

Department of Microbiology
Bylaws, Policies, and Procedures
(Amended April 2022)

Table of Contents

I. DEPARTMENT OF MICROBIOLOGY BYLAWS, ADOPTED 4/29/2022	6
II. ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION	6
A. PREAMBLE	6
B. MEETING GUIDELINES	6
C. DEFINITIONS OF MEMBERSHIP & VOTING PROCEDURES.....	6
D. DEFINITIONS OF QUORUM AND MAJORITY	6
E. CHANGING BYLAWS	6
III. FACULTY AND STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES AND EXPECTATIONS	7
A. FACULTY.....	7
1. <i>Teaching</i>	7
2. <i>Scholarship</i>	8
3. <i>Service</i>	8
B. INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF (IAS)	9
1. <i>Teaching</i>	9
2. <i>Professional Development</i>	10
3. <i>Service</i>	10
C. ADJUNCT FACULTY.....	11
1. <i>Adjunct Faculty Appointments</i>	11
2. <i>Privileges and Responsibilities</i>	11
D. NON-INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF (NON-IAS)	11
E. STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION (STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION)	11
IV. MERIT EVALUATION (ANNUAL REVIEW)	12
A. EVALUATION PROCESSES & CRITERIA	12
1. <i>Faculty Evaluation Criteria</i>	13
2. <i>Instructional Academic Staff in Permanent Budgeted Instructional Lines</i>	16
3. <i>Department Chair Evaluation Criteria</i>	17
4. <i>Program Directors</i>	17
B. DISTRIBUTION OF MERIT FUNDS.....	18
C. APPEAL PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY AND INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF.....	18
V. RANKED FACULTY PERSONNEL (RETENTION/TENURE) REVIEW	18
A. RETENTION (PROCEDURE, CRITERIA, AND APPEAL).....	19
B. TENURE REVIEW AND DEPARTMENTAL TENURE CRITERIA	20
C. POST-TENURE REVIEW.....	20
1. <i>Post-tenure Review Committee</i>	20
2. <i>Material for Consideration by the Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee</i>	20
3. <i>Criteria to Meet Expectations</i>	21
D. FACULTY PROMOTION PROCEDURES (PROCEDURE, CRITERIA AND APPEAL).....	21
1. <i>Promotion Recommendation Committee</i>	21
2. <i>Review Process</i>	22
3. <i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	22
VI. INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF REVIEW	23
A. ANNUAL REVIEW.....	23

B. IAS PROMOTION PROCEDURES	23
C. APPEAL PROCEDURE FOR ANNUAL REVIEW.....	23
VII. NON-INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF REVIEW	23
A. ANNUAL REVIEW.....	23
VIII. GOVERNANCE	24
A. DEPARTMENT CHAIR.....	24
1. <i>Election of the Department Chair</i>	24
2. <i>Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair</i>	24
B. DIRECTOR OF THE CLINICAL LABORATORY SCIENCE PROGRAM	24
C. DIRECTOR OF THE MICROBIOLOGY GRADUATE PROGRAM	25
D. STANDING DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEES.....	25
E. DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAMMATIC ASSESSMENT PLAN	26
IX. SEARCH AND SCREEN PROCEDURES	26
A. TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	26
B. INSTRUCTIONAL AND NON-INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF	26
C. POOL SEARCH.....	26
X. STUDENT RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS	27
A. COMPLAINT, GRIEVANCE, AND APPEAL PROCEDURES	27
1. <i>Grade Appeals</i>	27
2. <i>Academic Non-Grade Complaints, Grievances, and Appeals</i>	27
B. EXPECTATIONS, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT.....	27
C. ADVISING POLICY	28
D. EVALUATION OF TEACHING	28
XI. APPENDICES	29
A. DEPARTMENT STATEMENTS ON SCHOLARSHIP AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	29
1. <i>Scholarship</i>	29
2. <i>Professional Development</i>	29
B. DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL PAY PACKAGE	30
1. <i>Procedures and Formulas</i>	30
2. <i>Example of money distribution based solely on merit.</i>	31
3. <i>Example of Money Distribution Based on Merit and COLA</i>	32
4. <i>Example of Money Distribution in Year When Percent Increase is Insufficient to Award Merit Pay</i>	33
C. MERIT REPORT FORMS.....	35
D. PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING.....	40
1. <i>Evaluation Process</i>	40
2. <i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	40
E. POLICIES ON RELEASE TIME (SABBATICAL, TEACHING IMPROVEMENT, AND ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE)	42
F. SUMMER SCHOOL POLICIES AND SUMMER APPOINTMENTS	43
1. <i>Curriculum</i>	43
2. <i>Qualifications</i>	43
3. <i>Compensation</i>	43
4. <i>Priorities</i>	43
5. <i>Rotational System</i>	43
6. <i>Retirement</i>	44

7. <i>Need to Remain on Staff Following Summer Session Appointment</i>	44
G. SALARY EQUITY ADJUSTMENT POLICY	44
1. <i>Definition</i>	44
2. <i>Process</i>	44
H. PROCEDURE FOR SELECTING THE MICROBIOLOGY SENIOR OF THE YEAR AND CLINICAL LABORATORY SCIENCE STUDENT OF THE YEAR.....	45
1. <i>Eligibility</i>	45
I. PROCEDURE FOR SELECTING RECIPIENTS OF MICROBIOLOGY SCHOLARSHIPS.....	45
J. DEPARTMENT OF MICROBIOLOGY SEARCH AND SCREEN PROCEDURES.....	46
1. <i>Committee Responsibilities</i>	46

I. Department of Microbiology Bylaws, Adopted 4/29/2022

II. Organization and Operation

Department members are governed by the following six interdependent sets of regulations:

1. Federal and state laws and regulations
2. UW System policies and rules
3. UWL policies and rules
4. College policies and rules
5. Shared governance bylaws and policies for Faculty and Academic Staff
6. Department bylaws

A. Preamble

The UWL Department of Microbiology was created in 1999. Its mission is to provide high quality educational experiences in microbiology and clinical laboratory science to diverse undergraduate and graduate student populations with an emphasis on inquiry-based learning and laboratory competence.

B. Meeting Guidelines

Department meetings will be run according to:

- i. The most recent edition of Robert's Rules of Order (<http://www.robertsrules.com/>)
- ii. Wisconsin state open meeting laws (<https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/open-government-law-and-compliance-guides>), summary at (<https://www.wisconsin.edu/general-counsel/legal-topics/open-meetings-law/>).

Minutes will be recorded by a voting department member and distributed in a timely fashion to department members and the ADA. Copies of minutes of department and committee meetings shall be stored in a secure location by the Department. Minutes from closed meetings will be taken by the committee Chair and written within one week of the proceedings. They will be available by request.

C. Definitions of Membership & Voting Procedures

All Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) with at least a 50% appointment, tenured, and tenure-track Faculty have the right to vote in departmental matters, except as specified elsewhere in the bylaws. Temporary instructional academic staff (e.g., pool hires) do not have voting rights in the Department.

A simple majority of those voting carries the vote. Voting occurs with a voice vote or a hand vote, and any member can call for a roll call vote. Voting may be conducted via email in which case the vote should be recorded as an addendum to the prior or next department meeting minutes. Proxy votes are not permitted in meetings of the Department and its committees.

D. Definitions of Quorum and Majority

For meetings of the Department and its committees, a quorum is defined as 2/3 of members eligible to vote, unless otherwise specified. Within a meeting, the number of votes required to pass a motion is based on the number of yes-votes and no-votes. Abstentions are treated as non-votes.

E. Changing Bylaws

Amendments or additions to these bylaws may be adopted at any department meeting if supported by two-thirds of the voting members of the Department, following a first reading of the proposed amendments or additions at a previous department meeting. Second readings can be waived for bylaws that do not pertain to personnel decisions.

III. Faculty and Staff Responsibilities and Expectations

A. Faculty

Faculty responsibilities are referenced in section IV of the Faculty Senate bylaws entitled, "Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons" (<http://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/>).

1. Teaching

a. Teaching Responsibilities

Teaching excellence is expected of all Faculty in the Department of Microbiology and teaching activities shall constitute at least 50% of Faculty evaluations for merit, retention, promotion, and tenure. Faculty are expected to keep current in their subject area and to work to improve student learning. For examples of teaching activities see:

- i. Bylaws Section IV.A.1.a
- ii. UWL Center for Advanced Teaching and Learning (<https://www.uwlax.edu/cat/>)

Faculty are expected to offer additional time to address student questions including holding office hours. Course details including office hours should be part of the course syllabus shared with students at the beginning of a course. Current UWL syllabus policy should be followed and required information and statements can be found at <https://www.uwlax.edu/info/syllabus/>.

Faculty are expected to grade and return student assignments and exams in a timely fashion. Faculty are expected to facilitate student evaluation of their instruction in each course except seminars, forums, independent study courses, and additional courses that may be exempt at the discretion of the Chair.

b. Peer Evaluation of Instruction

The Department Chair shall appoint two faculty members each year (at least one of whom must be tenured) to serve as peer evaluators for new Faculty. New Faculty will be evaluated twice by each evaluator during their first semester and once by each evaluator during their second, third, and fourth semesters. Peer evaluators will present an assessment of classroom experiences they observed in a written report submitted to the probationary Faculty member and to the Department Chair within two weeks of the assessment date. See Appendix D for the report format and evaluation criteria. Additional evaluations may be done if recommended by the Promotion, Retention and Tenure Committee.

c. Teaching Workload

As dictated by the UW-La Crosse Faculty Handbook, Faculty workloads shall average 12 contact hours per semester (24 per academic year). Graduate faculty mentoring graduate students in research (MIC 799, MIC 761, MIC 721) shall average 9 contact hours per semester (18 per academic year).

Contact hour loads for faculty not mentoring graduate students may be less than 12 hours per semester but shall average at least 9 hours per semester if involved in the following activities:

- Development of new courses or laboratory curricula
- Direct supervision of an unusually large number of undergraduate research (MIC 299, MIC 489, MIC 499) students
- Heavy advising loads (a number of advisees in excess of the average number of students per faculty member)
- Training and supervision of graduate teaching assistants
- Teaching large lecture sections
- Administrative responsibilities
- Other duties deemed acceptable by the Department Chair

Policies on release time for sabbatical, teaching improvement and administrative leave are found in Appendix E.

2. Scholarship

The Department of Microbiology defines scholarship as any creative endeavor that results in original contributions to the microbiological sciences within the areas of teaching and research. Faculty are expected to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship. Scholarship shall constitute at 20-35% of Faculty evaluations for merit, retention, promotion, and tenure.

The Department 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 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 primary and secondary activities. Activities are not required in all areas of scholarship, but primary scholarship activities are of greater significance than secondary scholarship activities.

Primary Scholarship Activities are those subject to peer review by individuals or organizations external to the University and include, but are not limited to:

- Publication of research manuscripts or reviews in scholarly, peer-reviewed journals
- Publication of monographs, books, or book chapters by recognized academic publishers
- Grant applications (funded and unfunded) from federal, state, or private agencies for research or innovative teaching methodologies.
- Publication of articles on innovative teaching methods in peer-reviewed journals
- Grant applications (funded and unfunded) for purchase of equipment from external funding agencies, including UW System
- Obtaining a patent

Secondary Scholarship Activities include, but are not limited to:

- UW-L Faculty Research Grants and other UW-L grants
- Submission of data to public databases
- Presentation of original work at professional meetings, conventions, colleges or universities
- Publication of manuals, book reviews, technical reports, and laboratory manuals

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

3. Service

Faculty in the Department of Microbiology are expected to serve the University, the public, and their profession. This service will include participating in departmental committees and can take the form of university committees, college committees, student advising, organizing workshops and symposia, offering specialized advice to off-campus groups, and joining and participating in the activities of professional societies. Service shall constitute at least 15-30% of Faculty evaluations for merit, retention, promotion, and tenure. Examples of service include but are not limited to the following:

Departmental Service

- Departmental committees
- Maintaining the department web page
- Preparing Alumni and Student Newsletters
- Organizing senior dinners, retreats, and other departmental events
- Student services:
 - Curriculum advising

- Career counseling
- Internship supervision
- Laboratory assistant supervision
- Club advising
- Advisor for student seminars and presentations, including serving as a Capstone advisor

University Service

- University and faculty committees
- Interdepartmental and College committees
- Faculty Senate
- University clubs
- Foundation committees

Public and Professional Service (related to faculty member's professional training.)

- Serving as an information resource
- Speaking engagements
- Serving on governmental agency committees
- Providing testimony for hearings and courts
- Organizing scientific conferences, workshops, and symposia
- Service to local, regional and national scientific societies
- Holding office in a scientific society
- Serving on committees of scientific societies
- Memberships in scientific societies
- Refereeing and reviewing original manuscripts and grants

B. Instructional Academic Staff (IAS)

Requests for IAS hiring will be presented to the College Dean. The request will indicate one of the standard titles from the Teaching Professor or Clinical Professor series <https://kb.uwlax.edu/page.php?id=103704> and will outline specific duties including teaching and any additional workload assigned by the Chair. Total workload for IAS is defined as a standard minimum teaching load plus additional workload equivalency activities. See Faculty Senate Articles, Bylaws and Policies <https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/>.

1. Teaching

a. Teaching Responsibilities

Teaching excellence is expected of IAS in the Department of Microbiology, and teaching activities shall constitute at least 75% of evaluations for merit and retention for IAS with full time teaching responsibilities. IAS in the Department are expected to keep current in their subject area and to work to improve student learning. For examples of teaching activities see:

- i. Bylaws Section IV.A.1.a
- ii. UWL Center for Advanced Teaching and Learning (<https://www.uwlax.edu/cat/>)

IAS are also expected to offer additional time to address student questions including holding office hours. Course details including office hours should be part of the course syllabus shared with students at the beginning of a course. Current UWL syllabus policy should be followed and required information and statements can be found at <https://www.uwlax.edu/info/syllabus/>. IAS are expected to grade and return student assignments and exams in a timely fashion. IAS are expected to facilitate student evaluation of their instruction in each course except seminars, forums, and independent study courses. Additional courses may be exempt at the discretion of the Chair.

b. Peer Evaluation of Instruction

The Department Chair shall appoint two faculty members each year (at least one of whom must be tenured) to serve as classroom evaluators (Peer Evaluators) for all new IAS. IAS will be

evaluated twice by each evaluator during their first semester and once by each evaluator during their second, third, and fourth semesters. Peer Evaluators will present an assessment of classroom experiences they observed in a written report submitted to the IAS member and to the Department Chair within two weeks of the assessment date. See Appendix D for the report format and evaluation criteria. Additional evaluations may be done if recommended by the Retention and Tenure Committee.

c. Teaching Workload

Full-time IAS workloads in the Department of Microbiology shall average no more than 16 contact hours per semester (32 per academic year). Contact hour loads may be less than 16 hours per semester but shall average at least 12 hours per semester for IAS unless involved in multiple activities such as:

- Directing a program (if not already granted release time)
- Development of new courses or laboratory curricula
- Teaching upper-level courses
- Teaching large lecture sections
- Assuming primary responsibility for coordination of instructional laboratories with multiple sections
- Student advising
- Coordinating graduate student instructors
- Other duties deemed acceptable by the Department Chair

Instructional academic staff on fractional appointments shall have workloads proportional to that of full-time staff (e.g., a maximum of 8 contact hours per semester for 0.5-time appointments).

2. Professional Development

IAS are expected to maintain an active program of professional development. The Department of Microbiology defines professional development as any activity that enhances knowledge or a skill related to the academic staff member's instructional and service responsibilities.

Evidence of professional development 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 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
- 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)
- In-service training
- Clinical and/or practitioner experience
- Professional certification

IAS are expected to report their professional development activities and accomplishments in their electronic portfolio

3. Service

IAS in the Department of Microbiology are expected to serve the University, the public, and their profession. This service can take the form of serving on department and university committees, offering specialized advice to off-campus groups, organizing workshops and symposia, and joining

and participating in the activities of professional societies in their discipline (see Section IV.A.1c for examples of service activities).

Note: individuals hired to teach courses on per credit basis in the Department do not have service or professional development expectations and are only expected to fulfill teaching expectations (section III.B.1) but are subject to performance review as directed by the Chair (see Appendix D).

C. Adjunct Faculty

1. Adjunct Faculty Appointments

The Department of Microbiology can invite individuals not employed by the University to become adjunct faculty members. The individuals are asked to submit to the Department Chair their curriculum vitae and letter of application stating their reasons for seeking Adjunct Faculty status. The Department reviews the request and if approved by a majority vote is forwarded to the Dean of the CSH. If approved, the Dean writes a letter of appointment to adjunct faculty status to the individual. For adjunct graduate faculty status, the individual must meet the requirements for graduate faculty and make separate applications to both the Microbiology Director of the Graduate Program as well as the Graduate Council (<https://www.uwlax.edu/globalassets/academics/grad-studies/graduate-faculty-guidelines.pdf>). Adjunct faculty status will be reviewed every five years by the Department to ensure adjunct faculty are actively involved in the Department.

Adjunct faculty in Clinical Laboratory Science (CLS) are not required to apply but are required to maintain a NAACLS-accredited CLS program and to accept students from UW-La Crosse.

2. Privileges and Responsibilities

Adjunct faculty may teach and/or team-teach courses that have been approved by the Department Curriculum Committee. Adjunct Faculty may also co-advise (with a member of the Department) undergraduate research (MIC 499) and serve as thesis committee members (including co-major advisor) to MS graduate students in Microbiology. Adjunct Faculty must have Graduate Faculty status to qualify for teaching slash (400/500-level) and 700-level courses, to serve on thesis committees, and to serve as a co-major advisor. Adjunct faculty teaching courses must conduct student evaluation of instruction during the last two weeks of the semester. In addition, the Department Chair will appoint two Peer Evaluators to conduct evaluations based on classroom visits (Appendix D) during the first two times that a course is offered. Additional peer evaluations may be required if deemed necessary by the Department.

D. Non-Instructional Academic Staff (Non-IAS)

The expectations of Non-IAS vary depending on the type of position. Specific job expectations will be identified in the appointment letter for each Non-IAS member.

E. Student evaluation of instruction

The Department will follow the UWL student evaluation of instruction policy and procedure available on the Faculty Senate webpage (<https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/#tm-student-evaluation-of-instruction---student-evaluation-of-instruction>). Results from the Faculty Senate approved student evaluation of instruction questions are required for retention, tenure, and promotion for ranked faculty and for renewal and promotion of IAS in the form of (1) the single motivation item and (2) the composite student evaluation of instruction consisting of the five common questions. The Department of Microbiology student evaluation of instruction will ask students to provide written comments. For ranked faculty contract-renewal and both faculty and IAS promotion these numbers will be reported using the Teaching Assignment Information (TAI) form. The Department will add to the TAI form both the motivation item and the composite student evaluation of instruction fractional median for each course. In addition, the candidate's overall fractional median for the term on both the single motivation item and the composite student evaluation of instruction are reported. Finally, the Department adds the departmental fractional median for both the single motivation item and the

composite, the minimum and maximum composite student evaluation of instruction for the Department.

IV. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)

The results of merit reviews for all ranked Faculty and IAS who have completed at least one academic year at UWL are due to the Dean's Office on Dec.15, annually. Merit reviews reflect activities during the prior academic year ending May 31. Distribution of merit compensation shall be determined by the Department of Microbiology in accordance with department bylaws. Faculty Senate Promotion, Tenure and Salary (PTS) recommendations regarding Merit can be found at: https://uwlax-my.sharepoint.com/:w:/g/personal/provost_uwlax_edu/EddrYerkV21Or0MY5OxMSPoBRq54YatzgBmaTOD8y4HiZA?e=OIEODE. Reassigned duties outside of the Department should be evaluated annually by the appropriate supervisor for the purposes of within department personnel processes (such as merit and post tenure review). Guidance is provided in the document "Personnel review for faculty with appointments/assignments outside of their departments" available at: <https://kb.uwlax.edu/104210>

A. Evaluation Processes & Criteria

Faculty and IAS in the Department of Microbiology will complete an Annual Activity Report and be reviewed annually. The Annual Evaluation serves as a vehicle for self-evaluation and shall offer an opportunity for future goal setting and improvement as necessary. One exception is that new faculty who begin fall semester do not undergo an Annual Merit Review in that first semester but are reviewed for retention early in the spring semester. A second exception is that temporary IAS do not undergo merit review.

Early in the fall semester, the Department Chair shall provide individuals with a copy of an Annual Activity Report form (see Appendix C). Department members shall submit their completed Annual Activity Reports, containing a description of activities for the year ending May 31 of the current year. The Department Chair will chair the Merit Review Advisory Committee, which consists of all voting members who submit Annual Activity Reports. First-year faculty and first-year IAS will serve as non-voting *ad hoc* members of the committee to become familiar with the review process and the activities of department members.

Each Merit Review Advisory Committee member will use the completed Annual Activity Report, student evaluation information, and Peer Evaluation Information (when applicable in the case of Probationary Faculty) from the previous year to evaluate each department member's performance. Performance will be evaluated in the areas of faculty and staff responsibility based on the Evaluation Criteria specified in sections IV.A.1 and IV.A.2, respectively. Each member of the Merit Review Advisory Committee shall provide a Performance Rating (E = Exceptional, G = Good, S = Satisfactory, or U = Unsatisfactory) in each of the areas of teaching, scholarship/professional development, and service. Performance ratings for each area are determined as follows:

Exceptional (E). Individual has made several exceptional contributions far exceeding minimal expectations.

Good (G). Individual has made one or more significant contributions.

Satisfactory (S). Individual has made a satisfactory contribution.

Unsatisfactory (U). Individual has made an unsatisfactory contribution.

Failure to record an entry in any of the evaluation areas (Teaching, Scholarship/Professional Development, or Service) on the Annual Evaluation Form will result in an Unsatisfactory (U) Performance Rating for that area. Any committee member that evaluates a department member's performance to be unsatisfactory must provide the committee Chair with a written and signed rationale for the U. Members may, however, provide written comments in any category (complimentary or constructive criticisms) for any faculty member.

Based on the performance ratings, each member of the Merit Review Advisory Committee will assign an overall Merit Category Designation (4 = Exceptionally Meritorious; 3 = Significantly Meritorious; 2 = Meritorious; or 1 = No Merit) for each evaluated member. Definitions of the Merit Category Designations are as follows:

Category 4: Exceptionally meritorious. Individual has made multiple exceptional contributions in two or more of the evaluation areas. Contributions should be beyond those accomplishments required for category 3.

Category 3: Significantly meritorious. Individual has made significant contributions beyond the minimum required to be judged meritorious (category 2). 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 2: Meritorious. Individual has fulfilled responsibilities in teaching, as well as having made some contributions in each of the areas of Scholarship/Professional Development and Service.

Category 1: No Merit. Individual has been judged delinquent in their duties or has not submitted an evaluation form.

Each member of the Department will submit their evaluations for all department members (except the Department Chair) to the Department Chair. Evaluations of the Department Chair will be submitted to a tenured Faculty member appointed by the Chair. The Chair will construct a matrix of performance ratings and merit category designations for all department members evaluated. A similar matrix will be made by the faculty member receiving the Chair evaluations. The matrix data will be blinded to ensure anonymity of the evaluators. The rationale for any U performance ratings will be provided orally by the Chair (the name of the committee member assigning the U will remain anonymous). These matrices will be stored in a secure location in the Department.

At the merit meeting, the committee will only discuss the performance ratings and merit category designations of probationary faculty members. Any Faculty and IAS may request (at the time of merit evaluation submissions) their performance rating be discussed. Additionally, any individual receiving a rating of U in any category will be discussed (the member being evaluated will be asked to leave the room during the discussion). When the committee has concluded discussions, all committee members 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 Advisory Committee. **All discussions and the evaluations determined by the Merit Review Advisory Committee are to remain strictly confidential.**

The Department Chair will then summarize the evaluations and determine the merit category designation for each member of the Department. To receive a merit category designation of 1, a department member must have received that merit category designation from at least 55% 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 at least 55% of the total evaluating members. To receive a merit category designation of 4, a department member must receive that merit category designation from at least 55% of the evaluating members. All other department members that have been evaluated will receive a merit category designation of 2.

Within seven working 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 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. Any other written comments will also be provided.

1. Faculty Evaluation Criteria

The criteria used to evaluate the annual performance of each Faculty member are designed to evaluate effective teaching, high quality scholarship, and significant professional service. Of the areas of Faculty responsibility, teaching is weighted as the most important and should constitute at least 50% of the final evaluation assuming they are full-time. Release time for non-instructional responsibilities will reduce the percentage proportionally.

a. Teaching

In the area of teaching, Faculty are expected to motivate and challenge students to learn by using various pedagogical devices or techniques and by setting well-defined expectations. It is assumed that student assignments and examinations will be reviewed and graded in a timely manner and that student achievement will be appropriately assessed. Faculty are expected to keep current in their subject matter areas, to update the curriculum, to assess the effects of their teaching techniques, and to work to continually improve their knowledge of the subject matter and their teaching effectiveness. Additional activities recognized in the area of teaching include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Development of new curricula
- Development of new laboratory exercises or new lab courses
- Writing educational grants to support teaching efforts and improvement of instructional laboratories
- Presenting papers on successful curriculum development or educational pedagogy
- Publishing the results of successful curriculum development or educational pedagogy

Efforts and accomplishments to these ends are to be reported in the Annual Activity Report.

Student evaluations given in each of the courses taught will also be used as one measure to judge teaching effectiveness. Probationary Faculty also undergo Peer Evaluations based on classroom visitations by other faculty. For each Probationary Faculty Member, the Department Chair shall appoint two faculty members (at least one of which must be tenured). Probationary Faculty members will be evaluated twice by each evaluator during their first semester and once by each evaluator during the second, third, and fourth semesters. Peer Evaluators will present an assessment of classroom experiences they observed in a written report submitted to the Probationary Faculty Member and to the Department Chair (see Appendix D). Additional evaluations may be done if recommended by the Retention and Tenure Committee.

These evaluations will be submitted by the Peer Evaluators to the Chair of the Retention & Tenure Review Committee (which will be the Department Chair unless the Chair is being considered for retention or tenure) (see Appendix D). Faculty are also encouraged to include other measures of teaching effectiveness in their Annual Evaluation Report, such as course evaluations, alumni surveys, etc.

b. Scholarship

As stated in III.A.2 of the Department Bylaws, Faculty are expected to maintain an active program of scholarship. The Department of Microbiology defines scholarship as any creative endeavor that results in original contributions to the microbiological sciences within the areas of teaching, research, and professional service. When possible, such contributions should be subject to peer review. Scholarly activity may include, but is not limited to, the following:

Primary Scholarship Activities are those subject to peer review by individuals or organizations external to the University and include, but are not limited to:

- Publication of research manuscripts or reviews in scholarly, peer-reviewed journals
- Publication of monographs, books, or book chapters by recognized academic publishers
- Grant applications (funded and unfunded) from federal, state, or private agencies for research or innovative teaching methodologies.
- Publication of articles on innovative teaching methods in peer-reviewed journals
- Grant applications (funded and unfunded) for purchase of equipment from external funding agencies, including UW-System
- Obtaining a patent

Secondary Scholarship Activities include, but are not limited to:

- UW-L Faculty Research Grants and other UW-L grants
- Submission of data to public databases
- Presentation of original work at professional meetings, conventions, colleges or universities
- Publication of manuals, book reviews, technical reports, and laboratory manuals

Faculty are expected to report their scholarly activities and accomplishments in their Annual Activity Report.

c. Service

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

Department service:

- Departmental committees
- Maintaining the department web page
- Preparing alumni and student newsletters
- Organizing senior dinners, retreats, and other departmental events
- Student services:
 - Curriculum advising
 - Career counseling
 - Internship supervision
 - Laboratory assistant supervision
 - Microbiology Club advising
 - Advisor for student seminars and presentations

University Service:

- University and faculty committees
- Interdepartmental and College committees
- Faculty Senate
- University clubs
- Foundation committees

Public and Professional Service (public service must be related to department member's professional training):

- Serving as an information resource
- Speaking engagements
- Serving on Governmental Agency committees
- Providing testimony for hearings and courts
- Organizing scientific conferences, workshops, and symposia
- Service to local, regional and national scientific societies
- Holding office in a scientific society
- Serving on committees of scientific societies
- Memberships in scientific societies
- Refereeing and reviewing original manuscripts and grants

Faculty are expected to report their service activities in their Annual Evaluation Report.

Faculty who are on professional leave are required to submit a completed Annual Activity Report, which describes their leave and other professional activities. Faculty who have just retired do not have to submit a full faculty Annual Activity Report but are required to submit to the Department Chair their accomplishments in teaching, scholarship/professional development, and service by June 1 of the year they retire. This information is needed for incorporation into the Annual Departmental Report to the Dean. New Faculty who begin in the fall semester do not undergo an Annual (Merit) Review in that first semester (they are reviewed for retention early in the spring semester). If retained, the salary adjustment for these new Faculty will be (by contract) the average increment generated by the pay plan.

2. Instructional Academic Staff in Permanent Budgeted Instructional Lines

Instructional Academic Staff who are in permanent budget lines (aka “Redbooked” -- 102 or Growth, Quality and Access) are automatically eligible for state pay plan increases. In order to be eligible for pay plan, a Redbooked IAS instructor must have been found to have “met expectations.” An IAS instructor will be found to have met expectations through departmental merit review if that IAS received a merit review score of 2 or higher.

The criteria used to evaluate the annual performance of each IAS member are designed to evaluate effective teaching, professional development, and service. Expectations in these areas are different for IAS than for Faculty Members. This may result in different Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designations for IAS than for Faculty Members with a similar level of accomplishments. Of the areas of IAS responsibility, teaching is weighted as the most important and should constitute at least 75% of the final evaluation

a. Teaching

In the area of teaching, IAS 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. IAS are expected to keep current in their subject matter areas, to update the curriculum, to assess the effects of their teaching techniques, and to work to continually improve their knowledge of the subject matter and their teaching effectiveness. Additional activities recognized in the area of teaching include, but are not limited to, the following:

- development of new curricula
- development of new laboratory exercises or new lab courses
- writing educational grants to support teaching efforts and improvement of instructional laboratories
- presenting papers on successful curriculum development or educational pedagogy
- publishing the results of successful curriculum development or educational pedagogy

Efforts and accomplishments to these ends are to be reported in the Annual Activity Report.

Student evaluations given in each of the courses taught will also be used as one measure to judge teaching effectiveness. IAS will also undergo Peer Evaluations based on classroom visitations by faculty during their first four semesters. These evaluations will be submitted by the Peer Evaluators to the Chair of the Retention and Tenure Review Committee (which will be the Department Chair unless they are being considered for retention or tenure) (see Appendix D). IAS are also encouraged to include other measures of teaching effectiveness in their Annual Evaluation Report such as course evaluations, alumni surveys, etc.

b. Professional Development.

As stated in Section III.B of the Department Bylaws, IAS are expected to maintain a program of professional development. The Department of Microbiology defines professional development as any activity that enhances knowledge and skills related to the academic staff member’s instructional and service responsibilities. IAS are particularly encouraged to engage in professional development related to curriculum development and/or educational pedagogy. Professional development activities may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Engaging in self-study or professional growth to enhance competence in instructional areas
- 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 research grants or awards
- Publishing original works such as manuals, textbooks, monographs, 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)
- Reviewing original manuscripts and grants
- Participation in inclusive excellence institutes, short courses, seminars, workshops, and professional meetings

IAS are expected to report their professional development activities and accomplishments in the Annual Activity Report.

c. Service

The service component of an IAS member's responsibility may take many forms, such as service to the program or major, the Department, the University, the profession, or the general public. Service activity recognized by the Department of Microbiology for IAS includes the same items listed for Faculty (Section IV.A.1.c).

IAS are expected to report their service activities on the Annual Evaluation Report.

3. Department Chair Evaluation Criteria

The Department Chair will be evaluated in the same performance categories as faculty (teaching, scholarship, and service). In addition, the Chair will be evaluated *in a fourth category, Administration*, which includes the following areas:

- Promoting the needs of the Department to the College and the University administration
- Preparing and monitoring the department budget
- Arranging department meetings and appointing faculty to departmental committees
- Preparing class schedules and making workload assignments
- Developing curriculum revisions
- Arranging and coordinating the annual evaluation of Department staff (including Faculty, IAS, Non-IAS, and Classified Staff)
- Preparation of promotion, tenure, and retention documents
- Chairing or co-Chairing search and screen committees for departmental vacancies
- Preparation of departmental reports and audits
- Representing the Department in various university matters and activities
- Promoting faculty development of Department members
- Supervising Non-IAS members
- Supervising the Department ADA

In lieu of the Department Chair, an appointed tenured Faculty member will chair the Merit Review Advisory Committee for the Department Chair, and, with substantial input from the Dean, be responsible for the evaluation of the Department Chair. The Department Chair shall submit an Annual Activity Report and be evaluated like other department faculty. In addition, the Dean will assess the Chair's performance in promoting the needs of the Department, promoting faculty development of Department members, representing the Department in various university matters and activities, as well as their communication, cooperation, and compliance with the Administration (Appendix I). The Dean will assign a final Merit Category Designation from the same numerical scale (4, 3, 2, 1) used for all other department faculty, and the Dean's evaluation will be weighted equivalent to two faculty members. The Chair is expected to report their activities related to these responsibilities in their Annual Activity Report. If there is to be discussion of the Chair's evaluation, the Dean will be invited to attend the Merit Review Advisory Committee meeting for that discussion. The designated chair of the Department Chair's merit review committee will notify the Department Chair in writing of their Merit Category Designation and Performance Ratings in each area of evaluation within seven days of the review.

4. Program Directors

The evaluation criteria used in the Department of Microbiology to evaluate each Program Director are based on each Director's responsibilities and are designed to promote effective performance as

Director. The Evaluation Criteria and their relative importance will be contained in the special evaluation guidelines established for each directorship. Directors of programs affiliated with the Department will submit an annual evaluation report outlining activities related to the responsibilities of the directorship. A specific set of evaluation guidelines and criteria will be established for each directorship related to their responsibilities. Each Director will be evaluated by the Departmental Merit Review Advisory Committee. Directors who are members of the Department will submit this activity report as a supplement to their faculty annual activity report. The overall evaluation of the directorship will be considered in awarding their final merit evaluation. For Directors who are not members of the Department, the evaluation will be considered in appointment renewals and any financial compensation provided to the Director. For each Director being evaluated, members of the Merit Review Advisory Committee(s) will assign: i) a Performance Rating (E = Exceptional, G = Good, S = Satisfactory, or U = Unsatisfactory) for each evaluation category in each Director's evaluation guidelines and ii) a Merit Category Designation (4 = Exceptionally Meritorious, 3 = Significantly Meritorious, 2 = Meritorious, or 1 = No Merit). Within seven working days of the review, the Department Chair shall notify (in writing) each Director of their Merit Category Designation, including Performance Ratings in each of the areas of the Director's responsibility.

B. Distribution of Merit Funds

The distribution of the annual pay package is described in Appendix B (Distribution of Annual Pay Package). Unless mandated otherwise by the University System Administration, the entire pay package will be distributed based on merit as described in Appendix B. All department members (Faculty and IAS) who earned Merit Category Designations of 4, 3, or 2 (Exceptionally Meritorious, Significantly Meritorious, or Meritorious) are eligible for merit funds.

C. Appeal Procedures for Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff

A Faculty or IAS 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 request should include written documentation to support appeal. The Department Chair will convene a meeting of the Merit Review Advisory Committee to consider the appeal within one week after notification of the appeal. The Committee 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 55% of the votes of the Merit Review Advisory Committee must be in favor of the change.

The Department Chair may likewise request a reconsideration of their Merit Category Designation. The appeal must be made in writing to the Chair of the Department Chair Evaluation Committee within one week after the distribution of the Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designation from the Merit Review Advisory Committee and the Dean. The Chair of the Department Chair Evaluation Committee will convene a meeting of the Committee-of-the-Whole and the Dean of CSH within one week after notification of the appeal. To change the original Merit Category Designation, at least 55% of the votes of the Committee-of-the-Whole (including the Dean's votes) must be in favor of the change. The Dean's vote will be weighted to be equivalent to two faculty members. The Chair of the Department Chair Evaluation Committee will transmit the results of the action of the reconsideration meeting within three working days after this meeting.

Appeals beyond the departmental level may be presented to The Complaints, Grievances, Appeals and Academic Freedom Committee (see Section 1.G of the [Faculty Senate Bylaws](#)).

V. Ranked Faculty Personnel (Retention/Tenure) Review

The Department will follow the policies regarding retention and tenure described in the Faculty Personnel Rules (UWS 3.06 - 3.11 and UWL 3.06 -3.08) <http://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Unclassified-Personnel-Rules/>

Tenure/retention decisions will be guided by the criteria established in the bylaws at the time of hire unless a

candidate elects to be considered under newer guidelines.

A. Retention (procedure, criteria, and appeal)

1. The Promotion, Tenure and Review (PTR) Committee shall consist of all tenured members of the Department. If fewer than three tenured Microbiology Faculty exist, the Department Chair will work with the Dean to establish an appropriate committee which will use Department guidelines. The Department Chair shall serve as Chair of the committee unless they are the candidate under review, in which case the committee shall elect one of its tenured members as Chair of the PTR Committee.
2. All first-year tenure-track faculty will be formally reviewed in the spring of their first year. A departmental non-contract review letter will be filed with the faculty member, the Dean and HR. Formal reviews resulting in contract decisions will minimally occur for tenure-track faculty in their 2nd, 4th and 6th years.
3. For the current faculty personnel review calendar see <https://www.uwlax.edu/info/academic-department-calendar/>. At least 20 days prior to a retention review, the Department Chair must notify the Probationary Faculty Member of the date of the review meeting and inform them of the review report requirements. See <https://www.uwlax.edu/academic-affairs/retention-at-uwl/> for current report requirements.
4. Faculty under review provide two reports to the Department related to their teaching, scholarship, and service activities, one for the most recent year and one from the time of hire to the date of departmental review. Hyperlinked syllabi and peer evaluations (if conducted) are required, and the candidate may choose to provide additional evidence. The Department Chair shall provide the teaching assignment information (TAI) data sheet that summarizes the courses taught, workload data, grade distribution and student evaluation of instruction by individual course and semester (which are only available after completing a full academic year) and departmental comparison student evaluation of instruction composite data.
5. Faculty under review shall provide the Chair with their electronic retention/tenure report one week prior to the PTR Committee meeting. The Chair will immediately share the report with the PTR Committee members.
6. Criteria used by the PTR Committee members to judge the Probationary Faculty Member are based upon all submitted information in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. See Section III for activities to be considered in these areas. Of these areas of responsibility, teaching is most important and must be weighed at least 50%; however, service and a program of continued scholarship are necessary to earn recommendations for retention, and ultimately tenure.
7. At the PTR meeting, in closed session, a discussion of the probationary faculty member's report will occur, and a roll-call vote will be held to determine which contract recommendation should be made to the Dean. Options are:
 - Recommendation for a two-year contract
 - Recommendation for a one-year contract (also used if the tenure vote is within one-year rather than two)
 - Recommendation for tenure
 - Recommendation of non-retention
8. The probationary faculty member shall be notified of the recommendation in writing (e-mail is acceptable) by the Chair within seven calendar days of each retention/tenure review (UWL 3.06).
9. Departments will provide the following materials to the Dean:
 - i. Department letter of recommendation with vote
 - ii. Teaching assignment information (TAI) data sheet that summarizes courses taught, workload data, grade distribution and student evaluation of instructions by individual course and

- semester (which are only available after completing a full academic year) and departmental comparison student evaluation of instruction data
- iii. Merit evaluation data

10. In the years when a probationary faculty member is not being reviewed for a contract renewal (i.e., a “non-contract review”) the merit-review discussion of the probationary faculty member will be used by the Chair to generate a non-contract review letter that will be emailed to the probationary faculty member and the Dean by the UWL deadline in April.
11. The Department will follow policies guiding part-time appointments for faculty and tenure clock stoppage available on the Human Resources (HR) website <https://kb.uwlax.edu/105030>
12. 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. The procedure for the reconsideration meeting is detailed in [UWL 3.08](#).

B. Tenure Review and Departmental Tenure Criteria

1. A tenure decision is the last retention decision for a probationary faculty member. Unless a candidate is given credit for previous experience, the probationary period is seven years. The Department tenure decision is made in the Fall of the sixth year by the PTR Committee. The tenure review process and criteria under review are the same as for other retention reviews, however, the individual’s entire body of work from the date of hire will be evaluated to determine if the person should be recommended for tenure. At least a two-thirds majority of votes cast by roll call is required for a tenure recommendation. After the decision is made by the tenured faculty, the individual will be informed by the Department within seven days of the meeting.
2. If the 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. The procedure for the reconsideration meeting is detailed in [UWL 3.08](#).

C. Post-tenure Review

The Department follows the UWL procedure and schedule regarding post-tenure review <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/post-tenure-review-policy/>

1. Post-tenure Review Committee

The Post-Tenure Review Committee will be composed of the PTR Committee members, except those up for post-tenure review that year.

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 January 1 of their tenure year (if first post-tenure review) or last post-tenure review year to the date of the committee review. The faculty member must ensure that the report is up-to-date on 5 years of activities and includes hyperlinks to the following materials:

- i. 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
- ii. Evidence of scholarly activities associated with the specific entry (e.g., publications, grants, exhibitions, presentations)

Hyperlinks to evidence of service are not required. Seven calendar days prior to the committee meeting, the Department Chair must provide the following to the Post Tenure Review Committee,

for each semester being evaluated:

- i. Composite student evaluation of instruction scores
- ii. Merit scores

3. Criteria to Meet 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 exceeding these criteria “meet expectations” and do not need further review until five years hence.

Faculty with an unsatisfactory evaluation must develop a 3-year plan in consultation with the Faculty Development Plan Committee (FDPC) to improve their merit scores. The FDPC will be comprised of three tenured members of the Department—the Department Chair, who will serve as Chair of the FDPC; one member chosen by the Chair; and one member chosen by the individual being evaluated. If less than three tenured members of the Department are available, one member may be chosen from outside the Department in consultation with the Dean. Within two weeks after notification of an unsatisfactory performance rating by the Post-tenure Review Committee, the FDPC will meet with the Faculty Member under review to discuss a Faculty Development Plan to remedy concerns listed by the Post-tenure Review Committee within a two-year time period. The Faculty Development Plan must be established within thirty days of the first meeting of the FDPC.

The Faculty Member with an unsatisfactory evaluation shall have two annual evaluation periods (i.e., two years) to remedy the areas of concern. The post-tenure review committee will meet with the Faculty Member under review after the first annual evaluation to discuss the Faculty Member's progress toward remediation of the areas of concern. If the Faculty Member receives a satisfactory performance rating in all evaluation criteria including the areas of concern during the second annual evaluation after initiation of the Faculty Development Plan, the Chair will send a letter to the faculty member stating that the areas of concern have been remedied. A copy of the letter will be placed in the Faculty Member's file. The Department Chair will send a letter to the Dean and members of the FDPC stating that the areas of concern have been remedied and that the Faculty Member has achieved satisfactory performance ratings for all evaluation criteria.

If it is determined at the second annual evaluation after initiation of the Faculty Development Plan that the evaluation criteria of concern have not been remedied or that new areas of concern have arisen, the Post-tenure Review Committee will meet with the Faculty Member under review and attempt to resolve the insufficient remediation for the areas of concern. If the post-tenure review committee and the Faculty Member under review cannot resolve the inability to remedy the areas of concern, the results of the PTR Committee and the Faculty Development Plan for the Faculty Member under review will be forwarded to the Dean for consideration of further action.

A confidential file of the Faculty Member's Tenured Faculty Review will be kept in the office of the Department Chair. The file shall contain all documents and correspondence involved in the evaluation of the Faculty Member and the resolution of any identifiable areas of concern. A copy of all items in the file of the individual Faculty Member will be given to that individual if they submit a written request to the Department Chair.

Each year the results of the post-tenure review and any remediation plans will be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Science and Health.

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

The Department of Microbiology will follow the guidelines and schedules regarding faculty promotion available at <http://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Faculty-Promotion-Resources/>

1. Promotion Recommendation Committee

This committee is also the PTR committee (all tenured faculty in the Department of Microbiology). 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 (1) are not tenured and/or (2) 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.

2. Review Process

In late Spring Semester, HR sends eligibility lists to Chairs and Directors of instructional units for corrections of individuals who are eligible for promotion in the coming academic year. At this time, the Department Chair will notify in writing Faculty members who are eligible for promotion and, upon request, will notify eligible Faculty of the university and departmental guidelines on promotion.

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

Eligible faculty who wish to be considered for promotion must prepare a promotion report that follows the format and guidelines required under current HR policy posted at <https://kb.uwlax.edu/104534>

Candidates with non-instructional workload assignments must include performance reviews of those activities.

The Department Chair will make these materials and student evaluation information available to members of the PTR Committee prior to the promotion consideration meeting. Faculty may submit other written materials or make an oral presentation at the promotion consideration meeting. In addition, any member of the PTR Committee may solicit written and signed testimony about the candidate from (1) students, (2) other departments, (3) university committees on which the applicant has served, and (4) any other university source. However, no testimony may be solicited or used from outside the University without written consent of the candidate. The requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meeting law shall apply to this meeting (see Section 0.1 Meeting Guidelines).

At the meeting, the candidate's performance will be discussed with respect to the Evaluation Criteria in Section IV.A.1. Votes shall be cast by a show of hands on a motion to recommend promotion for each 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 submit a Promotion Recommendation Committee Report to the Dean along with TAI and merit data and a promotion transmittal form containing the committee members signature and a numerical vote tally. A copy of the letter shall be provided to the candidate at least one day prior to the submission of the promotion file to the Dean.

3. Evaluation Criteria

To be considered for promotion, Faculty must meet the minimum university criteria as stated in the Employee Handbook. 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 Section IV.A.1 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 amount and quality of curriculum development, 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.

Appeal 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.

VI. Instructional Academic Staff Review

A. Annual Review

An IAS Annual Performance Appraisal form, with the merit results, will be submitted to the Dean and HR according to current HR policy. The current policy is available at <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/services/employee-relations/performance-management/#expand-153379>

B. IAS Promotion Procedures

Policies and procedure guiding promotion for IAS are available at <http://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/ias-promotion-resources/>

IAS promotion portfolios are due to the Department by the first Friday of November. The Department PTR committee will serve as the committee to evaluate promotion portfolios. In addition, at least one IAS member who is senior to the person under consideration should serve as a consultant on the PTR committee. The PTR will use evaluation guidelines and promotion forms required by current HR policy posted at <https://kb.uwlax.edu/103704>

C. Appeal Procedure for Annual Review

Within seven days of receiving their annual review, the IAS member may, by writing to the Department Chair, request a reconsideration by the PTR Committee. The reconsideration review shall occur within 14 days of the annual review filing date. The IAS member shall be given at least a 7-day notice of such review. The IAS member shall be allowed an opportunity to present written or oral evidence or arguments relevant to the decision, and/or to use witnesses. Reconsideration shall be non-adversarial in nature. The committee shall give fair and full consideration to all relevant materials. Written notice of the reconsideration decision shall be transmitted to the IAS member and to the College Dean within seven days of the IAS member's reconsideration hearing.

VII. Non-Instructional Academic Staff Review

A. Annual Review

In the Department of Microbiology non-IAS includes the Department ADA and Prep-room Staff. The evaluation criteria used in the Department to evaluate each non-IAS member are based on individuals' job descriptions and are designed to promote effective performance of those job responsibilities. The evaluation process used is the annual performance appraisal for non-IAS. For current policy see Human Resources Performance Management for Non-IAS: <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/services/employee-relations/performance-management/#expand-153377>. In general, the Department Chair must complete an Annual Performance Appraisal Form for non-IAS and Classified Staff for each prep-room staff member and the Department ADA. The Department Chair will request written input about individuals' job performances from other members of the Department who have direct interactions with the staff member. After completing a draft of the appraisal form, the Chair meets with the staff member to discuss this year's evaluation and goals for next year. These evaluations are

due June 30th to the College Dean and HR.

VIII. Governance

A. Department Chair

1. Election of the Department Chair

Specific details of the selection process are contained in Faculty Senate Policies V: [The Selection of Department Chairpersons](#). Any tenured faculty member of the Department is eligible to serve as Chair. The term of office is three years. All voting members of the Department are eligible to vote in the election of the Chair.

In addition to the specific details of the University selection process for Department Chairs, the Department of Microbiology requires faculty members who are interested in becoming Department Chair to announce their candidacy for nomination for the position. In the first week of December prior to the nomination/election process, the Chair of the Department will send a call for announcement of candidacy to all tenured faculty. During the first week of classes in the spring semester, the Chair will schedule a meeting where each candidate will give a presentation to the Department. Presentations shall include each candidate's visions for the Department and University, their administrative style, and their ideas about being the main administrator of the Department. Each presentation will be followed by a question/answer period. By January 31, the Chair of the will send the list of candidates for Department Chair to the Dean. In February, the Dean will distribute ballots listing all candidates for Department Chair to voting members of the Department. The remainder of the election process is the same as described in Faculty Senate Policies V: [The Selection of Department Chairpersons](#).

2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair

The Department will adhere to the selection and duties of the Chair that are delineated in the Faculty Senate Policies under the following headings: "[IV. Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons](#);" "[V. The Selection of Department Chairpersons](#);" and "[VI. Remuneration of Department Chairpersons](#)." In addition, references to Chair-related duties can be found in the Employee Handbook <http://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Employee-handbook/>

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, IAS, Non-IAS, 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 Department Chair shall be granted a 0.5 release provided that the Department consists of a minimum of ten faculty and staff. The Chair shall receive a partial summer appointment (0.33-0.40) to receive monetary compensation for conducting responsibilities of the Chair.

B. Director of the Clinical Laboratory Science Program

The Clinical Laboratory Science Program Director is responsible for oversight of the undergraduate clinical laboratory science program. This position is determined at the time of hire with no set end date and is an annual appointment with 50% teaching reassignment time for directing the program. Responsibilities of this position include:

- Advising pre-CLS and CLS majors
- Guiding students through registration at all academic levels

- Monitoring students' progress towards the degree at all academic levels
- Teaching summer CLS pre-clinical curriculum
- Acting as liaison to UWL's CLS clinical affiliates to maintain affiliation agreements and serve on their program's advisory committee
- Admitting students into the UWL CLS major (organizing interviews, reviewing applications, chairing the interview committee, and selecting students for admission)
- Helping students secure the required internship for the major (e.g. setting up site tours, writing letters of recommendation for students in the program, setting up interviews)
- Working with the Dean's office and Financial aid office for internship year financials
- Working with the MIC, BIO, and CHM departments each semester regarding curriculum required for the CLS major
- Maintaining and evaluating program assessment for program/university assessment
- Participating in student recruitment activities (e.g. Health Professions Night, HP 106 presentations)
- Maintaining and operating program budget
- Evaluating and updating CLS program curriculum, as needed
- Coordinating lab prep for CLS lab classes
- Mentoring faculty in the CLS program

C. Director of the Microbiology Graduate Program

The Graduate Program Director term is three years. The Department of Microbiology requires Faculty members who are interested in becoming Graduate Program Director to announce their candidacy for nomination for the position. In the first week of December prior to the nomination/election process, the Department Chair will send a call for an announcement of candidacy to all tenure-track and tenured Faculty. During January, the Chair of the Department will schedule a meeting where each candidate will give a presentation to the Department. Presentations shall include each candidate's visions for the Graduate Program and their administrative style. Each presentation will be followed by a question/answer period. A majority vote (conducted via ballot) of the Graduate Faculty will elect the Director.

The Graduate Program Director is responsible for overseeing the Department of Microbiology's Masters program. This position comes with a three-contact hour per academic year reassignment time for directing the program. Responsibilities of this position include:

- Coordinating recruitment and admission of new students
- Maintaining the graduate program web site
- Coordinate the graduate assistantship program
- Advising incoming graduate students regarding selection of a program track, advisors and coursework
- Coordinating MIC 500
- Acting as a liaison with the Clinical Microbiology program affiliates and coordinating clinical rotations
- Monitoring students' progress toward the degree
- Acting as a liaison between graduate students and University faculty and administration
- Maintaining and evaluating program assessment
- Evaluating and updating current programs and development of new programs
- Summer responsibilities include communication with incoming students and maintaining relationships with program affiliates

D. Standing Departmental Committees

Assessment Committee
 Graduate Committee
 MIC 100 Committee
 MIC 230 Committee
 Speakers Committee

Promotion Tenure Review Committee
Safety Committee
Social Committee
Scheduling Committee
Curriculum Committee
Prep Room Student Recruitment/Retention
Library Liaison
Microbiology Scholarship Committee
Equity Liaison
Autoclave Liaison Committee

Any committee action that is to be presented to the Department in the form of a motion must be e-mailed to the rest of the Department at least 48 hours prior to the department meeting at which the vote will be taken. In the e-mail, a summary of the motion and supporting rationale must be spelled out. This 48-hour rule can be waived at the department meeting if a motion is made and seconded, and the vote is unanimous in support of the motion to waive.

E. Departmental Programmatic Assessment Plan

The Department of Microbiology will adhere to the UWL Faculty Senate policy regarding academic program assessment and review. The current policy can be found at <https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/committees/faculty-committees/program-planning-and-review/#tm-academic-program-review>

IX. Search and Screen Procedures

The Department will follow recruitment and hiring procedures prescribed by HR in conjunction with Equity and Affirmative Action, UW System and Wisconsin state regulations. The UWL Search and Screen Policy and Procedures (<https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/news/important-information-for-faculty-recruitments/>) are to be followed for all faculty and staff recruitments at UWL.

A. Tenure-track faculty

The approved UWL tenure track faculty recruitment and hiring policy and procedures are found at <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/services/talent-acquisition-and-employment/recruitment/>.

B. Instructional and Non-Instructional Academic Staff

Hiring policy and procedures are found at <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/services/talent-acquisition-and-employment/recruitment/>

C. Pool Search

Hiring policy and procedures are found at <https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/services/talent-acquisition-and-employment/recruitment/>

Additionally, UWL's spousal/partner hiring policy can be found at <http://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Spousal-and-partner-hiring/>.

X. Student Rights and Obligations

A. Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures

1. Grade Appeals

Students who believe that the grade they received for a course does not reflect their performance in that course may appeal the disputed grade. This appeal must take place before the end of the semester immediately following the semester in which the grade was recorded. The first step of the appeal process is the student meeting informally with the instructor to discuss the disputed grade and attempt to reach a mutually acceptable resolution.

If a student-instructor meeting is not possible, or if such a meeting does not result in a mutually acceptable resolution of the dispute, the student should file a written appeal explaining why they are disputing the given grade with the Department Chair. The Department Chair should schedule a formal meeting with the student, after which the Chair will discuss the student concern with the instructor, if possible. Following these meetings, the Chair will make a recommendation to the instructor regarding the grade dispute.

If the student is still in dispute after the instructor's response to the Department Chair's recommendation, the student may submit to the Chair a further written appeal to an *ad hoc* grade appeal committee. Upon receipt of the written request, the Chair will form an *ad hoc* committee consisting of three department members, not including the Chair or the instructor, to review the appeal. This committee may request additional information from the student and the instructor before forming and forwarding its recommendation to the instructor. Any decision to change a disputed grade remains that of the instructor. If communication with the instructor is not possible, the disputed grade will not be changed unless the grade is the result of a clerical error; in this case, the decision to change the disputed grade becomes that of the Department Chair.

The Department Chair and *ad hoc* grade appeal committee process will each be documented with a written report that describes the discussion, relevant evidence and rationale for the decision reached, plus the instructor's response. Note, the instructor of record, provided they are still a member of the university faculty, is the only person authorized to change an assignment or course grade.

2. Academic Non-Grade Complaints, Grievances, and Appeals

A student may file a grievance with the University because of discrimination or a violation of published policies. The following link contains the university policy pertaining to discrimination: <https://www.uwlax.edu/equity/discrimination/>. In general, a grievance against the Microbiology program should be addressed through the Student Life Office (149 Graff Main Hall, email: studentlife@uwlax.edu).

Students may initiate and resolve complaints regarding faculty and staff actions or inactions that violate published policies. Unless otherwise stated in the Eagle Eye Student Handbook (<https://www.uwlax.edu/student-life/student-resources/student-handbook/>) complaints should be lodged in writing with the Department Chair (if against a faculty or staff member) or College Dean (if against the Department Chair) within 90 days of the last occurrence.

B. Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct

Students who enroll in courses offered by the Department of Microbiology 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 (https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/code/admin_code/uws/14.pdf). Complete details on the university policy on student academic and nonacademic misconduct can be found at

<http://catalog.uwlax.edu/undergraduate/academicpolicies/studentconduct/> and in the Eagle Eye Student Handbook. Appeal procedures for student academic misconduct are the same as for grade appeal (see Section X.A.1).

C. Advising Policy

Each student who majors in Microbiology will be assigned a faculty advisor in the Department. First and second year students are required to meet with their faculty advisor at least once each semester to discuss their academic progress, career interests, and course schedules. After the second-year students may use e-mail to discuss their course schedule or other items with their faculty advisors. Face-to-face meetings, however, are encouraged at any time for all advisees.

D. Evaluation of Teaching

In each of the courses offered by the Department (except seminars, forums, research, and independent study courses or other courses approved by the Chair), students will have an opportunity to evaluate their instructors. This evaluation will take place on-line at the end of each semester.

XI. Appendices

A. Department Statements on Scholarship and Professional Development

1. Scholarship

The Department of Microbiology defines scholarship as any creative endeavor that results in original contributions to the microbiological sciences within the areas of teaching and research. Faculty are expected to develop and 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 of Microbiology 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 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 areas.

Primary Scholarship Activities are those subject to peer review by individuals or organizations external to the University and include, but are not limited to:

- Publication of research manuscripts or reviews in scholarly, peer-reviewed journals
- Publication of monographs, books, book chapters by recognized academic publishers
- Grants applications (funded and unfunded) from federal, state, or private agencies for research or innovative teaching methodologies.
- Publication of articles on innovative teaching methods in peer-reviewed journals
- Grants applications (funded and unfunded) for purchase of equipment from external funding agencies
- Obtaining a patent

Secondary Scholarship Activities include, but are not limited to:

- UW-L Faculty Research Grants and other UW-L grants
- UW-System Grants
- Submission of data to public databases
- Presentation of original work at professional meetings, conventions, colleges or universities
- Publication of manuals, book reviews, technical reports, and laboratory manuals

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

2. Professional Development

Instructional Academic Staff are expected to maintain an active program of professional development. The Department of Microbiology defines professional development as any activity that enhances knowledge or a skill related to the academic staff member's instructional and service responsibilities.

Evidence of professional development 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 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
- 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)
- 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

B. Distribution of Annual Pay Package

In some years the University System Administration mandates that the entire pay package be distributed based on merit, while in other years, it mandates that a portion be awarded based on merit and the remaining be awarded based on solid performance (COLA; based on a percentage of an individual's base salary). Merit money will be distributed to all Department Members with merit category designations of 2, 3, and 4. The money distribution formula will be the same for the Faculty, Instructional Academic Staff, and Non-Instructional Academic Staff (although there is one pool of money for faculty and separate pool of money for Instructional and Non-Instructional Academic Staff.

1. Procedures and Formulas

Merit funds will be distributed in two parts—one based an individual's merit category designation (part A), and one based on a percent of an individual's base salary (part B).

a. Distribution Based on Merit Category Designation

Money will be distributed per individual per merit category designation according to this 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 (with 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.

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 if any individuals in the Department receive merit designations of 3 or 4) is to be distributed as a percentage times the base salary of each Department Member.

2. Example of money distribution based solely on merit.

The following calculations were made for the Department of Microbiology in a year when the UW-System mandates that the entire salary increase be based on merit. Data used in the calculations are as follows:

- (1) Seven faculty members in the Department with an average salary of \$50,000;
- (2) A pay package of 4.00%, thus the sum of money available for distribution was 4.00% of the total faculty salaries of the Department, which equals \$14,000; and
- (3) merit category 1: 0 individuals, category 2: 1 individual, category 3: 4 individuals, and category 4: 2 individuals.

a. Calculation of the Merit Money Distribution Based on Merit Category

$$\text{Award for merit category 2: } [(0.04 \div 2) + 0.000] \times \$50,000 = \$1000 \times 1 = \$1000$$

$$\text{Award for merit category 3: } [(0.04 \div 2) + 0.003] \times \$50,000 = \$1150 \times 4 = \$4600$$

$$\text{Award for merit category 4: } [(0.04 \div 2) + 0.006] \times \$50,000 = \$1300 \times 2 = \underline{\$2600}$$

$$\text{Total awarded for entire Department for Part A} = \$8200$$

b. Calculation of the Merit Money Distribution based on Salary of Each Individual

The money available to award in Part B is the total money in pay package for the Department minus the money awarded in Part A (Note: Part B will be less than 50% of the pay package unless all members of Department are in category 2).

$$\$14,000 - \$8,200 = \$5,800$$

The **average** award for Part B is the total money available to award in Part B \div number of Department Members.

$$\$5,800 \div 7 = \$828$$

The actual award in Part B is a % of each individual's salary. The % used for Part B is the average award for Part B \div Average salary in Department \times 100.

$$(\$828 \div \$50,000) \times 100 = 1.66\%$$

Thus, the amount awarded in Part B is calculated as this percentage times base salary of each individual. Examples follow for individuals at three different salaries.

$$\$45,000 \times 0.0166 = \$ 747$$

$$\begin{aligned} \$55,000 \times 0.0166 &= \$ 913 \\ \$65,000 \times 0.0166 &= \$1079 \end{aligned}$$

The following table demonstrates the total pay package distributions based on conditions of this example (entire pay package based on merit):

Faculty Salary	Category 2 \$ increase	Category 2 % increase	Category 3 \$ increase	Category 3 % increase	Category 4 \$ increase	Category 4 % increase
\$45,000	\$1747	3.88	\$1897	4.22	\$2047	4.55
\$55,000	\$1913	3.58	\$2063	3.75	\$2213	4.02
\$65,000	\$2079	3.20	\$2229	3.43	\$2379	3.66

3. Example of Money Distribution Based on Merit and COLA.

This example is based on a year when the University of Wisconsin System mandates that 50% of the pay package is to be awarded based on merit and 50% is to be awarded based on solid performance (COLA; % of base salary). Data used in the calculations are as follows:

- (1) seven faculty members in the Department with an average salary of \$50,000;
- (2) a total pay package of 4.00% (2.00% for merit and 2.00% for COLA), thus \$7,000 was available for distribution as merit, and \$7,000 was available for distribution for COLA; and
- (3) merit category 1: 0 individuals, category 2: 1 individuals, category 3: 4 individuals, and category 4: 2 individuals.

a. Calculation of the Merit Money Distribution Based on Merit Category

$$\text{Award for merit category 2: } [(0.02 \div 2) + 0.000] \times \$50,000 = \$ 500 \times 1 = \$ 500$$

$$\text{Award for merit category 3: } [(0.02 \div 2) + 0.003] \times \$50,000 = \$ 650 \times 4 = \$2,600$$

$$\text{Award for merit category 4: } [(0.02 \div 2) + 0.006] \times \$50,000 = \$ 800 \times 2 = \underline{\$1,600}$$

$$\text{Total awarded for entire Department for Part A} = \$4,700$$

b. Calculation of the Merit Money Distribution based on Salary of each Individual

The money available to award in Part B is the total money in the pay package for the Department minus the money awarded in Part A (Note: Part B will be less than 50% of the pay package unless all members of Department are in category 2).

$$\$7,000 - \$4,700 = \$2,300$$

The **average** award for Part B is the total money available to award in Part B ÷ number of department members.

$$\$2,300 \div 7 = \$329$$

The actual award in Part B is a % of each individual's salary. The % used for Part B is the average award for Part B ÷ Average salary in Department X 100.

$$(\$329 \div \$50,000) \times 100 = 0.658\%$$

Thus, the amount awarded in Part B is calculated as this percentage times base salary of each individual. Examples follow for individuals at three different salaries.

$$\$45,000 \times 0.00658 = \$ 296$$

$$\begin{aligned} \$55,000 \times 0.00658 &= \$ 362 \\ \$65,000 \times 0.00658 &= \$ 428 \end{aligned}$$

c. Calculation of the Money Distribution based on COLA

The remaining 2.00% of the salary package (\$7,000) will be distributed as a percent of each individual's base salary (COLA). Examples follow for individuals at three different salaries.

$$\begin{aligned} \$45,000 \times 0.0200 &= \$ 900 \\ \$55,000 \times 0.0200 &= \$1100 \\ \$65,000 \times 0.0200 &= \$1300 \end{aligned}$$

The following table demonstrates the total pay package distributions based on conditions of this example:

Faculty Salary	Category 2 \$ increase	Category 2 % increase	Category 3 \$ increase	Category3 % increase	Category 4 \$ increase	Category 4 % increase
\$45,000	\$1696	3.76	\$1846	4.10	\$1996	4.44
\$55,000	\$1962	3.57	\$2112	3.84	\$2262	4.11
\$65,000	\$2228	3.43	\$2378	3.66	\$2528	3.89

4. Example of Money Distribution in Year When Percent Increase is Insufficient to Award Merit Pay

In the past, there have been years where the percent pay increase awarded by the University of Wisconsin System was insufficient to provide funds to distribute to both parts A and B of the merit distribution formula. In one such year, the pay package allowed a 1% pay increase—1/3 of which was awarded on merit and 2/3 awarded as COLA. In such years, the Department will distribute merit funds as described in the following example. Data used in the calculations are as follows:

- (1) seven faculty members in the Department with an average salary of \$50,000;
- (2) a total pay package of 1.00% (0.33% for merit and 0.67% for COLA), thus \$1,155 was available for distribution as merit, and \$2,345 was available for distribution for COLA; and
- (3) category 1: 0 individuals, category 2: 1 individuals, category 3: 4 individuals, and category 4: 2 individuals.

a. Calculation of the Merit Money Distribution Based on Merit Category

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Award for merit category 2: } & [(0.0033 \div 2) + 0.000] \times \$50,000 = \$ 82 \times 1 = \$ 82 \\ \text{Award for merit category 3: } & [(0.0033 \div 2) + 0.003] \times \$50,000 = \$232 \times 4 = \$ 928 \\ \text{Award for merit category 4: } & [(0.0033 \div 2) + 0.006] \times \$50,000 = \$382 \times 2 = \underline{\$ 764} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Total awarded for entire Department for Part A} = \$1,774$$

However, only \$1,155 are available in the total merit pay package (0.33%); therefore, there are not enough funds to even cover Part A of the money distribution (\$1,774). In such circumstances, 1) the distribution for Part B will be omitted and 2) the distribution for Part A will modified/recalculated.

Because the amount of money available for Part A was only 65% of the funds needed ($\$1155 / \1774×100), the calculated allocations for Part A are multiplied by 65% to arrive at a modified allocation as described in the example calculations shown below.

Allocation based on Part A for each merit category $\times 0.65$ = modified allocation

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Award for merit category 2: } & \$ 82 \times 0.65 = \$ 53 \times 1 = \$ 53 \\ \text{Award for merit category 3: } & \$232 \times 0.65 = \$151 \times 4 = \$ 604 \end{aligned}$$

Award for merit category 4: $\$382 \times 0.65 = \$248 \times 2 = \$ 496$

Total merit dollars awarded for entire Department: = \$1,153

C. Merit Report Forms

**Faculty Annual Merit Report Form
Department of Microbiology**

Name:

Evaluation period: June 1, 20____ through May 31, 20____

A. Student Evaluation Scores and Teaching Assignment

Fall Semester:

Student evaluation of instruction, fractional median of all questions for semester: ____

Lectures and Laboratories*	Enrollment	Contact hours	student evaluation of instruction
Total:			

Spring Semester:

Student evaluation of instruction, fractional median of all questions for semester: ____

Lectures and Laboratories*	Enrollment	Contact hours	student evaluation of instruction
Total:			

*Note: Slash course (e.g. MIC 425/525) should be listed separately to indicate graduate enrollments. Contact hours for the graduate number should be listed as 0 (i.e. simultaneous teaching of a 3-credit undergraduate/graduate class does not constitute 6 contact hours)

Mean student evaluation of instruction for both semesters combined: _____

B. Provide a Digital Measures Activities Report that describes your activities for each Evaluation Criterion (II. Teaching, III. Scholarship, and IV. Service). Refer to Section 5 (Merit Evaluation) of Department Bylaws.

Instructional Academic Staff Annual Activity Report Form
Department of Microbiology
Name:

Evaluation period: June 1, 20____ through May 31, 20____

A. Student Evaluation Scores and Teaching Assignment

Fall Semester:

Student evaluation of instruction, fractional median of all questions for semester: ____

Lectures and Laboratories*	Enrollment	Contact hours	student evaluation of instruction
Total:			

Spring Semester:

Student evaluation of instruction, fractional median of all questions for semester: ____

Lectures and Laboratories*	Enrollment	Contact hours	student evaluation of instruction
Total:			

*Note: Slash course (e.g., MIC 425/525) should be listed separately to indicate graduate enrollments. Contact hours for the graduate number should be listed as 0 (i.e., simultaneous teaching of a 3-credit undergraduate/graduate class does not constitute 6 contact hours)

Mean student evaluation of instruction for both semesters combined: _____

B. Provide a Digital Measures Activities Report that describes your activities for each Evaluation Criterion (II. Teaching, III. Professional Development, and IV. Service). Refer to Section 5 (Merit Evaluation) of Department Bylaws.

D. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

1. Evaluation Process

The Department Chair will appoint two Peer Evaluators for each Probationary Faculty Member and each new Instructional Academic Staff member. At least one of the evaluators shall be a tenured member of the Department. Teaching in one course (preferably a lecture course) will be evaluated twice by each Peer Evaluator during the first semester and once by each Peer Evaluator during the second, third and fourth semesters. Additional evaluations may be conducted after the first four semesters if 1) deemed necessary by the Department Chair or the Peer Evaluators or 2) requested by the Probationary Faculty Member being evaluated. In the first semester, the first evaluation will occur between the third and seventh weeks, and the second evaluation will occur between the ninth and twelfth weeks. In subsequent semesters, the evaluation should occur between the 5th and 12th weeks. Peer evaluations will be announced and will be coordinated between the Peer Evaluators and the Probationary Faculty/Academic Staff members. To minimize disruptions of classes, both Peer Evaluators are encouraged to evaluate the same class at the same time.

The Department Chair may also assign peer evaluators for any faculty, adjunct faculty, or academic staff member if recommended by the PTR committee or requested by the individual.

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 faculty member being reviewed. The 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 or slide projectors, white board, computer) 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 *Instructional Faculty and Staff*

Report Form

Faculty/Staff Member:

Peer Evaluator:

Class Name, Format (lecture, lab), and Size:

Date of Evaluation:

Comments (follow guidelines under Evaluation Criteria; Appendix D):

E. Policies on Release Time (Sabbatical, Teaching Improvement, and Administrative Leave)

The Department of Microbiology encourages faculty to participate in professional development activities or partial release of the faculty member from normal teaching, scholarship, and service obligations in the Department. Faculty released 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. Released-time appointments usually result in the responsibilities of the faculty on leave being assumed by other Department faculty.

The Department expects administrators to assist in obtaining adequate replacements for faculty being appointed to on-campus, full- or part-time appointments outside the Department. The Department expects that administrators provide replacement personnel on an FTE-basis equal to that of the faculty member on leave. If the responsibilities of the released faculty member 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 seeking release 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 release. This request must include: (1) the purpose of the release, (2) the length of the release, and (3) suggestions of how the faculty member's Departmental responsibilities might be fulfilled during their absence.

The request will be acted upon by the Department's full-time faculty and instructional academic staff with faculty status. It is expected that, when possible and within Department guidelines, the Department will honor reasonable requests for released time. However, it may be necessary for the Department to deny a request if: (1) the faculty 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 replacement faculty and the Department is unwilling to assume the responsibilities of the faculty member requesting release. Even if the Department denies a faculty member's request the Dean, Vice-Chancellor or Chancellor could approve the request and reassign a faculty member to other duties. Releases, if granted, may be for one semester or an academic year. Continued releases of more than one year must be requested annually. The Department limits full-time releases to a maximum of two consecutive years. The Department recommends that part-time releases usually be for no more than three years.

For the purposes of promotion, tenure, and salary determination, the Department will continue to evaluate all faculty on part-time releases. Faculty on full-time release for sabbaticals and teaching improvement leaves should follow the Department guidelines for merit evaluation. Department members on development leave or leave of absence may participate in the merit evaluation process. If a member on leave does not submit an evaluation form they will receive a category 2 merit rating or the average of the past three years, whichever is higher. Faculty released 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., advisement, program coordination and new course development) are not subject to these guidelines and faculty 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 advisement, program coordination, and new course development.

F. Summer School Policies and Summer Appointments

1. Curriculum

Summer school curriculum will be determined by projected needs, past offerings and support needs for other programs as well as general education. This may require the Chair to alter the staff from the strict rotational formula.

2. Qualifications

The courses selected for summer school should be taught by qualified personnel who have been selected using the priority and rotational systems as described below. Having taught the course previously will be one of the criteria utilized to determine qualifications.

3. Compensation

UWL summer session compensation policy can be found through this [link](#).

4. Priorities

After Department members with summer appointments are assigned their teaching responsibilities, remaining summer school teaching positions will be offered to qualified Department members using a priority system.

First priority—Those faculty and continuing academic staff **with earned doctorates** in their fields who will have completed a minimum of one and one-half year's experience at UWL by the onset of the summer session in question.

Second priority—Faculty and continuing IAS with less than one and one-half years of experience.

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 5 of this appendix will be used for staff selection.

5. Rotational System

Selection for summer teaching positions within a priority group will be determined using the last five (5) years teaching record as a basis. The summer teaching assignment will be recorded for each year with a full time assignment having a value of one (1). Those staff members having the lowest sum of fractional positions for the 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 multiple individuals who wish to teach summer school have 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 faculty and staff will not be considered for summer school positions unless their specialty requires that they teach a specific class or if no other faculty wish to teach summer school.

6. Retirement

Upon notification of intent to retire, a faculty member may request the opportunity to teach summer school during the last three years of service. This appointment will be contingent on adequate enrollment in the class taught and availability of summer school offerings.

7. 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 faculty for the upcoming academic year will not be recommended for summer session appointments. Faculty who were previously appointed for the summer session and resign may have their appointments rescinded.

G. Salary Equity Adjustment Policy.

1. 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 inequity; (2) to address inequities due to salary compression and inversion; (3) to address inequities due to individuals acquiring advanced degrees. Equity adjustments that negate past merit adjustments should not be made.

2. Process

a. Individual Inequities

Requests for individual salary equity adjustments may be initiated (1) by an individual faculty or teaching academic staff member on behalf of themselves or another individual, or (2) by the Department Chairperson on behalf of an individual.

Requests for salary equity adjustment must be submitted to the Departmental Chair in writing. Requests for salary equity adjustments must be accompanied by written rationale with supporting documentation of the inequity.

Requests for salary equity adjustment will be forwarded to the Departmental PTR Committee, which will make a recommendation whether to support the request. The Departmental Chairperson will become a member of the PTR Committee for salary equity issues.

Any PTR 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 Chair. If the Departmental Chair is being considered for a salary equity adjustment, the Chair of the Departmental PTR Committee will appoint a replacement for the Departmental Chair on the committee.

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 PTR Committee.

Cases for equity adjustments that have not been supported by the Departmental PTR 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.

Successful requests for salary equity adjustments will be announced to the Department.

b. Departmental Inequities

A request for a departmental salary equity adjustment may be initiated by the Department Chairperson or the Departmental PTR Committee.

The departmental PTR Committee will provide written rationale with supporting documentation of the inequity to the Department for consideration.

If the Department approves the Departmental salary equity adjustment, the Department Chair and Chair of the departmental PTR Committee will present the request and all supporting documentation to the Dean.

H. Procedure for Selecting the Microbiology Senior of the Year and Clinical Laboratory Science Student of the Year

These annual awards have been established by the Department of Microbiology to recognize exceptional academic achievement by senior microbiology majors and clinical laboratory science majors upon completion of coursework on the UWL campus. Awards will be given each spring.

1. Eligibility

The Microbiology Senior of the Year Award is given to a graduating senior majoring in Microbiology. The Clinical Laboratory Science Student of the Year Award is given to a clinical laboratory science student who has completed the required programmatic coursework at UWL and plans to complete the required clinical education experience in a hospital-sponsored, accredited program during his or her senior year.

Faculty will have an opportunity to nominate students for each award at a department meeting. CLS faculty advisors will discuss CLS students and bring their nomination(s) to the meeting. A list of graduating seniors majoring in Microbiology will be distributed to faculty members along with each student's overall GPA and GPA in the major. The Department will discuss the nominees before voting to select the award recipients by simple majority.

I. Procedure for Selecting Recipients of Microbiology Scholarships

The UWL Foundation will provide a list of candidates for Microbiology scholarships to the Microbiology Scholarship Committee. The Chair and members of the Microbiology Scholarship Committee will be appointed by the Department Chair.

The Microbiology Scholarship Committee will meet and discuss qualified applicants for each scholarship. The Committee will rank their top three candidates for each scholarship and supply the list to the UWL Foundation.

A list of available scholarships in the Department can be found on the UWL Foundation website.

J. Department of Microbiology Search and Screen Procedures

The Department will follow recruitment and hiring procedures prescribed by the University's Office of Human Resources in conjunction with Equity and Affirmative Action and UW System and Wisconsin state regulations.

Search and Screen Committee members will be appointed by the Department Chair.

1. Committee Responsibilities

Follow Search and Screen Procedures posted on the UWL Human Resources website for Faculty, IAS, or Non-IAS positions, as appropriate. In general, the Search and Screen Committee to conduct initial reviews of applicants and make recommendations to the whole Department for personal on-campus interviews.

Appendix I. Evaluation of the Microbiology Department Chair by the Dean

The Dean will assess the Department of Microbiology Chair's administrative effectiveness in the following areas:

1. Promoting the needs of the Department and individual faculty and staff to the College and the University administration
2. Promoting faculty and staff development of Department members
3. Communication with the college office on matters related to the Department
4. Preparation of promotion, tenure, and retention documents
5. Chairing or co-chairing search and screen committees for Departmental vacancies
6. Preparation of Departmental reports and program reviews
7. Representing the Department in various University matters and activities

The Dean will submit their score to the designated Chair of the Chair Merit Review Committee at least 24 hours prior to the merit evaluation meeting. The Dean will assign a final merit category designation from the same numerical scale (4, 3, 2, 1) used for all other Department Faculty.