

Department of Microbiology

Bylaws, Policies, and Procedures

(Adopted August 28, 2001)

Table of Contents

0.	Organization and Operation	3
0.0	Preamble	3
0.1	Meeting Guidelines	3
0.2	Definitions of Quorum and Majority	3
0.3	Proxy Votes.	3
0.4	Changes to Bylaws	3
1.	Student Rights and Obligations	4
1.1	Evaluation of Teaching	4
1.2	Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures	4
1.2.1	Grade Appeals	4
1.2.2	Academic Non-Grade Complaints, Grievances, and Appeals	4
1.3	Advisement.	4
1.4	Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct.	4
2.	Faculty Responsibilities and Expectations	5
2.1	Teaching	5
2.2	Scholarship	5
2.3	Service	5
3.	Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations	6
3.1	Academic Staff Appointments	6
3.2	Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Privileges.	6
3.2.1	Teaching	6
3.2.2	Scholarship	6
3.2.3	Service	7
3.2.4	Faculty Status	7
3.3	Non-Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Privileges	7
4.	Adjunct Faculty Responsibilities and Expectations	8
4.1	Adjunct Faculty Appointments	8
4.2	Privileges and Responsibilities	8
5.	Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)	9
5.1	Evaluation Process	9
5.1.1	Evaluation of Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff	9
5.1.2	Evaluation of the Department Chair	11
5.1.3	Evaluation of Non-instructional Academic Staff	11
5.1.4	Evaluation of Program Directors	12
5.2	Evaluation Criteria	12
5.2.1	Evaluation Criteria for Faculty	12
5.2.2	Evaluation Criteria for the Department Chair	14
5.2.3	Evaluation Criteria for Instructional Academic Staff	14
5.2.4	Evaluation Criteria for Non-Instructional Academic Staff	16
5.2.5	Evaluation Criteria for Program Directors	16
5.3	Distribution of Merit Funds	16
5.4	Appeals	16
5.4.1	Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff	16
5.4.2	Non-instructional Academic Staff	16
5.4.3	Program Directors	17

6.	Retention and Tenure Decisions	18
6.1	Review Process	18
6.2	Evaluation Criteria	19
6.3	Reconsideration of Retention and Tenure Recommendations	19
7.	Post-tenure Review	20
7.1	Review Criteria	20
7.2	Review Process	20
7.3	Faculty Development Plan	22
8.	Promotion Recommendations	23
8.1	Review Process	23
8.2	Evaluation Criteria	24
8.3	Reconsideration of the Promotion Recommendation	24
9.	Governance	25
9.1	Election of the Department Chair.	25
9.2	Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair	25
9.3	Standing Departmental Committees	26

Appendices

Appendix A.	Student Evaluation of Instruction.	27
Appendix B.	Procedures for Handling Student Academic Misconduct	34
Appendix C.	Distribution of Annual Pay Package	35
Appendix D.	Annual Activity Report Form	39
Appendix E.	Evaluation of Teaching by Probationary Faculty, Instructional Academic Staff, And Tenured Faculty being evaluated for Post Tenure Review	40
Appendix F.	Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report Form	42
Appendix G.	Policies on Release Time	43
Appendix H.	Summer School Policies	44
Appendix I.	Teaching by Adjunct Faculty.	46
Appendix J.	Salary Equity Adjustment Policy	47
Appendix K.	Procedure for Selecting the Microbiology Senior of the Year	48
Appendix L.	Procedures for Selecting Recipients of the Microbiology Scholarships	49
Appendix M.	Hiring Procedures	50
Appendix N.	Evaluation of the Department Chair by the Dean	55

0. Organization and Operation.

0.0 Preamble

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

0.1 Meeting Guidelines

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

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

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

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

0.2 Definitions of Quorum and Majority.

For meetings of the Department and its Committees, a quorum is defined as the majority of the entire Membership eligible to participate. Within a meeting, a majority or other proportion of votes required to pass a motion is based on the number of Members voting in the affirmative and negative and does not include Members abstaining from voting.

0.3 Proxy Votes

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

0.4 Changes to Bylaws

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

1. Student Rights and Obligations

1.1 Evaluation of Teaching

In each of the courses offered by the Department (except seminars, forums, and independent study courses), students will have an opportunity to evaluate their instructors. This evaluation will take place during the last two weeks of a semester and will utilize the Department Student Evaluation Forms (the Student Evaluation Forms for lectures and laboratories are in Appendix A). The evaluation will be administered by another faculty or teaching academic staff member at the beginning of the class. The instructor being evaluated should not appear in the classroom until the evaluation has been completed. Any staff member not administering student evaluations will receive an Unsatisfactory Performance Rating (U) in the teaching category of the Merit Evaluation (see Section 5—Merit Evaluation).

1.2 Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedure

1.2.1 Grade Appeals. Students who believe that the grade they received for a course does not reflect their performance in that course may appeal the disputed grade. This appeal must take place before the end of the semester immediately following the semester in which the grade was recorded. The student should first discuss this disputed grade with the instructor. If a student-instructor meeting is not possible, or if such a meeting does not result in a resolution of the dispute, the student should contact the Department Chair. After meeting with the student, the Chair will discuss the student concern with the instructor, if possible. Following these meetings, the Chair will make a recommendation to the instructor regarding the grade dispute.

After the Chair's recommendation and the instructor's response, a student may file a written appeal for a grade change, with the Department Chair. Upon receipt of the written request, the Chair will form an *ad hoc* committee consisting of three department members, not including the Chair or the instructor, to review the appeal. This committee may request additional information from the student and the instructor before forming and forwarding its recommendation to the instructor. Any decision to change a 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.

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

1.3 Advisement

Each student who majors in Microbiology will be assigned a faculty advisor in the Department. Students are required to meet with their faculty advisor at least once each semester to discuss their academic progress, career interests, and course schedules.

1.4 Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct

Students who enroll in courses offered by the Microbiology Department are expected to attend and participate in these classes. They are expected to devote sufficient non-class time to complete all class assignments in a timely manner and to undertake additional study of the material as necessary to demonstrate satisfactory mastery of the material. Academic misconduct by students will not be tolerated. Types of misconduct and associated penalties are presented in Appendix B (Department of Microbiology Procedures for Handling Student Academic Misconduct). Appeal procedures for student academic misconduct are the same as for any other grade appeal (see Section 1.2.1).

2. Faculty Responsibilities and Expectations

2.1 Teaching

Teaching excellence is expected of all faculty in the Microbiology Department 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 matter area and to work to improve student learning (see section 5.2.1 for examples of teaching activities). They are also expected to offer additional time to address student questions by holding office hours. Office hours and other course details should be part of the course syllabus shared with students at the beginning of a course. In addition, faculty are expected to grade and return student assignments, including examinations, in a timely fashion. Finally, faculty are required to allow student evaluation of instruction in each course they teach (except seminars, forums, and independent study courses). See Section 5.2.1 for additional activities to enhance teaching.

Faculty workloads shall average no more than 12 contact hours per semester (24 per academic year) as dictated by the UW-La Crosse Faculty Handbook. Contact hour loads may be less than 12 hours per semester (but shall average at least nine hours per semester) for faculty involved in the following activities:

- Development of new courses or laboratory curricula
- Direct supervision of undergraduate research (MIC 29, MIC 489, MIC 499)
- Direct supervision of graduate student research (MIC 721, MIC 799)
- Heavy advising loads (a number of advisees in excess of the average number of students per faculty member)

2.2 Scholarship

Faculty in the Microbiology Department are expected to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship. The Department's definition of scholarship (Section 5.2.1) includes conducting original research in one's discipline, publishing primary literature articles, reviews, or books in the discipline or in applications of the discipline. Original curriculum development or research in educational pedagogy in microbiology also constitute scholarship. Presentations in these areas at professional meetings, and in other appropriate forums, is an important part of scholarship. In addition, writing successful grant proposals to support any of these activities is an important area of scholarship.

2.3 Service

Faculty of the Microbiology Department are expected to serve the University, the public, and their profession. This service can take the form of participating in Departmental and University committees, student advising, organizing workshops and symposia, offering specialized advice to off-campus groups, and joining and participating in the activities of professional societies in their discipline (see Section 5.2.1 for examples of service activities).

3. Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations

3.1 Academic Staff Appointments

Academic Staff appointments may take many forms, including instructional, non-instructional, and combined instructional/non-instructional appointments. Instructional appointments usually used in academic departments are the *Lecture series* and *Clinical Professor series*. Non-instructional appointments include Laboratory Managers and Research Associates. Specific expectations of a member of the Academic Staff are stated in the contract letter *and position description*.

3.2 Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Privileges.

3.2.1 Teaching. Teaching excellence is expected of instructional academic staff in the Microbiology Department and teaching activities shall constitute at least 75% of evaluations for merit and retention. Lecturers in the Microbiology Department are expected to keep current in their subject matter area and to work to improve student learning (see Section 5.2.3 for examples of teaching activities). They are also expected to offer additional time to address student questions by holding office hours and review sessions. Office hours and other course details should be part of the course syllabus shared with students at the beginning of a course. In addition, lecturers are expected to grade and return student assignments, including examinations, in a timely fashion. Lecturers are required to allow student evaluation of instruction in each course they teach (except seminars, forums, and independent study courses).

The Department Chair shall appoint two faculty members each year (at least one of which must be tenured) to serve as classroom evaluators (Peer Evaluators) for all new Instructional Academic Staff. Instructional Academic Staff 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 E). Additional evaluations may be done if recommended by the Retention and Tenure Committee.

Full time instructional academic staff 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 lecturers involved in the following activities:

- Development of new courses or laboratory curricula
- Teaching upper level courses with significant writing components
- Assuming primary responsibility for coordination of and purchasing supplies for instructional laboratories with multiple sections
- Student advising

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).

3.2.2 Professional Development. Instructional academic staff in the Microbiology Department do not have the scholarship expectations of faculty, but are expected to stay current in their disciplines and engage in professional development. The Department's definition of professional development for instructional academic staff (see Section 5.2.3) includes engaging in a program of self study to enhance professional competence through participation in workshops, scientific and educational meetings, and reading current literature. Additional areas of professional development, which are encouraged but not required, include research in microbiology or

educational pedagogy, publishing results of such research, presentations in these areas at professional meetings, and writing grant proposals.

3.2.3 Service. Instructional academic staff in the Microbiology Department are expected to serve the University, the public, and their profession. This service can take the form of participating in Departmental 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 5.2.3 for examples of service activities).

3.2.4 Faculty Status. Instructional Academic Staff with at least a 50% appointment and who have worked in the Department for at least four consecutive years in a budgeted academic staff position are granted Faculty Status. Academic Staff with Faculty Status have the right to vote in all departmental matters including the election of the Department Chair, but excluding retention, tenure, and promotion. Temporary instructional academic staff replacing faculty on leave do not have voting rights in the department.

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 3.2.1).

3.3 Non-Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Privileges.

The expectations of non-instructional academic staff vary depending on the type of position. Specific job expectations will be identified in the appointment letter for each non-instructional academic staff member.

4. Adjunct Faculty Responsibilities and Expectations

4.1 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 vita 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 SAH. If approved, the Dean writes a letter of appointment to Adjunct Faculty status to the individual. The appointment may include Adjunct Graduate Faculty status if the individual meets the requirements for graduate faculty and makes a separate application to the Graduate Council. New adjunct faculty will be asked to present a department seminar within the first year of their appointment. Adjunct faculty status will be reviewed every five years to ensure adjunct faculty are actively involved in the department.

4.2 Privileges and Responsibilities.

Adjunct Faculty may teach and/or team-teach courses that have been approved by the Department Curriculum Committee (Appendix I, Teaching by Adjunct Faculty). 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 Biology (Microbiology or Clinical Microbiology Concentrations). 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 (SEI) 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 E) during the first two times that a course is offered. Additional peer evaluations may be required if deemed necessary by the department.

If individuals outside the department teach a departmental course, but are not adjunct faculty, they must also conduct student evaluation of instruction and undergo peer evaluations.

5. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)

5.1 Evaluation Process

Consistent with UWS 3.05 and UW L 3.05, the performance of all Faculty, Instructional Academic Staff, and Non-Instructional Instructional Academic Staff in the Microbiology Department will complete an Annual Activity Report and be reviewed annually. The only 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. The Annual Evaluation serves as a vehicle for self evaluation and shall offer an opportunity for future goal setting and improvement as necessary.

Early in the fall semester, the Department Chair, working with the Merit Review Advisory Committee, will use the completed Annual Activity Report, Student Evaluation Information (for Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff), 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 section 5.2.

5.1.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff. The areas of review for Faculty include teaching, scholarship and service. Areas of review for Instructional Academic Staff include teaching, professional development, and service. Expectations in these areas are different for Instructional Academic Staff than for Faculty Members (see section 3.2). This may result in different Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designations for Instructional Academic Staff than for Faculty Members with the a similar level of accomplishments.

Early in the Fall semester, the Department Chair shall provide each individual with a copy of an Annual Activity Report form (see Appendix D). Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff shall submit their completed Annual Activity Reports, containing a description of activities for the year ending May 31 of the current year. This completed Report and student evaluations will constitute the basis of the annual review and serve as a vehicle for self evaluation. In the case of Probationary Faculty, Peer Evaluation of Teaching (see section 6.1 and Appendix E) will also be used in the annual review.

Faculty and Continuing Instructional Academic Staff members who are on professional leave are required to submit a completed Annual Activity Report, which describes their leave and other professional activities. Faculty and Continuing Instructional Academic Staff 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.

All Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff *with faculty status* will form the Department Merit Review Advisory Committee, which shall be chaired by the department Chair. To be a voting member of the Committee, an individual must be on staff at the time of the evaluation and have been employed at least one semester prior to the evaluation period. First year faculty 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 member of the Merit Review Advisory Committee shall evaluate the Annual Activity Reports of all other Faculty and Instructional Staff and 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 are determined as follows:

- E = *Exceptional***—Department Member has made several exceptional contributions in an area of performance far exceeding minimal expectations.
- G = *Good***—Department Member has made one or more significant contributions in an area of performance.
- S = *Satisfactory***—Department Member has made a satisfactory contribution in an area of performance.
- U = *Unsatisfactory***—Department Member has made an unsatisfactory contribution in an area of performance.

Failure to record an entry in any of the evaluation 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 member evaluated. Definitions of the Merit Category Designations are as follows:

Category 4: Exceptionally meritorious. Individuals who have 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. Individuals who have 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. Individuals who have 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. Individuals who have been judged delinquent in their duties, or have 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 evaluations 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 randomized to insure anonymity of the evaluators and presented to the committee for discussion. 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).

The committee will discuss the Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designations of each Department Member being evaluated (the member being evaluated will be asked to leave the room

during the discussion). When the committee has concluded discussions of each member, a Committee Member will have one working day to change evaluations and resubmit them to the Committee Chair. If at this time any committee member changes a Merit Category Designation to 1, the committee must reconvene to discuss the rationale for this type of change, i.e., a change of a Merit Category Designation to 1 must be made known at a meeting of the Merit Review 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 his/her Merit Category Designation, including Performance Ratings in each of the areas of faculty responsibility. The Department Chair will transmit to any Department Member who received a U the written rationale for the determination of the U--the confidentiality of the evaluator will be maintained. Any other written comments will also be provided.

5.1.2 Evaluation of the Department Chair. The Merit Review Advisory Committee, with substantial input from the Dean, is responsible for evaluation of the Department Chair. The 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 his/her communication, cooperation, and compliance with the Administration (Appendix N). 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 his/her activities related to these responsibilities on the Annual Activity Report. The Dean will be invited to attend the Merit Review Advisory Committee meeting for the discussion of the Chair evaluation. An appointed tenured faculty member will chair the Chair Evaluation Committee and, working with the Dean, will notify the Department Chair in writing of his/her Merit Category Designation and Performance Ratings in each area of evaluation within seven days of the review.

5.1.3 Evaluation of Non-instructional Academic Staff. The annual evaluation process for Non-instructional Academic Staff is different from that of Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff and will be conducted by a Special Merit Review Advisory Committee appointed by the Department Chair. A specific set of evaluation guidelines and criteria will be established for each Non-instructional Academic Staff Member. The guidelines should conform as closely as possible to those for Instructional Staff and will contain evaluation categories reflecting each individual's job description. For each individual being evaluated, members of the Special 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 individual's evaluation guidelines and ii) a Merit Category Designation (4 = Exceptionally Meritorious, 3 = Significantly Meritorious, 2 = Meritorious, or 1 = No Merit). The Chair of the Special Review Advisory Committee will transmit the results of the evaluation to the Department Chair who will, within seven working days of the

review, notify (in writing) each Non-instructional Academic Staff Member of his/her Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designation.

5.1.4 Evaluation of Program Directors. Directors of programs affiliated with the Department of Microbiology 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 (consisting of all faculty and instructional academic staff). Directors that 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 that 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 his/her Merit Category Designation, including Performance Ratings in each of the areas of the director's responsibility.

5.2 Evaluation Criteria

Faculty, Instructional Academic Staff, and Non-Instructional Academic Staff each have different responsibilities (see sections 5.2.1, 5.2.2 and 5.3.3) and thus are evaluated on different criteria. The criteria are designed to promote continued professional growth and improvement in each department member.

5.2.1 Evaluation Criteria for Faculty. Faculty are evaluated in the areas teaching, scholarship, and service. 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.

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 on 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 and faculty undergoing post-tenure review will also undergo Peer Evaluations based on classroom visitations by other faculty. 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 he/she is being considered for retention or tenure) (see Section 6.1 and Appendix E). Faculty are also encouraged to include other measures of teaching effectiveness in their Annual Evaluation Form such as course evaluations, alumni surveys, etc.

Scholarship. As stated in Section 2.2 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:

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

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

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.

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*

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 the 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 and workshops
- Service to local, regional and national scientific societies
- Holding office in a scientific society
- Serving on committees of scientific societies
- Memberships in scientific societies

Faculty are expected to report their service activities on the Annual Evaluation Form.

5.2.2 Evaluation Criteria for the Department Chair

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, Instructional Academic Staff, Non-instructional Academic Staff, 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-instructional academic staff members

The Chair is expected to report his/her activities related to these responsibilities on the Annual Activity Report. The Dean will be invited to attend the Merit Review Advisory Committee meeting for the discussion of the Chair evaluation.

5.2.3 Evaluation Criteria for Instructional Academic Staff. Instructional Academic Staff are evaluated in the areas teaching, professional development, and service. The criteria used to evaluate the annual performance of each Instructional Academic Staff member are designed to evaluate effective teaching, professional development, and service. Of the areas of Instructional Academic Staff responsibility, teaching is weighted as the most important and should constitute at least 75% of the final evaluation.

Teaching. In the area of teaching, Instructional Academic Staff are expected to motivate and challenge students to learn by using various pedagogical devices or techniques and by setting well-defined expectations. It is assumed that student assignments and examinations will be reviewed and graded in a timely manner and that student achievement will be appropriately assessed. Instructional Academic Staff are expected to keep current in their subject matter areas, to update the curriculum, to assess the effects of their teaching techniques, and to 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 on the Annual Activity Report.

Student evaluations given in each of the courses taught will also be used as one measure to judge teaching effectiveness. Instructional Academic Staff 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 he/she is being considered for retention or tenure) (see Section 6.1 and Appendix E). Instructional Academic Staff are also encouraged to include other measures of teaching effectiveness in their Annual Evaluation Form such as course evaluations, alumni surveys, etc.

Professional Development. As stated in Section 3.2 of the Department Bylaws, Instructional Academic Staff 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. Instructional Academic Staff 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

Instructional Academic Staff are expected to report their professional development activities and accomplishments on the Annual Activity Report.

Service. The service component of a Instructional Academic Staff 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 Instructional Academic Staff includes the same items listed for Faculty (Section 5.2.1).

Instructional Academic Staff are expected to report their service activities on the Annual Evaluation Form.

5.2.4 Evaluation Criteria for Non-instructional Academic Staff. The Evaluation Criteria used in the Microbiology Department to evaluate each Non-instructional Academic Staff Member are based on each individual's job description and are designed to promote effective performance of the job responsibilities. The Evaluation Criteria and their relative importance will be contained in the special evaluation guidelines established for each individual.

5.2.5 Evaluation Criteria for Program Directors. The Evaluation Criteria used in the Microbiology Department 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.

5.3 Distribution of Merit Funds

The distribution of the annual pay package is described in Appendix C (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 C. All Department members (Faculty, Instructional Academic Staff, and Non-instructional Academic Staff) who earned Merit Category Designations of 4, 3, or 2 (Exceptionally Meritorious, Significantly Meritorious, or Meritorious) are eligible for merit funds. The pool of merit funds for Academic Staff is separate from the faculty pool.

5.4 Appeals

5.4.1 Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff. A Faculty or Instructional Academic Staff Member may request a reconsideration of his/her 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 his/her 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 Committees 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 SAH 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.E of the Faculty Senate Bylaws).

5.4.2 Non-instructional Academic Staff. Non-instructional Academic Staff Members may request a reconsideration of their Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designations. This request must be made in writing to the Department Chair within one week of the distribution of the Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designation by the Department Chair. The Chair of the appropriate

Special Merit Review Advisory Committee will convene a meeting to consider the appeal within one week after notification of the appeal. To change the original Merit Category Designation, at least 55% of the votes of the Special Merit Review Advisory Committee must be in favor of the change. The Committee shall transmit its findings to the Department Chair who will transmit the appeal decision to the appellant within three working days after the reconsideration meeting.

If the appellant is not satisfied with the outcome of the reconsideration by the Special Merit Review Advisory Committee, he/she may appeal to the Department of Microbiology acting as a Committee-of-the-Whole (defined here as all Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff with faculty status). The rest of the appeal process is the same as that for Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff (see section 5.4.1).

5.4.3 Program Directors. Program directors that are not faculty or academic staff may request a reconsideration of their Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designations. This request must be made in writing to the Department Chair within one week of the distribution of the Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designation by the Department Chair. The Chair will convene a meeting of the Committee-of-the-Whole to consider the appeal 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 must be in favor of the change. The Department Chair will transmit the results of the action of the reconsideration meeting within three working days after this meeting.

6. Retention and Tenure Decisions.

6.1 Review Process

The Retention & Tenure Review Committee shall consist of all tenured members of the Microbiology Department. In cases where a Committee consists of fewer than three Faculty Members, the Department Chair shall work with the Dean to establish an appropriate committee, which will use the Microbiology Department Guidelines. The Department Chair shall serve as Chair of the Retention and Tenure Committee. If the Department Chair is a candidate for retention or tenure, the Department Retention and Tenure Review Committee shall elect one of its tenured members as Chair of the Retention and Tenure Committee. For each Probationary Faculty Member, the Department Chair shall appoint two faculty members (at least one of which must be tenured) each of the first two years to serve as classroom evaluators (Peer Evaluators), who will be responsible for producing the Peer Evaluation Information required for Probationary Faculty in Section 5.2 of these Bylaws (see Appendix E).

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 E). Additional evaluations may be done if recommended by the Retention and Tenure Committee.

Retention and tenure reviews are usually conducted fall semester. Exceptions are: (1) first-year faculty who begin in fall semester are reviewed in spring semester and (2) second-year faculty are reviewed in both semesters. At least 20 days prior to the Annual Retention Review, the Department Chair will notify each Probationary Faculty Member in writing of the time and date of the review meeting. The Department Chair will also instruct candidates for retention to submit a recent copy of their Annual Activity Report, a current curriculum vita, and any supplemental materials they deem appropriate to the Chair of the Retention & Tenure Review Committee at least seven days prior to the date of the review. The Chair of the Retention & Tenure Committee will supply the results of student evaluations and peer evaluation of teaching (if appropriate) for each Probationary Faculty Member to the Retention & Tenure Committee. Probationary Faculty Members may also make oral or written presentations at the review meeting. The requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meeting law shall apply to the review meetings; however, the meeting may be converted to a closed session (see section 0.1 Meeting Guidelines).

During the year of the tenure decision, the candidate will submit (i) an activity report summarizing their accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service since arriving at UW-L, (ii) a current curriculum vita, and (iii) any supplementary materials the candidate deems appropriate. The chair of the Retention and Tenure Committee will supply a summary of teaching and merit evaluations for each year and copies of peer evaluation of teaching.

Using the criteria in Section 5.2 of these Bylaws, the Retention & Tenure Review Committee shall evaluate each Probationary Faculty Member's performance based on all submitted information. At the meeting, a faculty member selected by the Department Chair will present an oral summary of the candidate's performance. After further discussion of a candidate's performance, votes shall be cast by a show of hands on a motion to retain/tenure the candidate. At least a two-thirds majority is necessary for a positive retention/tenure recommendation. The results of the vote shall be recorded by the Chair of the Retention & Tenure Committee. In the case of a recommendation for non-renewal, the Committee shall prepare written reasons for its decision. These reasons shall be retained by the Chair of the Retention & Tenure Committee in case they are requested by the Probationary Faculty Member. Within seven days of the review meeting, each Probationary Faculty Member shall be informed in writing by the Committee Chair of the results of the retention review. Even in the case of a recommendation for retention/tenure, the written notice may include concerns identified by the Committee and suggestions formulated by the Committee for improvement.

6.2 Evaluation Criteria

Members of the Retention & Tenure Review Committee shall use all submitted information to judge each Probationary Faculty Member's performance in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Service (see Section 5.2 for activities to be considered in these areas). Of these areas of responsibility, teaching is most important and must be weighted at least 50%; however, service and a program of continued scholarship are necessary to earn recommendations for retention and, ultimately, for tenure.

6.3 Reconsideration of Retention and Tenure Recommendations

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

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

7. Post-tenure Review Process

Every five years, the performance of each tenured Faculty Member is reviewed by the Post-tenure Review Committee to evaluate their performance in each of the areas of faculty responsibility (teaching, scholarship, and service). All Faculty who have been tenured for five years will be reviewed during the first possible review period and every five years thereafter. Faculty who have been tenured less than five years will be reviewed after their fifth year of tenure and every five years thereafter. Faculty being reviewed will be notified in writing at the at the start of the academic year when the evaluation will occur. The review will be held in April of the year being evaluated. The Department Chair will send the College Dean a list of tenured department members and the years in which they are to be reviewed.

7.1 Review Criteria

The post-tenure review will be based on the following criteria:

- a) A five-year activity report detailing activities in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service in the format of the Annual Activity Reports.
- b) The results of the annual review for the five preceding years. The performance ratings of individuals (Excellent [E], Good [G], Satisfactory [S], or Unsatisfactory [U]) in each category of evaluation (teaching, scholarship, and service) and the overall evaluation (1, 2, 3, or 4) in each of the five years of the review period shall be considered.
- c) Peer evaluation of classroom teaching. Two peer evaluators will be appointed by the Department Chair who will each conduct one classroom evaluation (see Appendix E) each semester during the year the tenured faculty member is being reviewed.

7.2 Review Process

The Faculty will form the Department Post Tenure Review Committee, which shall be chaired by the department Chair. If the department Chair is undergoing post-tenure review, a committee Chair shall be appointed by the dean. Each member of the Post Tenure Review Committee shall evaluate the 5-year Activity Report and peer evaluation of teaching reports of the faculty member(s) being reviewed and provide a Performance Rating (E = Exceptional, G = Good, S = Satisfactory, or U = Unsatisfactory) in each of the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Performance ratings are determined as follows:

E = *Exceptional*: Department Member has made several exceptional contributions in an area of performance far exceeding minimal expectations.

G = *Good*: Department Member has made one or more significant contributions in an area of performance.

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

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

Failure to record an entry in any of the evaluation areas (Teaching, Scholarship or Service) in the Post Tenure Review Activity Report 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 Post Tenure Review Committee will assign an overall Post-tenure Review Category Designation (4 = Exceptionally Meritorious; 3 = Significantly Meritorious; 2 = Meritorious; or 1 = Unsatisfactory Performance) for each member evaluated. Definitions of the Post-tenure Review Category Designations are as follows:

Category 4: Exceptionally meritorious. Individuals who have 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. Individuals who have 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, and Service.

Category 2: Meritorious. Individuals who have fulfilled responsibilities in Teaching, as well as having made some contributions in each of the areas of Scholarship and Service.

Category 1: Unsatisfactory Performance. Individuals who have been judged delinquent in their duties, or have not submitted an evaluation form.

The Department Chair will construct a matrix of Performance Ratings and Post-tenure Review Category Designations for the department member(s) being evaluated. The matrix data will be randomized to insure anonymity of the evaluators and presented to the committee for discussion. 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).

The Post Tenure Review Committee will discuss the Performance Ratings and Post-tenure Review Category Designations of the department member(s) being evaluated. When the committee has concluded discussions, a Committee member will have one working day to change their evaluation and resubmit to the Committee Chair. If at this time any Committee member changes a Post-tenure Review Category Designation to 1, the Committee must reconvene to discuss the rationale for this type of change, i.e., a change of a Post-tenure Review Category Designation to 1 must be made known at a meeting of the Post-tenure Review Committee. **All discussions and the evaluations determined by the Post Tenure Review Committee are to remain strictly confidential.**

The Department Chair will then determine the Post Tenure Review Category Designation for the department member(s) being evaluated. To receive a Post-tenure Review Category Designation of 1, a Department Member must have received that Category Designation from at least 55% of the total evaluating members or have not submitted an evaluation form. To receive a Post-tenure Review Category Designation of 3, a Department Member must receive a Category Designation of 3 or 4 from at least 60% of the total evaluating members. To receive a Post-tenure Review Category Designation of 4, a Department Member must receive that Category Designation from at least 55% of the evaluating members. If the department member being reviewed does not receive a 1, 3, or 4 designation, they will receive a Post-tenure Review Category Designation of 2.

Within seven days of the review, the Department Chair shall notify (in writing) the department member(s) of his/her Post-tenure Review Category Designation, including Performance Ratings in each of the areas of faculty responsibility. If any performance evaluations of a “U” are given, the Department Chair will transmit to the department member(s) being evaluated 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.

Faculty receiving a Post Tenure Review evaluation of Meritorious (2) or higher will receive a favorable review. Faculty receiving a Post-tenure Review evaluation of Significantly Meritorious (3) will be recommended for an additional \$1000 merit pay increase. Faculty receiving a Post-tenure Review evaluation of Exceptionally Meritorious (4) will be recommended for an additional \$2000 merit pay increase.

Faculty receiving a Post Tenure evaluation of Unsatisfactory Performance (1) rating shall be given written notification within seven days after determination of the rating. The written notice will include (1) the reasons for the rating and (2) notification of the date of a meeting with the Faculty Development Plan Committee (FDPC).

7.3 Faculty Development Plan

The Faculty Development Plan Committee (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 the Evaluation Criteria of concern 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 shall have two (2) Annual Evaluation periods (i.e., two years) to remedy the areas of concern. The FDPC 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 FDPC will meet with the Faculty Member under review and attempt to resolve the insufficient remediation for the areas of concern. If the FDPC and the Faculty Member under review cannot resolve the inability to remedy the areas of concern, the results of the Tenured Faculty Review 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 correspondences 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 he/she submits 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 Allied Health.

8. Promotion Recommendations

8.1 Review Process

Before the end of spring semester each year, lists of faculty who will meet the minimum University eligibility requirements for promotion in the coming academic year are distributed by the Dean to the Department Chair. These lists will be reviewed for accuracy by the Department Chair. At this time, the Department Chair will notify in writing faculty members who are eligible for promotion and, upon request, will provide eligible faculty a Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report Form (see Appendix F), copies of the University and Departmental guidelines on promotion, and information on the provisions of the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law.

The Promotion Recommendation Committee shall consist of 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 he/she (1) is not tenured and/or (2) is being considered for promotion. If the Department Chair cannot serve as Chair of the Promotion Recommendation Committee, he/she shall convene the Committee during the first week of classes in fall semester to elect (by simple majority) a Chair for a one-year term.

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

Faculty who are eligible and wish to be considered for promotion must submit a completed Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report Form and vita to the Department Chair at least seven days prior to the date of the promotion consideration meeting. The Department Chair will make these materials and student evaluation information available to members of the Promotion Recommendation Committee prior to the promotion consideration meeting. Faculty may submit other written materials or make an oral presentation at the promotion consideration meeting. In addition, any Member of the Promotion Recommendation 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. All testimony must be written and related to items that relate to areas addressed by the Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report Form. The requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meeting law shall apply to this meeting (see Section 0.1 Meeting Guidelines).

At the meeting, a faculty member selected by the Department Chair will present an oral summary of the candidate's performance with respect to the Evaluation Criteria in Section 5.2. After further discussion, votes shall be cast by a show of hands on a motion to promote for each promotion candidate. At least a two-thirds majority is necessary for a positive promotion recommendation. The results of the vote shall be recorded by the Committee Chair and entered on the Committee's portion of the Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report Form. The Committee shall prepare written reasons for each of its recommendations.

Within seven days of the promotion consideration meeting, the Department Chair shall notify each candidate of the Committee's recommendation and the reasons for that recommendation. For positive recommendations, the Committee Chair shall include a letter of recommendation on behalf of the Committee as part of the Faculty Promotion Evaluation form. With these materials, the Department Chair shall also transmit in writing his/her recommendation to the Dean. A copy of this letter shall be provided to the candidate at least one day prior to the submission of the promotion file to the Dean.

8.2 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 5.2.1 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.

8.3 Reconsideration of the Promotion Recommendation

Within two weeks of receiving the written reasons for non-promotion, a candidate may request, by writing to the Department Chair, reconsideration by the Promotion Recommendation Committee. The faculty member 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 faculty member speaking on the individual's behalf at the reconsideration meeting.

9. Governance

9.1 Election of the Department Chair

Specific details of the selection process are contained in Faculty Senate Bylaw VII: 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 Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff Members with Faculty Status (as defined in Section 3.2.4) 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 PRS Committee will send a call for announcement of candidacy to all tenured faculty. During the first week of classes in the spring semester, the Chair of the PRS Committee 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 PRS Committee 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 Bylaw VII: The Selection of Department Chairpersons.

9.2 Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair

A thorough listing of the Chair's responsibilities is contained in Faculty Senate Bylaw VI: Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons (Appendix 8.6). These duties include:

- 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, Instructional Academic Staff, Non-instructional Academic Staff, and Classified Staff)
- Preparation of promotion, tenure, and retention documents
- 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-instructional academic staff members

The Department Chair shall be granted a 0.5 release provided that the department consists of a minimum of 10 faculty and academic staff. The Department Chair shall also receive a partial summer appointment (0.33 to 0.40) for conducting the responsibilities of the Chair.

9.3 Standing Departmental Committees

The following are standing Department Committees. The Chair may appoint additional *ad hoc* committees as needed. Additional standing committees may be established by a two thirds vote of the department.

Assessment Committee
Graduate Committee**
Library liaison
Merit Review Advisory Committee (Instructional Staff)*
Special Merit Review Advisory Committee (Non-instructional Staff)*
MIC 100 Committee
MIC 230 Committee
Promotion, Tenure, and Retention Committee
Social Committee
Speakers Committee

* = Committee of the Whole

** = Joint Committee with the Department of Biology

Issues related to curriculum and budget will be dealt with by a committee of the whole.

Any committee action that is to be presented to the Department in the form of a motion must be made known (by posted announcement) to the rest of the Department at least 48 hours prior to the Department meeting at which the vote will be taken. At this time, a summary of the motion and supporting rationale must also be made available in the department office for review by all Department Faculty. 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.

Appendix A. Student Evaluation of Instruction

This appendix includes instructions for conducting Student Evaluation of Instruction and Evaluation forms for lecture and laboratory classes. Student Evaluation of Instruction may be administered any time during the last two weeks of class and must be administered by a faculty or instructional academic staff member.

In addition to the formal Student Evaluation of Instruction, instructors are encouraged to invite students to evaluate their course. In this case, the instructor can create a form that is tailored specifically to their course. This type of evaluation is informal and is to be used by instructors to obtain feedback from students concerning lecture content, pace, suitability and value of laboratory exercises and reports, etc. Instructors can then review the evaluations as a means of self/course improvement. The evaluations can be administered up to midterm and then again after the formal Student Evaluation of Instruction has been administered in the final two weeks of the semester.

Instructions to Faculty Administering Evaluations:

1. Write the last name of the instructor, the class (MIC XXX), and the section (001, L52, etc.) on the board.
2. Read the following instructions to the class prior to administering the evaluation.
3. Hand out one evaluation and one computer score sheet per student. Note that a separate evaluation is used in laboratory sections. Hand out #2 pencils to any students that need one.
4. When done, have students hand in the computer sheets **upside down**. Hand in the evaluation form separately. Place the scored computer sheets in a manila envelope, sign your name, and date. The computer center will not accept score sheets if any unused sheets remain in the envelope.
5. Hand in the envelope containing the evaluations to the departmental secretary **personally**. Place the evaluation form, this page, and unused computer score sheets in appropriate boxes in the department office.

Instructions to Students:

The items that appear on this form are designed to describe the qualities and behaviors of good teachers. We ask that you be objective and fair. Your responses should evaluate the **teacher's ability to stimulate student learning** and not the course content.

Filling out the evaluation form is optional. If you choose to complete the form, do not sign your name and please answer all items. The results **will not** be made available to your instructor until after the final grades for this course are completed.

On the computer score sheet provided, use a **#2 pencil** to write your instructor's name, the course number, and section number. Without this information, your evaluation cannot be scored.

Department of Microbiology
Student Evaluation of Lecture Instruction
(amended 11-21-01)

The items that appear on this form are designed to describe qualities and behaviors of good teachers. Student evaluation of instruction should be taken seriously, because your input is used in making decisions that affect improvement of teaching, retention, promotion, tenure, and salary adjustments. Careful thought should be given to each item. Please be objective and fair. Your responses should evaluate the **teacher's ability to stimulate student learning** and not the course content.

Filling out the evaluation form is optional. If you choose to complete the form, do not sign your name and please answer all items. After these evaluations are collected, they will be sealed in an envelope and tabulated at the Computer Center. The results **will not** be made available to your instructor until after the final grades for this course are completed.

On the computer score sheet provided, use a #2 pencil to write your instructor's name, the course number, and section number. Evaluate him/her on each of the following attributes using the keys provided above each question or set of questions.

Student Data		
1. Student classification:		
A. Freshman	C. Junior	E. Graduate or special student
B. Sophomore	D. Senior	
2. Reasons for taking the course		
A. General education	C. Required in minor	
B. Required in major	D. Elective	
3. What grade do you expect from this course?		
A. A	C. B	E. D/F
B. AB	D. BC/C	

Course Organization and Planning				
A = Strongly Agree	B = Agree	C = Neither Agree nor disagree	D = Disagree	E = Strongly disagree
4. Instructor clearly conveyed course content, expectations, and the grading policy.				

A = Always	B = Almost always	C = Frequently	D = Sometimes	E = Occasionally
5. Instructor returns lecture assignments, quizzes, and exams within an appropriate amount of time (Note: essay exams, lab reports, and papers may take a week or more to grade).				

Clarity and Communication Skills

A = Always **B = Almost always** **C = Frequently** **D = Sometimes** **E = Occasionally**

- 6. Instructor communicates subject matter in a well-organized manner.
- 7. Instructor demonstrates a command of the subject matter.
- 8. Instructor demonstrates the importance and significance of the course content.

A = Strongly Agree **B = Agree** **C = Neither Agree
nor Disagree** **D = Disagree** **E = Strongly
disagree**

- 9. Instructor satisfactorily answers questions raised in class.
- 10. Instructor finds ways to help students answer their own questions.
- 11. Instructor provides constructive criticism promoting improvement of student learning.

Teacher-Student Interaction

A = Always **B = Missed once** **C = Missed twice** **D = Missed three
times** **E = Missed more than
three times**

- 12. Instructor was present for class or arranged for other coverage.

A = Strongly Agree **B = Agree** **C = Neither Agree
nor Disagree** **D = Disagree** **E = Strongly
disagree**

- 13. Instructor displays concern that students learn and understand.
- 14. Instructor encourages students' questions and ideas.
- 15. Instructor is available to students outside of class.
- 16. Instructor inspires students to set and achieve course goals that challenge them.

Course Difficulty

A = Strongly Agree B = Agree C = Neither Agree nor Disagree D = Disagree E = Strongly disagree

- 17. Instructor sets high achievement standards.
- 18. Instructor stimulates students to develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills.

Student Self-Rated Learning

A = Strongly Agree B = Agree C = Neither Agree nor disagree D = Disagree E = Strongly disagree

- 19. I developed a greater understanding of the importance and significance of the subject matter.
- 20. I learned fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories.
- 21. I acquired an interest in learning more by asking my own questions and seeking answers.
- 22. I improved critical-thinking, problem-solving, and decision-making skills to analyze and evaluate scientific information.

A = Excellent B = Good C = Average D = Below Average E = Poor

23. Based on the previous questions and my overall experience in this class, I would rate this instructor

Feel free to provide additional comments on the “Comments Sheet” regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the instructor and/or the value or benefit of the course (these will be typed and provided anonymously to the instructor after grades are posted).

**Department of Microbiology
Student Evaluation of Laboratory Instruction**

The items that appear on this form are designed to describe qualities and behaviors of good laboratory instructors. Student evaluation of instruction should be taken seriously, because your input is used in making decisions that affect improvement of teaching, retention, promotion, tenure, and salary adjustments. Careful thought should be given to each item. Please be objective and fair. Your responses should evaluate the **teacher's ability to stimulate student learning** in a laboratory course, and not the course content.

Filling out the evaluation form is optional. If you choose to complete the form, do not sign your name and please answer all items. After these evaluations are collected, they will be sealed in an envelope and tabulated at the Computer Center. The results **will not** be made available to your instructor until after the final grades for this course are completed.

On the computer score sheet provided, use a #2 pencil to write your instructor's name, the course number, and section number. Evaluate him/her on each of the following attributes using the keys accompanying each section or item.

Student Data		
1. Student classification:		
A. Freshman	C. Junior	E. Graduate or special student
B. Sophomore	D. Senior	
2. Reasons for taking the course:		
A. General education	C. Required in minor	
B. Required in major	D. Elective	
3. What grade do you expect from this course?		
A. A	C. B	E. D/F
B. AB	D. BC/C	

Course Organization and Planning				
A = Strongly Agree	B = Agree	C = Neither Agree	D = Disagree	E = Strongly
Disagree				
Nor Disagree				
4. Instructor clearly conveyed course content, expectations, and the grading policy.				

A = Always	B = Almost always	C = Frequently	D = Sometimes	E = Occasionally
5. Instructor returns assignments, quizzes, and exams within an appropriate amount of time (Note: essay exams, lab reports, and papers may take a week or more to grade).				

Clarity and Communication Skills

A = Always B = Almost always C = Frequently D = Sometimes E = Occasionally

- 6. Instructor introduced laboratories in a well-organized manner.
- 7. Instructor demonstrated proficiency in the procedures used
- 8. Instructor demonstrated a command of the principles procedures are based on and their applications in microbiology.

A = Strongly Agree B = Agree C = Neither Agree D = Disagree E = Strongly Disagree

- 9. Instructor satisfactorily answers questions raised in class.
- 10. Instructor finds ways to help students answer their own questions.
- 11. Instructor provides constructive criticism promoting improvement of technique, lab safety, and analytical abilities.

Teacher-Student Interaction

A = Always more than B = Missed once C = Missed twice D = Missed three times E = Missed three times

- 12. Instructor was present for class or arranged for other coverage.

A = Strongly Agree B = Agree C = Neither Agree D = Disagree E = Strongly Disagree

- 13. Instructor displays concern that students learn and understand.
- 14. Instructor encourages students' questions and ideas.
- 15. Instructor is available to students outside of class.
- 16. Instructor inspires students to work safely and efficiently in the lab in an organized manner

Course Difficulty

**A = Strongly Agree
Disagree**

B = Agree

**C = Neither Agree
nor Disagree**

D = Disagree

E = Strongly

17. Instructor sets high achievement standards.

18. Instructor stimulates students to develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills.

Student Self-Rated Learning

**A = Strongly Agree
Disagree**

B = Agree

**C = Neither Agree
nor disagree**

D = Disagree

E = Strongly

19. I increased my competence in laboratory techniques.

20. I learned fundamental principles underlying laboratory procedures and their applications.

21. I acquired an interest in learning more by asking my own questions and seeking answers through laboratory experimentation.

22. I improved critical-thinking, problem-solving, and decision-making skills to conduct and analyze scientific experiments and laboratory procedures.

A = Excellent

B = Good

C = Average

D = Below Average

E = Poor

23. Based on the previous questions and my overall experience in this class, I would rate this instructor

Feel free to provide additional comments on the “Comments sheet” regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the instructor and/or the value or benefit of the course (these will be typed and provided anonymously to the instructor after grades are posted).

Appendix B. Procedures for Handling Student Academic Misconduct

Student Responsibility for Ethical Behavior:

It is the position of the faculty of the Department of Microbiology that cheating on exams, plagiarism, or any other type of academic misconduct is to be abhorred and is inexcusable. Any student found to be engaging in any form of academic misconduct will be subjected to the severest of penalties as outlined in the UW-L Student Handbook. Students in all Microbiology classes will be provided with guidelines on academic misconduct and be referred to the University web site on academic misconduct. Students who see other students engaging in acts of academic misconduct are encouraged to refer to the Student Handbook and/or speak with their instructor or the Department of Microbiology Chairperson.

A. Examples of Academic Misconduct and Their Associated Penalties

The UW-System Policy on Academic Misconduct is detailed on the UW-La Crosse web site at:

<http://www.uwlax.edu/StudentLife/uws14.html>

The penalty for the following student academic misconduct is at the instructor's discretion and may range from a reprimand up to failure in the course and removal from the course. Examples of academic misconduct and penalties are provided on the above web site.

B. Appeal Procedures for Student Academic Misconduct--Procedures for appeal of student academic misconduct are the same as those for any other grade appeal (see Section 1.2 of the Bylaws).

Appendix C. 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 on an individual's merit category designation (part A), and one based on a percent of an individual's base salary (part B).

1.1 Part A—Distribution Based on Merit Category Designation. Money will be distributed per individual per Merit Category Designation according to the following formula:

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

Where:

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

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

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

$Y_o = 0.00\%$ 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.

1.2 Part B--Distribution Based on Salary of Each Individual. After determining the above distribution of the pay package to individuals with Merit Category Designations of 2, 3, and 4, the remaining merit money (which will be less than 50% of the pay package 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 Microbiology Department 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) Category 1: 0 individuals, Category 2: 1 individuals, Category 3: 4 individuals, and Category 4: 2 individuals.

2.1 Part A. Calculation of the Merit Money Distribution Based on Merit Category

Award for Merit Category 2: $[(0.04 \div 2) + 0.000] \times \$50,000 = \$1000 \times 1 = \1000
 Award for Merit Category 3: $[(0.04 \div 2) + 0.003] \times \$50,000 = \$1150 \times 4 = \4600
 Award for Merit Category 4: $[(0.04 \div 2) + 0.006] \times \$50,000 = \$1300 \times 2 = \underline{\$2600}$
 Total awarded for entire Department for Part A: $ = \8200

2.2 Part 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):

i.e. $\$14,000 - \$8,200 = \$5,800$

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

i.e. $\$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 $\times 100$.

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

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.

$\$45,000 \times 0.0166 = \$ 747$
 $\$55,000 \times 0.0166 = \$ 913$
 $\$65,000 \times 0.0166 = \1079

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) Category 1: 0 individuals, Category 2: 1 individuals, Category 3: 4 individuals, and Category 4: 2 individuals.

3.1 Part A. Calculation of the Merit Money Distribution Based on Merit Category

Award for Merit Category 2: $[(0.02 \div 2) + 0.000] \times \$50,000 = \$ 500 \times 1 = \$ 500$
 Award for Merit Category 3: $[(0.02 \div 2) + 0.003] \times \$50,000 = \$ 650 \times 4 = \$2,600$
 Award for Merit Category 4: $[(0.02 \div 2) + 0.006] \times \$50,000 = \$ 800 \times 2 = \underline{\$1,600}$
 Total awarded for entire Department for Part A: $= \$4,700$

3.2 Part 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):

i.e. $\$7,000 - \$4,700 = \$2,300$

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

i.e. $\$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 \div Average salary in Department $\times 100$.

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

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.

$\$45,000 \times 0.00658 = \$ 296$
 $\$55,000 \times 0.00658 = \$ 362$
 $\$65,000 \times 0.00658 = \$ 428$

3.3 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 individuals base salary (COLA). Examples follow for individuals at three different salaries.

$\$45,000 \times 0.0200 = \$ 900$
 $\$55,000 \times 0.0200 = \1100
 $\$65,000 \times 0.0200 = \1300

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	Category 3 % 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 a year where the percent increase is insufficient to award Merit funds. 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.

4.1 Part A. Calculation of the Merit Money Distribution Based on Merit Category

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Award for Merit Category 2: } & [(0.0033 \div 2) + 0.000] \times \$50,000 = \$ 82 \quad \times 1 = \$ 82 \\ \text{Award for Merit Category 3: } & [(0.0033 \div 2) + 0.003] \times \$50,000 = \$232 \quad \times 4 = \$ 928 \\ \text{Award for Merit Category 4: } & [(0.0033 \div 2) + 0.006] \times \$50,000 = \$382 \quad \times 2 = \underline{\$ 764} \\ \text{Total awarded for entire Department for Part A:} & = \$1,774 \end{aligned}$$

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 ($\$1155/1774 \times 100$), the calculated allocations for Part A are multiplied by 65% to arrive at a modified allocation as described in the example calculations shown below.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Allocation based on Part A for each Merit Category } & \times 0.65 = \text{modified allocation} \\ \text{Award for Merit Category 2: } & \$ 82 \times 0.65 = \$ 53 \quad \times 1 = \$ 53 \\ \text{Award for Merit Category 3: } & \$232 \times 0.65 = \$151 \quad \times 4 = \$ 604 \\ \text{Award for Merit Category 4: } & \$382 \times 0.65 = \$248 \quad \times 2 = \underline{\$ 496} \\ \text{Total merit dollars awarded for entire Department:} & = \$1,153 \end{aligned}$$

Appendix D. Annual Activity Report Forms

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

Name:

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

A. Student Evaluation Scores and Teaching Assignment

A. Fall Semester:

Student Evaluation of Instruction, fractional median of all questions for semester: _____

Lectures and Laboratories*	Enrollment	Contact hours	SEI
Total:			

B. Spring Semester:

Student Evaluation of Instruction, fractional median of all questions for semester: _____

Lectures and Laboratories*	Enrollment	Contact hours	SEI
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)

3. Mean student evaluation of instruction for both semesters combined: _____

Note: Overall SEI for each semester and year should only include SEIs done with the departmental form. List separately SEIs from SAH 105, etc. in table.

B. Provide a narrative 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. Fall Semester:

Student Evaluation of Instruction, fractional median of all questions for semester: _____

Lectures and Laboratories*	Enrollment	Contact hours	SEI
Total:			

B. Spring Semester:

Student Evaluation of Instruction, fractional median of all questions for semester: _____

Lectures and Laboratories*	Enrollment	Contact hours	SEI
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)

3. Mean student evaluation of instruction for both semesters combined: _____

Note: Overall SEI for each semester and year should only include SEIs done with the departmental form. List separately SEIs from SAH 105, etc. in table.

B. Provide a narrative 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.

Appendix E. Peer Evaluation of Teaching.

1. Evaluation Process

Anyone teaching classes as the primary instructor in the Department of Microbiology will be required to undergo peer evaluation (with the exception of clinical courses, research, independent study and internship courses, or other similar courses that do not contain formal instruction). 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. Faculty undergoing post-tenure review will be evaluated once each semester by two peer evaluators during the year that they undergo the post-tenure review. Faculty undergoing post-tenure review will also have two peer evaluators appointed the year they undergo post-tenure review and will have one evaluation conducted by each evaluator each semester (between the 5th and 12th week of the semester).

Adjunct faculty or other non-departmental members teaching classes in the department will be evaluated by two peer evaluators the first two times they teach a course. The department chair may also assign peer evaluators for any faculty, adjunct faculty, or academic staff member if recommended by the PTRS 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, chalk or 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 E):

Appendix F. Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report Form.

The Promotion Schedule, Guidelines and blank Promotion Evaluation forms may be found at the following UW-L website:

<http://138.49.128.196/hr/promo%2Dresources.htm>

Appendix G. Policies on Release Time (Sabbatical, Teaching Improvement, and Administrative Leaves)

The Department of Microbiology encourages faculty to participate in professional development activities (e.g., sabbaticals and teaching improvement leaves). However, such activities may require temporary, full, 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 of Microbiology 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 to 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 can not 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 sabbatical leave, 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.

Appendix H. 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 by the rotational system. Having taught the course previously will be one of the criteria utilized to determine qualifications.

3. FTE Allocations for Teaching Summer School

Summer teaching positions are generally between 0.4 and 0.6 FTE depending on the course credits and contact hours.

4. Priorities

The priority system will be utilized to determine who shall teach summer school. Summer school teaching positions will be filled by those in first priority. If there are still positions available, staff will be drawn from the second and third priorities. If the number of staff in a priority exceeds the number of positions available, the rotational system in section 5 of this appendix will be used for staff selection.

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

¹Academic Staff with multiple-year appointments

²Academic staff with single-year appointments

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 that 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.

F. Chairperson

The department Chairperson will be guaranteed a partial summer appointment as established by the dean (generally a 0.33 to 0.4 FTE appointment) for activities associated with being Chair. This appointment will be included as a zero (0) in the rotational system. Any additional summer appointment for teaching will be included in the formula for the rotational system.

G. 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.

H. 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 will have their appointments rescinded.

Appendix I. Teaching by Adjunct Faculty and Other Non-Departmental Members.

Any course offered by an adjunct faculty member or other individual outside the department must be approved by the Department Curriculum Committee according to the following criteria:

1. The request is to be submitted on an LX-138 form with outline included.
2. There should be a demonstrated student need for the course.
3. Any faculty member(s) in the same or closely related discipline should be consulted.
4. The impact of the proposed course enrollment on existing course enrollments.
5. The cost to the department.
6. Whether the course *is to* be offered only one semester or more than once?
7. A final course evaluation is recommended.

If a course taught by adjunct faculty or other individual outside the department is approved, the individual must conduct a Student Evaluation of Instruction (see Appendix A). In addition, the Department Chair shall appoint two faculty members (at least one of which must be tenured) to serve as classroom evaluators (Peer Evaluators). Peer Evaluators will present an assessment of classroom experiences they observed in a written report submitted to the adjunct faculty member and to the Department Chair (see Appendix E). If the course is offered more than once, additional evaluations may be done if recommended by the Departmental Committee of the Whole.

Appendix J. 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

- 1) 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.
- 2) Requests for salary equity adjustment must be submitted to the departmental Chairperson in writing. Requests for salary equity adjustments must be accompanied by written rationale with supporting documentation of the inequity.
- 3) Requests for salary equity adjustment will be forwarded to the departmental PRS Committee, which will make a recommendation whether to support the request. The departmental Chairperson will become a member of the PRS Committee for salary equity issues.

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

- 4) 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 PRS Committee.
- 5) Cases for equity adjustments that have not been supported by the departmental PRS 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.
- 6) Successful requests for salary equity adjustments will be announced to the Department.

b. Departmental Inequities

- 1) A request for a departmental salary equity adjustment may be initiated by the department Chairperson or the departmental PRS Committee.
- 2) The departmental PRS Committee will provide written rationale with supporting documentation of the inequity to the department for consideration.
- 3) If the department approves the departmental salary equity adjustment, the department Chair and Chairperson of the departmental PRS Committee will present the request and all supporting documentation to the Dean.

Appendix K. Procedure for Selecting the Microbiology Senior of the Year.

An annual award established by the Department Microbiology in recognition of exceptional academic achievement by a senior microbiology major

Eligibility: awarded to a graduating senior majoring in Microbiology.

Award will be given each spring to a student graduating any time during the current academic year (December, May or August).

- A. A list of seniors majoring in microbiology will be submitted to each microbiology faculty member who will be asked if he/she would care to recommend any outstanding senior(s) for the Senior of the Year Award. GPA and on-campus credits will be included with the list.
- B. These recommendations will be compiled by the Chair and brought to the Department in a Department meeting.
- C. The department will discuss the nominated students and select the top three or four seniors. Highlights of the recommendations for each senior will be presented prior to the vote. The Department will then vote to select the top student.
- D. The department will present the Senior of the Year Award at the May Graduating Senior Dinner. The recipient will receive a plaque and be allowed to select a book that will be purchased by the department.

Appendix L. Procedure for Selecting Recipients of Microbiology Scholarships

1. The candidates for the Microbiology Scholarships will be provided to the Chair who will chair the Scholarship Selection Committee(s).
2. The Scholarship Selection Committee will compile a list of eligible candidates for each scholarship. The relative merits of each candidate will be discussed by the faculty and a list of 6-12 highly qualified students prepared for each scholarship.
3. Each committee member will rank each candidate (1 = top candidate, 2 = second, etc.) and submit rankings to the Chair.
4. The committee Chair will compile all rankings and prepare a ranked list of candidates for each scholarship.

Scholarships in the Department of Microbiology:

Scholarship	Major	Minimum GPA	Class	Other requirements
Microbiology Scholarship	Microbiology	above avg	Soph, Jr, or Sr	Extracurricular activities in microbiology considered (e.g. undergraduate research, work in the prep room, or contributions to the Microbiology Club)
Microbiology Freshman Scholarship	Microbiology	none	Freshman	Must have participated in the Microbiology Scholar Camp when a High School student and declared Microbiology as a major upon entering UW-L
Robert Burns Medical Microbiology Scholarship	Microbiology	3.25	Jr or Sr	Completed or currently enrolled in Pathogenic Bacteriology
Allen Nelson Mycology Scholarship	Microbiology or Biology	above avg	Jr or Sr	Completed mycology or medical mycology
Microbiology Public Health Scholarship	Microbiology	3.5	Jr or Sr	Completed or currently enrolled in Immunology
Larry Trammel Microbiology Prep Room Scholarship	Microbiology	none	Soph, Jr, or Sr	Must have worked in the Microbiology prep room for at least two semesters (including the current semester)
Walter. M. Winfrey Memorial Microbiology Scholarship	Microbiology	3.0	Jr or Sr	Full time student. Preference given to non-traditional students with children while attending UW-L
Grace M. Smith Clinical Laboratory Science Scholarship	Clinical Laboratory Science	3.25	Jr or Sr	Must have been admitted into the Clinical Laboratory Science program

Microbiology majors are also eligible to apply for the Lee Scholarship in the Department of Biology. The recipient of this scholarship will be selected by a subcommittee that recommends candidates to the Department of Biology, which makes the final decision. The subcommittee will consist of a microbiologist, a field biologist, and a general biologist.

Appendix M. Department of Microbiology Search and Screen Procedures
(approved September 29, 2000)

Committee Organization and Protocols

1. The Department Chair will appoint the search and screen committee for any position and shall serve as Chair or co-Chair. For specialized positions, a second department member with expertise in the discipline being sought shall serve as co-Chair. The remainder of the committee shall consist of at least one other member with expertise in the specialty area and at least one member from outside the area of specialty.
2. A two thirds majority of the committee members constitutes a quorum necessary to conduct committee business. Members may not vote by proxy. The Chair is a voting member of the committee. All voting shall be by a show of hands unless a roll call vote is requested by any member of the committee. The secretary shall maintain a record of all votes. These procedures may be amended, but shall require a two thirds majority.
3. The committee shall elect a secretary (which may be the Chair or co-Chair of the committee). The secretary, in compliance with open meetings rules, will post all meetings—noting if any meeting will go into a closed session. The secretary shall also be responsible for taking minutes of meetings.
4. All deliberations of the committee and the names of nominees and candidates are confidential. Public statements are to be made only by the Chair, and all questions relating to the business or progress of the committee are to be referred to the Chair for reply.
5. Evaluation meetings may move into "closed session" by majority vote of those in attendance (taken by roll call), for the purpose of discussing individual candidates. The Chair or presiding officer will announce they will entertain the following motion:

"I move to convene in a closed session to consider personal history information about applicants for the position of _____ as provided in section 19.85 (1)(f) of Wisconsin Statutes."

Upon completing business in a closed session, the committee may not reconvene in an open session within 12 hours, unless notice of the subsequent open session was included in the original meeting notice.

6. Committee members shall not be considered for the position.

Committee Record and Responsibilities

1. The committee is responsible for drafting a position description and list of selection criteria. These descriptions will be brought before the department for approval prior to initiating a search.
2. All material concerning individual nominees/applicants is confidential.
3. The Chair shall be the custodian of all application materials and shall be responsible for their maintenance and making them available to the committee.

4. The Chair shall maintain a file of committee documents and records as required by the Human Resources (HR) Office.
5. The Chair will keep a list of all applicants, including those who withdraw at a later stage. Applicants requesting confidentiality may be identified on such a list by candidate number.
6. The assistant to the chancellor for Affirmative Action & Diversity shall compile summary data on the sex and racial/ethnic background of the applicant pool from EEO forms returned to Affirmative Action & Diversity. This summary will be made available to the committee.

Search Procedures

1. Before the position can be advertised, the committee will submit the following documents to the assistant to the chancellor for Affirmative Action & Diversity:
 - Recruitment Efforts Form (salmon form)
 - Position Vacancy Form (yellow form)
 - Selection Criteria (based on position description and responsibilities in Position Vacancy Form)
 - Search and Screen Committee Procedures (these procedures)
2. On the Recruitment Efforts Form, the committee will indicate proposed recruitment methods:
 - Where the position will be advertised, e.g., *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, other newspapers, professional journals and meetings, the Internet, etc.
 - Other contacts, e.g., letters to presidents/chancellors, deans, or Chairs at other universities; alumni; etc.
3. On the Position Vacancy Form, the committee will indicate the:
 - Position description and qualifications
 - Application deadline: 30 days from the first ad for a national and regional search and two weeks for a local search
 - Application procedure, specifying the contents of a complete application and contact person
4. The committee Chair will work with UW-L Advancement & External Relations regarding the wording and placement of advertisements.
5. Upon receipt of a written nomination or application, the Chair will send i) an acknowledgment letter (see attached sample), ii) an EEO form (furnished by the AA Office, but with a candidate number added by the search contact person), iii) a Request for Confidentiality Form (see attached sample), iv) and information about the department and community to each applicant. Applicants will also be notified of any missing application materials.
6. After the closing date, all candidate files will be assembled by the department support staff. The support staff will provide summary information for each candidate, including the dates and places of degrees, areas of specialty, whether the files are complete, etc. All files shall be kept in a locked cabinet in the departmental office.

Initial Screening

1. Each committee member shall review all candidate files and make an initial assessment to retain or remove each from further consideration based on the previously approved selection criteria.
2. The committee will meet and discuss each candidate's credentials and application materials. If any committee member believes that a candidate deserves further consideration (based on the selection criteria), they will be retained for detailed evaluation. If desired, the committee Chair may request further information from the applicant. Candidates receiving no votes for retention will be removed from further consideration. The committee Chair will identify the appropriate "reason code" (see list of codes on reverse side of Applicant Interview List form). Candidates not retained will be notified in writing that they are no longer under consideration and thanked for their interest.
3. If there is not a sufficient number of viable candidates in the applicant pool, a motion to re-open the search process may be made.

Second Screening

1. The committee may solicit additional material from candidates retained for further consideration:
 - a. Candidates may be asked to respond in writing to a more detailed position description and criteria established by the committee and furnished to the candidates at this stage, or
 - b. Candidates may be asked to provide any additional materials in support of their candidacy, to respond to any specific questions developed by the committee, and/or to provide additional references, or
 - c. The committee may conduct telephone interviews of semifinalists. Calls will be made by a minimum of two committee members using a standard set of questions. For each call, a written record will be maintained, or
 - d. The committee may conduct telephone reference checks on each of the semifinalists. Calls will be made by a minimum of two committee members, using a standard set of questions. For each call, a written record will be maintained.
2. Committee members making telephone reference checks shall share the information obtained with the committee. The Chair or designee may seek further information about each semifinalist as needed, while respecting the semifinalist's need for confidentiality. The committee may contact individuals not listed as references by a candidate with the permission of the candidate. The candidate may identify individuals s/he does not wish to have called. A written record must be maintained for each call. Callers will also ask if accommodations for disability are needed by any candidate.
3. The committee shall discuss and vote on each candidate to select those to be moved to finalist status (highly qualified candidates). A simple majority vote of those present is required to advance a candidate. The committee should strive to identify 5-10 finalists (or 10% of the initial candidate pool, which ever is greatest).

4. Should a candidate fail to be advanced to finalist status on the initial vote, s/he can be brought to a re-vote only once. Any committee member may request a re-vote.
5. The committee shall vote to cluster the candidates in two “tiers.” The top tier shall include the 2-4 candidates the committee believes should be invited to interview on campus. The second tier shall include the remaining highly qualified candidates, who the committee believes would be suitable for the position if the top tier candidates are unavailable or are determined to be unacceptable after an interview. If phone interviews and phone reference checks have not been conducted for any of the finalists, they will be done at this time. The committee may reconvene to consider results of telephone interviews and reference checks in finalizing the tier 1 and tier 2 lists.
6. The Chair may consult with the assistant to the chancellor for Affirmative Action & Diversity to determine whether the applicant pool generated by the search is sufficiently diverse, and whether individual candidates in these two tiers reflect the diversity of the pool, as determined from returned EEO forms.
7. The files of the tier 1 and tier 2 finalists will be made available to the department a minimum of 48 hours prior to a scheduled meeting. The department will meet to discuss the candidates and vote to accept or reject the two lists of finalists prepared by the search and screen committee. A simple majority of the department members present is required to approve the finalists lists.
8. After consultation with and approval from the dean/division officer, the Chair shall submit the Applicant List, identifying these two tiers of candidates, to the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action & Diversity for approval to interview. This list must specify reason codes for all candidates, for whom an interview is not sought.

Final Screening

1. After the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action & Diversity approves candidates for interview, via E-mail, with a copy to Human Resources, the Chair shall contact (verbally) each approved candidate to schedule a campus interview. Written confirmation of the invitations will follow phone contacts. The committee Chair will include a schedule of interview activities and further information about the department facilities and faculty in the written confirmation. For faculty positions, a seminar will be a required part of the interview.
2. Personal interviews will be conducted with legal and identical questions asked of each candidate, as indicated in the reference materials found in the Faculty & Academic Staff Recruitment Reference Manual. Faculty interviews shall include the following:
 - Review of job description by Department Chair (including class assignment, typical loads, expectations in teaching, service and scholarship)
 - UW-La Crosse tenure density policy
 - Summary of benefits
 - Tour of department facilities including classrooms and teaching laboratories, research space available for the candidate, and support facilities
 - Meeting with the Dean(s) of the College of Science and Allied Health
 - Presentation of a seminar (presentation of a lecture may also be required)
 - Introduction and individual visits with faculty and staff
 - Meeting with students
 - Interview with Search and Screen Committee

- Tour of Campus
 - Tour of La Crosse and surrounding areas
 - Social events with faculty and staff (dinners, mixers, etc.)
3. After completing all interviews, the committee members shall vote on the finalists, one at a time. A two thirds majority vote of the committee members present is required to move the finalist to the recommendation to hire.
 4. The list of candidates, including their complete application files, will be made available to the department a minimum of 48 hours prior to a scheduled meeting. The department will meet to discuss the candidates recommended for hire and vote to accept or reject the list. A simple majority of the department members present is required to approve the finalists lists. The Search and Screen Committee Chair may make a recommendation on salary, rank, and probationary period if the committee feels such a recommendation is justified. Such recommendations must be approved by a simple majority vote of the department members present.

Recommendation to Hire

1. The Search and Screen Committee Chair (and co-Chair) shall deliver its recommendation(s) to hire, with supporting information on each recommended candidate, to the dean. The dean shall request the authorization of the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action & Diversity and the provost/vice chancellor to extend an offer. This communication is to be made via E-mail, with a copy to recruit@mail.uwlax.edu. More than one candidate may be approved to reduce delay if first/second candidate declines the offer.
2. If the candidate accepts the offered position, the Personnel Action Form (back of the pink sheet) shall be completed and forwarded to the Human Resources Office, along with materials from the candidate's file that are needed to draft the contract letter and create the candidate's personnel file. (See Recruitment Manual for a listing of this information.)
3. After a candidate has accepted the position in writing, the Chair will notify all candidates not previously notified that the position has been filled.
4. The Chair will prepare final committee materials and is responsible for the archiving or other disposition of committee records in consultation with Human Resources.

Appendix N. Evaluation of the Microbiology Department Chair by the Dean.
(approved November 21, 2001; amended November XX, 2005)

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.