otherwise by the University System Administration, the entire pay package for each year will be distributed as merit money according to the following procedure. Merit money will be distributed to all Department Members with Merit Category Designations of 2, 3, and 4. To receive a merit designation of 4 for pay purposes, a department member must have received merit designations of 4 in two of the last three years. To receive a merit designation of 3 for pay purposes, a department member must have received merit designations of 3 (or higher) in two of the last three years. To receive a merit designation of 2 for pay purposes, a department member must have received merit designations of 2 (or higher) in two of the last three years. Department members will be placed in the highest merit category designation for which they qualify. For Department members with one or two years of service the highest merit designation score will be used. The money distribution formula will be the same for the Faculty, Instructional Academic Staff, and Non-Instructional Academic Staff. There are two pools of merit funds, i.e., one for Faculty and another for Instructional Academic Staff and Non-Instructional Academic Staff.

6.1 Procedures and Formulas

6.1.1 Part A--Distribution Based on Merit Category Designation. Money is to be distributed per individual per Merit Category Designation according to the following formula:

$$[(\text{Pay package \%} \div X_1) + Y_0 \text{ or } Y_1 \text{ or } Y_2] \times \text{Average Salary in Department}$$

Where:

Pay package % = the average % raise for the University.

$X_1 = 2$ The factor to determine the percentage of money given to each Department Member with Merit Category Designations of 2, 3, and 4. This factor distributes 50% of the merit dollars as an equal sum to each meritorious individual (Merit Category Designations 2, 3, and 4).

$Y =$ The factor to determine the additional amount of money to be awarded to any individual with a Merit Category Designation of 3 or 4.

$Y_0 = 0.00\%$ No additional amount of money is awarded to individuals with a Merit Category Designation of 2

$Y_1 = 0.30\%$ The additional amount of pay package awarded to each individual with a Merit Category Designation of 3.

$Y_2 = 0.60\%$ The additional amount of pay package awarded to each individual with a Merit Category Designation of 4.

6.1.2 Part B--Distribution Based on Salary of Each Individual. After determining the above distribution of the pay package to individuals with Merit Category Designations of 2, 3, and 4, the remaining merit money (which will be less than 50% of the pay package) is to be distributed as a percentage times the base salary of each Department Member.

6.2 Example of Money Distribution for Faculty for the 1992/1993 Academic Year

The following calculations were made for the Biology Department for the 1992/93 salary distribution. Data used in the calculations are as follows:

- (1) the average salary of Faculty in the Department was \$44,147;
- (2) a pay package of 4.25%, thus the sum of money available for distribution was 4.25% of the total Faculty salaries of the Department, which equaled \$43,154; and
- (3) Category 1= 0 individuals, Category 2 = 5 individuals, Category 3 = 13 individuals, and Category 4 = 5 individuals.

6.2.1 Part A. Money Distribution Based on Merit Category Designation

Award for Individuals in Merit Category 2

$$[(4.25\% \div 2) + 0.00\%] \times \$44,147 = \$ 938$$

Award for Individuals in Merit Category 3

$$[(4.25\% \div 2) + 0.30\%] \times \$44,147 = \$ 1070$$

Award for Individuals in Merit Category 4

$$[(4.25\% \div 2) + 0.60\%] \times \$44,147 = \$ 1203$$

Total awarded in 1992/93 for individuals in Merit Category 2 = \$ 938 X 5 = \$ 4,690

Total awarded in 1992/93 for individuals in Merit Category 3 = \$1070 X 13 = \$13,910

Total awarded in 1992/93 for individuals in Merit Category 4 = \$1203 X 5 = \$ 6,015

Total awarded in 1992/93 for entire Department for Part A = \$24,615

6.2.2 Part B. Money Distribution based on Salary of each Individual

Money available to award in Part B = Total money in pay package for the Department - money awarded in Part A--\$43,154 - \$24,615 = \$18,539 (which is less than 50% of the pay package)

Money available to award in Part B \div number of Department Members = Average award for Part B =
 $\$18,539 \div 23 = \806

Award in Part B as a % of each individual's salary = Average award for Part B) Average salary in Department = $\$806 \div \$44,147 = 1.83\%$. Thus, the amount awarded in Part B is calculated as this percentage multiplied by the base salary of each individual. Examples follow for individuals at three different salaries.

$$\$38,146 \times 1.83\% = \$698$$

$$\$44,146 \times 1.83\% = \$808$$

$$\$50,146 \times 1.83\% = \$918$$

The following table demonstrates the total pay package distributions based on conditions of the 1992/93 academic year.

Total Merit \$(A+B) for Salaries of:	Merit Category 2	Percent Increase	Merit Category 3	Percent Increase	Merit Category 4	Percent Increase
\$38,146	\$1636	4.29	\$1768	4.63	\$1901	4.98
\$44,146	\$1746	3.96	\$1878	4.25	\$2011	4.56
\$50,146	\$1856	3.70	\$1988	3.96	\$2121	4.23

6.3 Modified Example of Money Distribution for Faculty for the 1994/1995 Academic Year--a year when the entire pay package was only 1% and the University System Administration mandated that 2/3 of the package was to be distributed as a percentage of base salary. The remaining 1/3 of the pay package was only 0.33%, which was too small to accommodate the money distribution system described in 2.1. The following calculations were therefore made for the Biology Department for the 1994/95 salary distribution. Data used in the calculations are as follows:

(1) the average salary of Faculty in the Department was \$51,001;

(2) a merit pay package of 0.33%, thus the sum of money available for distribution was 0.33% of the total Faculty salaries of the Department, which equaled \$3,544; and

(3) Category 1= 0 individuals, Category 2 = 4 individuals, Category 3 = 12 individuals, and Category 4 = 5 individuals.

6.3.1 Part A. Money Distribution Based on Merit Category Designation

Award to have been made to Individuals in Merit Category 2

$$[(0.33\% \div 2) + 0.00\%] \times \$51,001 = \$ 84$$

Award to have been made to Individuals in Merit Category 3

$$[(0.33\% \div 2) + 0.30\%] \times \$51,001 = \$ 237$$

Award to have been made to Individuals in Merit Category 4

$$[(0.33\% \div 2) + 0.60\%] \times \$51,001 = \$ 390$$

Total money to have been awarded in 1994/95 for all individuals in Merit Category 2 =

$$\$ 84 \times 4 = \$ 336$$

Total money to have been awarded in 1994/95 for all individuals in Merit Category 3 =

$$\$237 \times 12 = \$2844$$

Total money to have been awarded in 1994/95 for all individuals in Merit Category 4 =

$$\$390 \times 5 = \$1950$$

Therefore, the total money to have been awarded in 1994/95 for entire Department for Part A was = \$5130. However, only \$3,544 was available in the total merit pay package (0.33%); therefore, there were not enough funds to even cover Part A of the money distribution (\$5,130). Because of this, (1) the distribution for Part B was omitted and (2) the distribution for Part A was modified/recalculated. Because the amount of money available for Part A was only 69% of the funds needed, the calculated allocations for Part A were multiplied by 69% to arrive at a Student Handbook modified allocation--example calculations are shown below.

Allocation based on Part A for each Merit Category X 0.69 = modified allocation

Merit Category 2 = \$ 84 X 0.69 = \$ 58

Merit Category 3 = \$237 X 0.69 = \$164

Merit Category 4 = \$390 X 0.69 = \$269

Based on these modified allocations the total money awarded in 1994/1995 to individuals in the respective Merit Categories were as follows:

Total money awarded in 1994/94 to individuals in Merit Category 2 = \$ 58 X 4 = \$ 232

Total money awarded in 1994/95 to individuals in Merit Category 3 = \$164 X 12 = \$1,968

Total money awarded in 1994/95 to individuals in Merit Category 4 = \$269 X 5 = \$1,345

Total money awarded in 1994/95 for entire Department = \$3,545

APPENDIX C. EVALUATION OF TEACHING BY PROBATIONARY FACULTY AND NEWER INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF (updated 5-2013)

1. Evaluation Process

The Department Chair will appoint two Peer Evaluators for each Probationary Faculty Member. Teaching in one course (preferably a lecture course) will be evaluated at least once each semester by a Peer Evaluator for a minimum of four semesters, with the option for longer evaluation periods (1) if deemed necessary by the Department Chair or the Peer Evaluators or (2) if requested by the Probationary Faculty Member being evaluated. Peer evaluations will be announced (unless an unannounced visit is agreed upon by the Probationary Faculty Member) and will be coordinated between the Peer Evaluators and the Probationary Faculty Members.

Peer Evaluators will prepare a written report for each class visit and will transmit a copy of the report within one week of the class visit to the Probationary Faculty Member and to the Department Chair. At that time, the Peer Evaluators will also discuss the contents of the report with the Probationary Faculty Member. The Department Chair will retain the reports in the Departmental file of the Probationary Faculty Member. A Peer Evaluation of Probationary Faculty Report Form, which is included at the end of this appendix, must contain written comments regarding Evaluation Criteria.

2. Evaluation Criteria

The Peer Evaluators are encouraged to evaluate any criteria they deem appropriate to good teaching. These criteria may include but are not restricted to the following list:

- Was the instructor on time and prepared for class?
- Did the instructor present the material in a clear, organized manner that could be understood by students who may have limited background? Was the level and speed of the presentation appropriate?
- Did the instructor attempt to engage the class in a discussion or challenge them with questions requiring critical thinking skills?

- Did the instructor ask the students if there were questions over old and new material and give adequate time for responses? Were the students' questions repeated and answered clearly?
- Did the instructor make use of visual aids (e.g., overhead projectors, white board, computer, animations) when appropriate?
- Did the instructor show enthusiasm for the subject and to the class?
- What, if any, distracting mannerisms did the instructor exhibit?
- Did the instructor treat all students equally and with respect and patience?
- What are your general observations of the class' attitude toward the instructor (e.g., quiet at beginning, teacher in charge, respect for teacher, boredom, frustration, etc.)?

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Professor _____ Observer _____ Visit was: ☐scheduled ☐unscheduled
 Course _____ Section _____ Date _____

Use your observations to respond to the questions below:

	Not Applicable	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The class began and ended on schedule.	—	—	—	—	—	—
2. The professor was well prepared.	—	—	—	—	—	—
3. The professor demonstrated mastery of the subject.	—	—	—	—	—	—
4. The lecture's objectives were clearly presented.	—	—	—	—	—	—
5. The instructional activity supported the lecture's objectives.	—	—	—	—	—	—
6. The presentation (volume, voice, eye contact, enunciation) were appropriate.	—	—	—	—	—	—
7. The professor used technology in an appropriate manner.	—	—	—	—	—	—
8. The professor used relevant demonstrations to support the material.	—	—	—	—	—	—
9. The professor used relevant visuals to support the material.	—	—	—	—	—	—
10. Handouts (if provided) were appropriate for the material.	—	—	—	—	—	—
11. If assignments were given, enough time was allocated for discussion/questions.	—	—	—	—	—	—
12. The class discussion and/or assignments were appropriate for the textbook.	—	—	—	—	—	—
13. The professor used clear and relevant examples, when needed, to convey major facts, ideas, and/or issues.	—	—	—	—	—	—
14. The professor encouraged participation by the students through discussion methods, and asking questions.	—	—	—	—	—	—
15. The professor's questions were appropriate to the level of the students.	—	—	—	—	—	—
16. The professor's questions facilitated analytical thinking and problem solving skills.	—	—	—	—	—	—
17. The professor was receptive to student questions.	—	—	—	—	—	—
18. The professor answered student questions effectively.	—	—	—	—	—	—
19. The students were attentive and engaged.	—	—	—	—	—	—
20. The atmosphere was one of mutual respect.	—	—	—	—	—	—
21. The professor seemed to be fair and impartial.	—	—	—	—	—	—
22. The professor was enthusiastic and positive to students.	—	—	—	—	—	—
23. The professor was professional and in control of class discipline.	—	—	—	—	—	—
24. Overall, the professor taught this lecture well.	—	—	—	—	—	—

Please write additional comments below and on the back.

APPENDIX E. POLICIES ON REASSIGNMENT TIME (E.G., SABBATICAL AND TEACHING IMPROVEMENT LEAVES)

The department encourages its members to participate in professional development activities (e.g., sabbaticals and teaching improvement leaves). However, such activities may require temporary, full, or partial reassignment of the individual from normal teaching, scholarship, and service obligations in the department. Faculty or IAS reassigned from these obligations should also recognize that the continued productivity of the department and its various programs is a result of the collective and cooperative effort of all members of the department. Such appointments usually result in the responsibilities of the reassigned individual being assumed by other department members.

The Department of Biology expects administrators to assist in obtaining adequate replacements for faculty or IAS appointed to on-campus, full- or part-time appointments outside the department. The department expects administrators to provide replacement personnel on an FTE-basis equal to that of the department member on leave. If the responsibilities of the reassigned individual are absorbed by the department, the department should receive the majority of the salary savings resulting from the release. When a replacement is granted, salary savings beyond the FTE costs should be shared between the department and the college.

Faculty or IAS seeking reassignment from normal department responsibilities for sabbaticals, teaching improvement leaves, administrative positions, etc. must make a formal, written request to the department chair at least six months prior to the proposed effective date of the reassignment. This request must include: (1) the purpose of the reassignment, (2) the length of the reassignment, and (3) suggestions of how the individual's departmental responsibilities might be fulfilled during their absence. In cases where a six-month prior notification is impossible, the chair should be notified of the request for reassignment as soon as possible.

The request for reassignment will be acted upon by the department's full-time faculty and continuing instructional academic staff. The requesting individual may want to speak about their request at the meeting and answer any questions, but should then leave the meeting in order to facilitate discussion and for the vote. It is expected that, when possible and within department guidelines, the department will honor reasonable requests for reassigned time. However, it may be necessary for the department to deny a request if: (1) the department member is needed to teach required courses and a suitable replacement cannot be hired or (2) the administration fails to adequately fund the cost of a replacement and the department is unwilling to assume the responsibilities of the individual requesting release. Even if the department denies a faculty or IAS member's request the dean, vice-chancellor or chancellor could approve the request and reassign a department member to other duties. Reassignments, if granted, may be for one semester or an academic year. Reassignments should be reviewed by the department annually. The department limits full-time reassignments to a maximum of two consecutive years. The department recommends that part-time reassignments usually be for no more than three years.

For the purposes of promotion, tenure, and salary determination, the department will continue to evaluate all department members on part-time reassignment. Faculty or IAS on full-time reassignment for sabbaticals and teaching improvement leaves should follow the department guidelines for merit evaluation in terms of submitting their materials. Department members on sabbatical leave, development leave, or leave of absence may participate in the merit evaluation process. If a member on leave does not update their merit materials they will receive a category 2 merit rating or the average of the past three years, whichever is higher. Faculty reassigned full-time for administrative positions will be evaluated for promotion, tenure, and salary determination according to administrative personnel guidelines.

Load reductions from internal department responsibilities (e.g., advising, program coordination and new course development) are not subject to these guidelines and faculty or IAS should contact the chair concerning procedures. At the beginning of each semester, the chair should inform the department of those faculty having been given load reductions for advising, program coordination, and new course development.

APPENDIX F. SUMMER SCHOOL POLICIES

A. Curriculum

Summer school curriculum will be determined by projected needs, past offerings, staff interest and support needs for other programs as well as basic studies. This may require the chair to alter the staff from the strict rotational system as defined in section D and E.

B. Qualifications

The courses selected for summer school should be taught by qualified personnel who have been selected by the rotational system. Having taught the course previously will be one of the criteria used to determine qualifications.

C. Positions

Summer teaching positions will ordinarily be less than 3/4 time. Larger assignments may be made with the approval of the department.

D. Priorities

The priority system will be employed to determine who shall teach summer school. Summer school teaching positions will be filled by those in first priority. If there are still positions available, staff will be drawn from the second and third priorities. If the number of staff in a priority exceeds the number of positions available, the rotational system in section E will be used for staff selection.

1. **First priority**--Those faculty and continuing academic staff¹ with earned doctorates in their fields who will have completed a minimum of one and one-half years experience at La Crosse by the onset of the summer session in question.
2. **Second priority**--Faculty and continuing academic staff with less than one and one-half years experience.
3. **Third priority** - Other types of appointments.

¹Academic Staff with voting rights as defined in Section 3.1.2.

E. Rotational System

Those staff members having the fewest summer teaching appointments for the previous five-year period will have first choice for receiving a summer teaching position.

For individuals who have been on staff less than five years, their rotational position will be determined only for that period of time that they have a record.

If individuals end up with the same priority ranking, the person with the greatest length of time in the department will be given higher priority in the selection of summer teaching positions.

First-year people should not be considered for summer school positions except as their specialty warrants or by default.

F. Retirement

Upon notification of intent to retire the faculty or IAS member shall have the opportunity for one-half (2) to full-time employment for three (3) of the last five (5) years of service.

G. Need to Remain on Staff Following Summer Session Appointment

Staff members who are on temporary or terminal appointments for the current year will be recommended for summer school appointments only with the understanding that such appointments are contingent upon reappointment to the university for the following academic year. Those who resign or expect to resign from the department staff for the ensuing academic year should not be recommended for summer session appointments,

or if previously appointed to staff the summer session, their appointments will be rescinded.

APPENDIX G. TEACHING BY ADJUNCT FACULTY

Any course offered by an Adjunct Faculty Member shall be approved by the Department Curriculum Committee according to the following criteria:

- A. The request is to be submitted on an LX-138 form with outline included.
- B. Is there a student need for the course?
- C. Any faculty member in the same or closely related discipline should be consulted.
- D. The impact of the proposed course enrollment on existing course enrollments.
- E. The cost to the department.
- F. Will the course be offered only one semester or more than once?
- G. A final course evaluation is recommended

Upon approval by the Department Curriculum Committee, the course shall be brought to the department for approval.

APPENDIX H. SALARY EQUITY ADJUSTMENT POLICY

A. Definition

An equity adjustment is a salary adjustment that results from the need to address unusual disparities that cannot be remedied with departmental distribution of the annual pay plan. An equity adjustment may be recommended for the following reasons: (1) to address issues of race and gender; (2) to address inequities due to salary compression and inversion; (3) to address inequities due to individuals acquiring advanced degrees; (4) to address changes in one's assigned responsibilities. Equity adjustments that negate past merit adjustments should not be made.

B. Process

1. Individual Inequities

- a. Requests for individual salary equity adjustments may be initiated (1) by an individual faculty or instructional academic staff member on behalf of themselves or another individual, or (2) by the department chairperson on behalf of an individual.
- b. Requests for salary equity adjustment must be submitted to the departmental chairperson in writing. Requests for salary equity adjustments must be accompanied by written rationale with supporting documentation of the inequity.
- c. Requests for salary equity adjustment will be forwarded to the departmental PTS Committee, which will make a recommendation whether to support the request. The departmental chairperson will become a member of the PTS Committee for salary equity issues.

Any PTS Committee member under consideration for an equity adjustment will be replaced with another member of the department for the purpose of equity considerations--that individual will be appointed by the department chairperson. If the departmental chairperson is being considered for a salary equity adjustment, the chairperson of the departmental PTS Committee will appoint a replacement for the departmental chairperson on the committee.

- d. Recommendations in support of equity adjustments for individuals from the department will be jointly presented to the Dean by the department chairperson and the chairperson of the PTS Committee.

- e. Cases for equity adjustments that have not been supported by the departmental PTS Committee may be submitted by the individual directly to the Dean. Any application/appeal for an equity adjustment to the Dean shall include the same rationale and documentation as required at the departmental level.
- f. Successful requests for salary equity adjustments will be announced to the Department of Biology.

2. Departmental Inequities

- a. A request for a departmental salary equity adjustment may be initiated by the department chairperson or the departmental PTS Committee.
- b. The departmental PTS Committee will provide written rationale with supporting documentation of the inequity to the department for consideration.
- c. If the department approves the departmental salary equity adjustment, the department chair and chairperson of the departmental PTS Committee will present the request and all supporting documentation to the Dean.

APPENDIX I. PROCEDURE FOR SELECTING THE BIOLOGY SENIORS OF THE YEAR

An annual award in recognition of academic achievement established by the Department of Biology.

Eligibility: awarded to graduating seniors majoring in Biology.

Award will be given once a year to students graduating any time during the year.

- A. A list of seniors in biology and in the various concentrations will be submitted to each biology faculty member who will be asked if they would care to recommend any outstanding senior(s) for the senior of the year award. GPA and on-campus credits will be included with the list.
- B. These recommendations would be in the form of a short note of support sent to the chair.
- C. The biology faculty and continuing IAS shall make the final selection. Highlights of the recommendations for each senior will be presented prior to the vote.

APPENDIX J. HIRING PROCEDURES

I. Search and Screen Committee

- A. Appointed by Department Chair
- B. Committee Responsibilities
 - 1. Write Specific Position Description
 - 2. Proceed according to Search and Screen Committee: Recruitment Tools and Forms as posted on the Human Resources website for faculty, IAS, or NIAS positions, as appropriate.