

Department of Biology & Microbiology
Bylaws, Policies, and Procedures

(Adopted February 23, 1996)

Table of Contents

0.	Organization and Operation	1
0.0	Preamble.....	1
0.1	Meeting Guidelines	1
0.2	Definitions of Quorum and Majority	2
0.4	Changes to Bylaws.....	2
1.	Student Rights and Obligations.....	2
1.1	Evaluation of Teaching	2
1.2	Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures	2
1.2.1	Grade Appeals.....	2
1.2.2	Academic Non-Grade Complaints, Grievances, and Appeals	3
1.3	Advisement	3
1.4	Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct.....	3
2.	Faculty Responsibilities.....	4
2.1	Teaching.....	4
2.2	Scholarship.....	4
2.3	Service.....	4
3.	Academic Staff and Adjunct Faculty Responsibilities and Expectations	4
3.1	Academic Staff.....	4
3.1.1	Appointments.....	4
3.1.2	Faculty Status.....	5
3.2	Adjunct Faculty.....	5
3.2.1	Appointments.....	5
3.2.2	Privileges and Responsibilities	5
4.	Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)	5
4.1	Evaluation Process	5
4.1.1	Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff.....	5
4.1.2	Non-instructional Academic Staff.	7
4.2	Evaluation Criteria--Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff.....	8

4.2.1	Teaching.....	8
4.2.2	Scholarship.....	8
4.2.3	Service.....	9
4.3	Evaluation Criteria--Non-instructional Academic Staff.....	9
4.4	Distribution of Merit Funds	9
4.5	Appeals	9
4.5.1	Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff.....	9
4.5.2	Non-instructional Academic Staff	10
5.	Retention and Tenure Decisions.....	11
5.1	Review Process	11
5.2	Evaluation Criteria	12
5.3	Reconsideration of Retention and Tenure Recommendations	12
6.	Post-tenure Review.....	13
7.	Promotion Recommendations	14
7.1	Review Process	14
7.2	Evaluation Criteria	15
7.3	Reconsideration of the Promotion Recommendation.....	16
8.	Governance.....	16
8.1	Election of the Department Chair.....	16
8.2	Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair	16
8.3	Standing Departmental Committees.....	17
8.3.1	Aquatic Science Committee	17
8.3.2	Assessment Committee	17
8.3.3	Biology 101 Committee	17
8.3.4	Biology Major Review Committee	17
8.3.5	Budget Committee	17
8.3.6	Computer Utilization Committee	17
8.3.7	Curriculum Committee.....	17
8.3.8	Graduate Committee	17
8.3.9	Library Committee.....	17

8.3.10	Merit Review Advisory Committees (Instructional Staff).....	17
8.3.11	Special Merit Review Advisory Committees (Non-instructional Staff)	17
8.3.12	Microbiology Major Review Committee	17
8.3.13	Museum Committee.....	17
8.3.14	Promotion, Tenure, Salary Committee.....	17
8.3.15	Promotion Recommendation Committee	17
8.3.16	Retention & Tenure Review Committee.....	17
8.3.17	Room Utilization, Building Remodeling, Safety, & Equipment Committee	17
8.3.18	Social Committee.....	17
8.3.19	Speakers and Seminar Committee	17
8.3.20	Student Relations Committee.....	17
APPENDIX A.	STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION.....	18
APPENDIX B.	PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING STUDENT ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT	21
APPENDIX C.	MERIT REVIEW (ANNUAL EVALUATION) PROCEDURES	22
APPENDIX D.	EVALUATION OF TEACHING BY PROBATIONARY FACULTY	36
APPENDIX E.	TENURED FACULTY REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE	40
APPENDIX F.	FACULTY PROMOTION EVALUATION REPORT FORM.....	43
APPENDIX G.	POLICIES ON RELEASE TIME.....	55
APPENDIX H.	SUMMER SCHOOL POLICIES.....	57
APPENDIX I.	TEACHING BY ADJUNCT FACULTY	59
APPENDIX J.	SALARY EQUITY ADJUSTMENT POLICY	60
APPENDIX K.	PROCEDURE FOR SELECTING THE BIOLOGY SENIOR OF THE YEAR.....	62

APPENDIX L. PROCEDURE FOR SELECTING RECIPIENT OF THE LEE SCHOLARSHIP..... 63

APPENDIX M. HIRING PROCEDURES..... 64

0. Organization and Operation

0.0 Preamble

The Bylaws in this document were adopted by the members of the Department of Biology and 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 A closed session@ if matters of a confidential nature are to be discussed. Section 19.85(1) of Wisconsin Statutes contains procedural requirements for convening in closed session. The following steps **must** precede a closed session.

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

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

same manner as the notice for the open session prior to the closed session.

0.2 Definitions of Quorum and Majority

For meetings of the Department and its Committees, a quorum is defined as the majority of the entire Membership eligible to participate. 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 Form (A copy of the Student Evaluation Form is contained 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.

1.2 Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures

1.2.1 Grade Appeals. Students who believe that the grade they received for a course does not reflect their performance in that course may appeal the disputed grade. This appeal must take place before the end of the semester immediately following the semester in which the grade was recorded. The student should first discuss this 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 a program offered by the Biology & Microbiology Department will be assigned a faculty advisor in the Department. Students are encouraged to meet with their faculty advisor at least once each semester to discuss their academic progress, career interests, and course schedules.

1.4 Expectations, Responsibilities, and Academic Misconduct

Students who enroll in courses offered by the Biology & 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 Biology & 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

2.1 Teaching

Faculty of the Biology & Microbiology Department are expected to keep current in their subject matter area and to work to improve student learning (see Appendix C for examples of teaching activities).

They are further expected to offer additional time to address student questions by holding office hours.

Office hours and other course details should be part of the course syllabus shared with students at the beginning of a course. In addition, faculty are expected to grade and return student assignments, including examinations, in a timely fashion. Finally, faculty are expected to allow student evaluation of instruction in each course they teach (except seminars, forums, and independent study courses).

2.2 Scholarship

Faculty in the Biology & Microbiology Department are expected to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship. The Department's definition of scholarship (Appendix C) includes publishing papers or books in the discipline, in applications of the discipline, or in education for the discipline. Presentations in these areas at professional meetings, and in other appropriate forums, also constitute scholarship. In addition, writing successful grant proposals to support any of these activities is an important area of scholarship.

2.3 Service

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

3. Academic Staff and Adjunct Faculty Responsibilities and Expectations

3.1 Academic Staff

3.1.1 Appointments. Academic Staff appointments may take many forms, including instructional, non-instructional, and combined instructional/non-instructional appointments. Appointments

usually used in academic departments are the Lecturer, Laboratory Manager, Research Associate and Faculty Associate. Academic Staff Lecturers in the Biology & Microbiology Department are held to the same teaching expectations as faculty (see 2.1 above). If Lecturers do not have the full range of faculty responsibilities, their teaching load will be larger than that of faculty. Any special expectations of a member of the Academic Staff are stated in the contract letter.

3.1.2 Faculty Status. Instructional Academic Staff with at least a 50% appointment and on a rolling appointment, or who have worked in the Department for six of the past ten years, have the right to vote in all departmental matters including the election of the Department Chair, but excluding retention, tenure, and promotion. Section 3.1.2 was amended on 13 December 1996 in accordance with section 0.4 of the Bylaws.

3.2 Adjunct Faculty

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

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

4. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)

4.1 Evaluation Process

4.1.1 Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff. Consistent with UWS 3.05 and UW L 3.05, the performance of all Faculty, Instructional Academic Staff, and Continuing Instructional Academic Staff in the Biology & Microbiology Department will be reviewed annually. The areas of review shall include teaching, scholarship and service. Expectations in these areas are different for Instructional Academic Staff than for Faculty Members. This may result in different Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designations for Instructional Academic Staff than for Faculty Members with the same level of accomplishments.

During the first week of May, the Department Chair shall provide each individual with a copy of an Annual Evaluation Form (see Appendix C). Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff shall submit their completed Annual Evaluation Forms, containing a description of activities for the previous summer and the current academic year, to the Chair by June 1. This completed form 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 5.1 of the Bylaws and Appendix D. Evaluation of Teaching by Probationary Faculty) will also be used in the annual review.

Retiring Faculty and Continuing Instructional Academic Staff do not have to submit a faculty Annual Evaluation Form at the end of their last academic year. Retiring faculty are, however, requested to submit to the Department Chair their accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service--this is needed for incorporation into the Annual Departmental Report to the Dean.

Early in the fall semester, the Department Chair, working with the Merit Review Advisory Committees, will use the completed Annual Evaluation Form, Student Evaluation Information, and Peer Evaluation Information (when applicable in the case of Probationary Faculty) from the previous year to evaluate each Department Member=s performance. Performance will be evaluated in each of the three areas of faculty responsibility (Teaching, Scholarship, and Service) based on the Evaluation Criteria specified in section 4.2.

According to the Annual Evaluation Procedures of the Department of Biology &

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

Faculty and Continuing Instructional Academic Staff members who are on professional leave are expected to submit by June 1 a completed Annual Evaluation Form, which describes their leave and other professional activities.

New faculty who begin fall semester do not undergo an Annual (Merit) Review in that first semester. They are reviewed for retention early in the spring semester. If retained, the salary adjustment for these new faculty will be (by contract) the average increment generated by the pay plan.

The Merit Review Advisory Committees, with substantial input from the Dean, are responsible for evaluation of the Department Chair. The Chair shall submit an Annual Evaluation Form and be evaluated like other Department Faculty. In addition, the Dean will assess the performance of the Chair with regard to communication, cooperation, and compliance with the Administration. The Dean will assign a final Merit Category Designation from the same numerical scale (1, 2, 3, 4) used for all other Department Faculty, and the Dean's evaluation will be weighted at 50% of the evaluation from the Department (i.e., 33% of the total evaluation). The Chairs of the Merit Review Advisory Committees, working with the Dean, will, within seven days of the review, notify the Chair in writing of

his/her Merit Category Designation and Performance Ratings in each area of evaluation.

4.1.2 Non-instructional Academic Staff. The annual evaluation process for Non-instructional Academic Staff and Continuing Non-instructional Academic Staff is different from that of Faculty, Instructional Academic Staff, and Continuing 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 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 conforming to each individual's job description. The Special Merit Review Advisory Committee will evaluate Non-instructional Academic Staff based on the specific guidelines established for each individual. For each individual being evaluated, members of the Special Merit Review Advisory Committee(s) will assign (1) a Performance Rating (U = Unsatisfactory, S = Satisfactory, or E = Exceptional) for each evaluation category in each individual's specific guidelines and (2) a Merit Category Designation (1= Non-meritorious, 2 = Meritorious, 3 = Significantly Meritorious, 4 = Exceptionally Meritorious). The Chair of the Special Review Advisory Committee will transmit the results of the evaluation to the Department Chair who will, within seven days of the review, notify (in writing) each Non-instructional Academic Staff Member of his/her Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designation.

4.2 Evaluation Criteria--Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff

The criteria used in the Biology & Microbiology Department to evaluate the annual performance of each Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff Member are designed to promote effective teaching and high quality scholarship and service. Of the areas of Faculty responsibility, teaching is weighted as the most important.

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

accomplishments to these ends are to be reported on the Annual Evaluation Form.

Student evaluations given in each of the courses taught will also be used to judge teaching effectiveness. In the case of Probationary Faculty, peer evaluations based on classroom visitations 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 5.1 and Appendix D).

4.2.2 Scholarship. As stated in Section 2.2, Faculty are expected to maintain an active program of scholarship. Efforts in this area of responsibility include preparing, presenting, and/or publishing papers on a topic of basic or applied research. Expository and educational topics are also significant areas for scholarly work. Writing grant proposals to support teaching, scholarship, or service is itself an important area of scholarly activity. Faculty are expected to report their scholarly activities and accomplishments on the Annual Evaluation Form.

4.2.3 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, the profession, or the general public. Examples of appropriate service activities include preparation of program or policy documents, serving on committees, serving as an officer in a professional society, and consulting with external agencies. Faculty are expected to report their service activities on the Annual Evaluation Form.

4.3 Evaluation Criteria--Non-instructional Academic Staff

The Evaluation Criteria used in the Biology & 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.

4.4 Distribution of Merit Funds

Unless mandated otherwise by the University System Administration, the entire pay package for each will be distributed according to policies in the Annual Evaluation Procedures (Appendix C) to all Department members who earned Merit Category Designations of 2, 3, or 4 (Meritorious, Significantly Meritorious, or Exceptionally Meritorious). The pool of merit funds for Academic Staff is separate

from the faculty pool.

4.5 Appeals

4.5.1 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 Chairs of the appropriate two Merit Review Advisory Committees will convene a meeting to consider the appeal within one week after notification of the appeal. The Committees shall transmit their findings to the Department Chair who will transmit the appeal decision to the appellant within three working days after the reconsideration meetings. To change the original Merit Category Designation, at least 60% of the votes of both committees combined must be in favor of the change.

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

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 PTS 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 PTS Committee will convene a meeting of the Committee-of-the-Whole (defined in the preceding paragraph) and the Dean of SAH within one week after notification of the appeal. To change the original Merit Category Designation, at least 60% of the votes of the Committee-of-the-Whole and the Dean must be in favor of the change. The Dean's vote will be weighted at 33% of the vote of the Committee-of-the-Whole (i.e., 25% of the

total vote). The Chair of the Department PTS Committee will transmit the results of the action of the reconsideration meeting within one working day after this meeting.

Appeals beyond the Departmental level may be presented to The Complaints, Grievances, Appeals and Academic Freedom Committee (see Section 1.E of the Faculty Senate Bylaws).

4.5.2 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 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.

The Committee shall transmit its findings to the Department Chair who will transmit the appeal decision to the appellant within one working day after the reconsideration meeting.

If the Appellant is not satisfied with the outcome of the reconsideration by the Special Merit Review Advisory Committee, he/she may appeal to the Department of Biology & Microbiology acting as a Committee-of-the-Whole (defined here as all Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff). The rest of the appeal process is the same as that for Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff (see section 4.5.1).

5. Retention and Tenure Decisions

5.1 Review Process

The Retention & Tenure Review Committee shall consist of all tenured members of the Biology & 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 Biology & Microbiology Department Guidelines. The Department Chair shall serve as Chair of the Retention & Tenure Committee. If the Department Chair is a candidate for retention or tenure, the Department Retention & Tenure Review Committee shall elect one of its tenured members as Chair of the Retention & Tenure Committee. For each Probationary Faculty Member, the Committee Chair shall select two members of the Retention & Tenure Committee to serve as classroom evaluators (Peer Evaluators), who will be responsible for producing the Peer Evaluation Information required for

Probationary Faculty in Section 4.1 Evaluation Process of these Bylaws.

Each semester the Peer Evaluators will each observe at least two classes taught by each Probationary Faculty Member. Peer Evaluators will present an assessment of classroom experiences they observed in a written report submitted to the Probationary Faculty Member and to the Chair of the Retention & Tenure Review Committee (see Appendix D. Evaluation of Teaching by Probationary Faculty).

Retention reviews are usually conducted fall semester. Exceptions are: (1) first-year faculty who begin in fall semester are reviewed in spring semester and (2) second-year faculty are reviewed in both semesters. At least 20 days prior to the Annual Retention Review, the Department Chair will notify each Probationary Faculty Member in writing of the time and date of the review meeting. The Department Chair will also instruct candidates to submit a recent copy of their Annual Evaluation Form (completed the previous spring semester), a current 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 make oral or written presentations at the review meeting. The requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meeting law shall apply to the review meetings; however, the meeting may be converted to a closed session (see section 0.1 Meeting Guidelines).

Using the criteria in Section 5.2 of these Bylaws, the Retention & Tenure Review Committee shall evaluate each Probationary Faculty Member=s performance based on all submitted information. 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.

5.2 Evaluation Criteria

Members of the Retention & Tenure Review Committee shall use all submitted information to judge each Probationary Faculty Member=s performance in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Service (see Appendix C 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 continued Scholarship are necessary to earn recommendations for retention and, ultimately, for tenure.

5.3 Reconsideration of Retention and Tenure Recommendations

If a recommendation for non-renewal is made by the Retention & Tenure 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).

6. Post-tenure Review

At least once every five years, the performance of each tenured Faculty Member is reviewed by the Department Chair to determine whether this performance is satisfactory in each of the areas of faculty responsibility. This review is based on the results of the annual review for the five preceding years. The performance of individuals receiving Satisfactory (S) Performance Ratings in each category of evaluation (teaching, scholarship, and service) in each of the five years of the review period shall be deemed satisfactory. The Department of Biology & Microbiology Procedure for Review and Development of Tenured Faculty and the Review Cycle for Tenured Faculty Members is contained in Appendix E.

Individuals receiving an unsatisfactory 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 of the Committee-of-the-Whole (COTW--comprised of those Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff who served on the Merit Review Advisory Committees). The COTW will review the data upon which the original evaluation was made and any data submitted by the individual. If the COTW determines

that the individual=s performance is unsatisfactory, the Department Chair will (1) provide notification to the individual, (2) provide the individual with a list of concerns, and (3) establish a Faculty Development Plan Committee (FDPC). The FDPC will be comprised of three tenured members of the Department--the Department Chair, who will serve as Chair of the Committee; one member chosen by the Department Chair; and one member chosen by the individual. The FDPC will establish a Faculty Development Plan to remedy the areas of concern listed by the COTW in a specified period of time. The individual=s progress with the Faculty Development Plan will be evaluated in the future according to the Biology & Microbiology Review and Development Procedure for Tenured Faculty (Appendix E).

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

7. Promotion Recommendations

7.1 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 Biology & 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 renotify 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 4.2. After further discussion, votes shall be cast as a show of hands on a motion to promote for each promotion candidate. At least a two-thirds majority is necessary for a positive promotion recommendation. The results of the vote shall be recorded by the Committee Chair and entered on the Committee's portion of the Faculty Promotion Evaluation Report Form. The Committee shall prepare written reasons for each of its recommendations, and it shall rank the candidates who are recommended for promotion to a given rank.

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.

7.2 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 Appendix C for activities recognized by the Department in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service). Evidence of teaching excellence shall include the results of self evaluations, peer evaluations (when applicable in the case of Probationary Faculty), and student evaluations. To be promoted to the rank of Professor, a faculty member must show evidence of continued excellence in teaching, substantial service activity, and significant scholarly productivity. Continued teaching excellence is measured by the results of self evaluations, peer evaluations (in the case of Probationary Faculty), and student evaluations. Substantial service activity will include service to the Department, the University, and the Profession. Examples of significant scholarly productivity include the quality and quantity of presentations, publications, and grant acquisitions.

7.3 Reconsideration of the Promotion Recommendation

Within two weeks of receiving the written reasons for non-promotion, a candidate may request, by writing to the Department Chair, reconsideration by the Promotion Recommendation Committee. The 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.

8. Governance

8.1 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 Continuing Instructional Academic Staff Members (as defined in Section 3.1.2) 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 Biology & 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 PTS Committee will send a Acall for announcement of candidacy@ to all tenured faculty. During the first week of classes spring semester, the Chair of the PTS 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 PTS 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 rest of the election process is the same as described in Faculty Senate Bylaw VII: The Selection of Department Chairpersons.

8.2 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: preparing class schedules and teaching assignments; developing curriculum revisions; preparing and monitoring the Department=s operating budget; arranging Department meetings and appointing faculty to Departmental committees; appointing and chairing/co-chairing search and screen activities for Departmental vacancies; arranging and coordinating the annual evaluation of Department staff (including Faculty, Instructional Academic Staff, Non-instructional Academic Staff, and Classified Staff); preparing the Department=s annual report; and representing the Department in various University matters and activities.

8.3 Standing Departmental Committees

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

- 8.3.1 Aquatic Science Committee
- 8.3.2 Assessment Committee
- 8.3.3 Biology 101 Committee
- 8.3.4 Biology Major Review Committee
- 8.3.5 Budget Committee
- 8.3.6 Computer Utilization Committee
- 8.3.7 Curriculum Committee
- 8.3.8 Graduate Committee
- 8.3.9 Library Committee
- 8.3.10 Merit Review Advisory Committees (Instructional Staff)
- 8.3.11 Special Merit Review Advisory Committees (Non-instructional Staff)
- 8.3.12 Microbiology Major Review Committee
- 8.3.13 Museum Committee
- 8.3.14 Promotion, Tenure, Salary Committee
- 8.3.15 Promotion Recommendation Committee
- 8.3.16 Retention & Tenure Review Committee

- 8.3.17 Room Utilization, Building Remodeling, Safety, & Equipment Committee
- 8.3.18 Social Committee
- 8.3.19 Speakers and Seminar Committee
- 8.3.20 Student Relations Committee

APPENDIX A. STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

All Biology & Microbiology staff members, unless on leave, shall conduct student evaluations in each course (except seminars, forums, and independent study) each semester; any staff member not administering student evaluations will receive an Unsatisfactory Performance Rating (U) in the teaching category of the Merit Evaluation (Annual Review--see Appendix C).

The student evaluations will take place during the last two weeks of a semester and will utilize the Department Student Evaluation Instruments (Student Evaluation Forms are attached to this appendix). 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. The student evaluation rating is based on 5 possible points and shall be computed from the standard SEI, as a fractional median score. The student evaluation score for one year shall be the average of the two semesters score.

Prior to commencing the student evaluation, the following instructions to students will be read to the students by the administrator of the evaluation. The items that appear on the student evaluation of instruction forms are designed to describe qualities and behaviors of good teachers. We ask that you be objective and fair and that you use this form to evaluate the teacher's performance, not the course. Filling out the form is optional; however if you choose to complete the form, do not sign your name and please answer all items.

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. 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.

Student Evaluation of Instruction

Student evaluations of instruction should be taken seriously for they are used in making decisions that affect the retention, promotion and salaries of teaching staff. Furthermore, they provide an opportunity to give feedback that can lead to better instruction.

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, write your instructor's name, the course number and section and evaluate him/her on each of the following attributes using the key:

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

Student-Teacher Relationship

1. Instructor's regularity in meeting class.
2. Instructor's willingness to give additional time and help to students.

Grading Policy

3. Clarity of the grading policy.
4. Degree to which tests and assignments are returned within a reasonable time.
5. Appropriateness of test questions and assignments for the course content.

Teaching Ability

6. Instructor's enthusiasm for teaching.
7. Instructor's knowledge, presentation and explanation of material.
8. Instructor's competence and clarity in answering students' questions.
9. Instructor's ability to stimulate students to think.

Summary

10. On the basis of the factors considered above, how do you rate this instructor?



Student Evaluation of Instruction--Biology 101 Laboratories

Student evaluations of instruction should be taken seriously for they are used in making decisions that affect the retention, promotion and salaries of teaching staff. Furthermore, they provide an opportunity to give feedback that can lead to better instruction.

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, write your instructor's name, the course number and section and evaluate him/her on each of the following attributes using the key:

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

Student-Teacher Relationship

1. Instructor's regularity in meeting class.
2. Instructor's willingness to give additional time and help to students.

Grading Policy

3. Clarity of lab quiz and attendance policies.
4. Degree to which quizzes and assignments are returned within a reasonable time.
5. Appropriateness of quiz questions.

Teaching Ability

6. Instructor's enthusiasm for teaching.
7. Instructor's knowledge, presentation and explanation of material.
8. Instructor's competence and clarity in answering students' questions.
9. Instructor's ability to stimulate students to think.

Summary

10. On the basis of the factors considered above, how do you rate this instructor?



**APPENDIX B. PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING STUDENT ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT, ADOPTED
JANUARY 23, 1976**

A. Examples of Academic Misconduct and Their Associated Penalties

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.

1. Cheating on an exam.

Penalty: Failure on Exam - 0 points assigned to and recorded for the exam.

2. Collaborating with others in work to be presented, contrary to stated rules.

Penalty: Failure on that report - 0 points assigned to and recorded for the report.

3. Plagiarizing - submitting other's ideas or papers.

Penalty: Failure on that report - 0 points assigned to and recorded for the report.

4. Stealing examinations or course materials.

Penalty: Dismissal from the course.

5. Falsifying records or lab data.

Penalty: Failure on report - 0 points assigned to and recorded for the report.

6. Knowingly and intentionally assisting another student in any of the above.

Penalty: Same penalty as in 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5.

7. Conduct creating unsafe conditions in lab, or violation of state or university safety codes.

Penalty: Oral warning to cease such conduct. If student refuses to heed warning, dismissal from lab for remainder of lab exercise and 0 points assigned to and recorded for that lab. Dismissal from course if such violations or conduct occurs in subsequent periods.

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. MERIT REVIEW (ANNUAL EVALUATION) PROCEDURES

REVISED MAY 6, 1994 and FEBRUARY 1996

1 Evaluation Process

1.1 Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff. Consistent with UWS 3.05 and UW L 3.05, the performance of all Faculty, Instructional Academic Staff, and Continuing Instructional Academic Staff in the Biology & Microbiology Department will 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. 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.

During the first week of May, the Department Chair shall provide each individual with a copy of an Annual Evaluation Form (copy appended to the end of these procedures). Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff shall submit their completed Annual Evaluation Forms, containing a description of activities for the previous summer and the current academic year, to the Chair by June 1. This completed form and student evaluations will constitute the basis of the annual review and serve as a vehicle for self evaluation. Furthermore, the Annual Evaluation shall offer an opportunity for future goal setting and improvement as necessary. In the case of Probationary Faculty, peer evaluation of teaching (see section 5.1 of the Bylaws and Appendix D, Evaluation of Teaching by Probationary Faculty) will also be used in the annual review. Faculty and Continuing Instructional Academic Staff members who are on professional leave are expected to submit by June 1 a completed Annual Evaluation Form that describes their leave and other professional activities.

Retiring Faculty and Continuing Instructional Academic Staff do not have to submit a faculty Annual Evaluation Form at the end of their last academic year. Retiring faculty are requested, however, to submit to the Department Chair their accomplishments in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service--this is needed for incorporation into the Annual Departmental Report to the Dean.

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

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 continually improve their knowledge of the subject matter and their teaching effectiveness. Efforts and accomplishments to these ends are to be reported on the Annual Evaluation Form.

Student evaluations, which will be given in each of the courses taught, will also be used to judge teaching effectiveness. In the case of Probationary Faculty, peer evaluations based on classroom visitations 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 5.1 and Appendix D, Promotion and Tenure Procedures).

Scholarship. As stated in Section 2.2 of the Department Bylaws, Faculty are expected to maintain an active program of scholarship. The Department defines scholarship as any creative endeavor that results in original contributions to the biological sciences, within the areas of teaching, research, and professional service. Scholarly activity may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- ! Research activity
- ! Publishing the results of original research
- ! Presentations of creative or original works 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 grants and awards
- ! Participation in institutes, short courses, seminars, workshops, and professional meetings
- ! Publishing original works such as manuals, textbooks, monographs, book reviews
- ! Engaging in a self-study or a professional growth plan to enhance professional competence
- ! Refereeing and reviewing original manuscripts

Faculty are expected to report their scholarly activities and accomplishments on the Annual Evaluation Form.

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, the profession, or the general public. Service activity recognized by the Department may include, but is not limited to, the following lists.

- ! Departmental
 - ! Departmental committees
 - ! Student services
 - ! Curriculum advising
 - ! Career counseling
 - ! Internship supervision
 - ! Club advising

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

- ! Public and Professional- Public service must be related to the Department Member's professional training.
 - ! Information resource
 - ! Speaking engagements
 - ! Governmental agency committees
 - ! Testimony for hearings and courts
 - ! Local, regional and national society service
 - ! Memberships in scientific societies
 - ! Committees of scientific societies
 - ! Organizing scientific conferences

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

1.1.2 Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designations.

Expectations are different for Instructional Academic Staff than for Faculty Members. This may result in different Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designations for Instructional Academic Staff than for Faculty Members with the same level of accomplishments.

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

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

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

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

Failure to record an entry in any of the evaluation criteria (Teaching, Scholarship or Service) on the Annual Evaluation Form will result in an Unsatisfactory (U) Performance Rating for that criterion.

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

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

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

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

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

1.1.3 Merit Review Advisory Committees. The Department Chair will separate the Department Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff into three Merit Review Advisory Committees, with an attempt to have all sub-disciplines within the Department (general biology, zoology, botany, microbiology, and aquatic science) represented in each committee. The membership of each Merit Review Advisory Committee shall be established during the first part of the fall semester. To participate on a Merit Review Advisory Committee, an individual must be on staff at the time of evaluation and have been employed one semester prior to the annual evaluation process.

Each Merit Review Advisory Committee shall elect a Chair to be responsible for supervising the meetings and recording data.

1.1.4 Annual Review Process. Early in the fall semester, the Merit Review Advisory Committees will use the completed Annual Evaluation Form, Student Evaluation Information, and Peer Evaluation Information (in the case of Probationary Faculty) from the previous year to evaluate each Department Member=s performance based on the evaluation criteria specified in section 1.1.1.

Each member of each Merit Review Advisory Committee shall review the Annual Evaluation Forms of all other Members of the Department. Each member of the committee shall determine for each Member of the Department (1) a Performance Rating for each of the evaluation criteria (Teaching, Scholarship, and Service) and (2) a Merit Category Designation.

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

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

Performance Ratings will be presented to the committee by the committee Chair if requested by any member of the committee.

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

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

Within seven days of the review, the Department Chair shall notify (in writing) each Department Member of 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.

1.1.5 Appeals. 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 Chairs of the appropriate two Merit Review Advisory Committees will convene a meeting to consider the appeal within one week after notification of the appeal. The Committees shall transmit their findings to the Department Chair who will transmit the appeal decision to the appellant within three working days after the reconsideration meetings. To change the original Merit Category Designation, at least 60% of the votes of both committees combined must be in favor of the change.

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

Appeals beyond the Departmental level may be presented to The Complaints, Grievances, Appeals and Academic Freedom Committee (see Section 1.E of the Faculty Senate Bylaws).

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

1.2.1 Appeal. The Department Chair may request a reconsideration of his/her Merit Category Designation. The appeal must be made in writing to the Chair of the Department PTS Committee

within one week after the distribution of the Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designation from the Merit Review Advisory Committees and the Dean. The Chair of the Department PTS Committee will convene a meeting of the Committee-of-the-Whole (defined in the preceding paragraph) and the Dean of SAH within one week after notification of the appeal. To change the original Merit Category Designation, at least 60% of the votes (by show of hands) of the Committee-of-the-Whole and the Dean must be in favor of the change. The Dean=s vote will be weighted at 33% of the vote of the Committee-of-the-Whole (i.e., 25% of the total vote). The Chair of the Department PTS Committee will transmit the results of the action of the reconsideration meeting within one working day after this meeting.

Appeals beyond the Departmental level may be presented to The Complaints, Grievances, Appeals and Academic Freedom Committee (see Section 1.E of the Faculty Senate Bylaws).

1.3 Non-instructional Academic Staff. The annual evaluation process for Non-instructional Academic Staff and Continuing Non-instructional Academic Staff is different from that of Faculty, Instructional Academic Staff, and Continuing 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/criteria will be established for each Non-instructional Academic Staff Member. The guidelines should conform as closely to those for Instructional Staff as possible and will contain evaluation categories conforming to each individual=s job description. The Special Merit Review Advisory Committee will evaluate Non-instructional Academic Staff based on the specific guidelines established for each individual. For each individual being evaluated, members of the Special Merit Review Advisory Committee(s) will assign (1) a Performance Rating (U = Unsatisfactory, S = Satisfactory, or E = Exceptional) for each evaluation category in each individual=s specific guidelines and (2) a Merit Category Designation (1= Non-meritorious, 2 = Meritorious, 3 = Significantly Meritorious, 4 = Exceptionally Meritorious). The Chair of the Special Review Advisory Committee will transmit the results of the evaluation to the Department Chair who will, within seven days of the review, notify (in writing) each Non-instructional Academic Staff Member of his/her Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designation.

1.3.1 Appeals. Non-instructional Academic Staff Members may request a reconsideration of their Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designations. This request must be made in writing to the Department Chair within one week of the distribution of Performance Ratings and Merit Category Designation by the Department Chair. The Chair of the appropriate Special Merit Review Advisory Committee will convene a meeting to consider the appeal within one

week after notification of the appeal. The Committee shall transmit its findings to the Department Chair who will transmit the appeal decision to the appellant within one working day after the reconsideration meeting.

If the appellant is not satisfied with the outcome of the reconsideration by the Special Merit Review Advisory Committee, he/she may appeal to the Department of Biology & Microbiology acting as a Committee-of-the-Whole (defined here as all Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff). The rest of the appeal process is the same as that for Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff (see section 1.1.5).

2 Money Distribution

Unless mandated otherwise by the University System Administration, the entire pay package for each year will be distributed as merit money according to the following procedure. Merit money will be distributed to all Department Members with Merit Category Designations of 2, 3, and 4. The money distribution formula will be the same for the Faculty, Instructional Academic Staff, and Non-Instructional Academic Staff. There are two pools of merit funds, i.e., one for Faculty and another for Instructional Academic Staff and Non-instructional Academic Staff.

2.1 Procedures and Formulas

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

"(Pay package %) X_1)+ Y_o or Y_1 or Y_2 _ X Average Salary in Department

Where:

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

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

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

$Y_o = 0.00\%$ 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.

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

2.2 Example of Money Distribution for Faculty for the 1992/1993 Academic Year. The following calculations were made for the Biology & Microbiology Department for the 1992/93 salary distribution. Data used in the calculations are as follows:

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

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

Award for Individuals in Merit Category 2

$$"(4.25\% + 0.00\% \times \$44,147 = \$ 938$$

Award for Individuals in Merit Category 3

$$"(4.25\% + 0.30\% \times \$44,147 = \$ 1070$$

Award for Individuals in Merit Category 4

$$"(4.25\% + 0.60\% \times \$44,147 = \$ 1203$$

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

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

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

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

2.2.2 Part B. Calculation of the Money Distribution based on Salary of each Individual

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

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

Award in Part B as a % of each individual=s salary = Average award for Part B) Average salary in Department = \$806) \$44,147 = 1.83%. 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (1) the average salary of Faculty in the Department was \$51,001;
- (2) a merit pay package of 0.33%, thus the sum of money available for distribution was 0.33% of the total Faculty salaries of the Department, which equaled \$3,544; and
- (3) Category 1= 0 individuals, Category 2 = 4 individuals, Category 3 = 12 individuals, and Category 4 = 5 individuals.

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

Award to have been made to Individuals in Merit Category 2

$$"(0.33\% \text{) } 2)+ 0.00\% > \text{ X } \$51,001 = \$ 84$$

Award to have been made to Individuals in Merit Category 3

$$"(0.33\% \text{) } 2)+ 0.30\% > \text{ X } \$51,001 = \$ 237$$

Award to have been made to Individuals in Merit Category 4

$$"(0.33\% \text{) } 2)+ 0.60\% > \text{ X } \$51,001 = \$ 390$$

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

$$\$ 84 \text{ X } 4 = \$ 336$$

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

$$\$237 \text{ X } 12 = \$2844$$

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

$$\$390 \text{ X } 5 = \underline{\$1950}$$

Therefore, the total money to have been awarded in 1994/95 for entire Department for Part A was = \$5130

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX D. EVALUATION OF TEACHING BY PROBATIONARY FACULTY

1. Evaluation Process

The Department Chair will appoint two Peer Evaluators for each Probationary Faculty Member. Teaching in one course (preferably a lecture course) will be evaluated twice each semester by each Peer Evaluator for a minimum of four semesters, with the option for longer evaluation periods (1) if deemed necessary by the Department Chair or the Peer Evaluators or (2) if requested by the Probationary Faculty Member being evaluated. Each semester, the first evaluation will occur between the third and seventh weeks, and the second evaluation will occur between the eleventh and fourteenth weeks. Peer evaluations will be announced and will be coordinated between the Peer Evaluators and the Probationary Faculty Members. To minimize disruptions of classes, both Peer Evaluators are encouraged to evaluate the same class at the same time.

Peer Evaluators will prepare a written report for each class visit and will transmit a copy of the report within one week of the class visit to the Probationary Faculty Member and to the Department Chair. At that time, the Peer Evaluators will also discuss the contents of the report with the Probationary Faculty Member. The Department Chair will retain the reports in the Departmental file of the Probationary Faculty Member. 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 PROBATIONARY FACULTY REPORT FORM

Probationary Faculty Member _____

Peer Evaluator _____

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

Date of Evaluation _____

COMMENTS

**APPENDIX E. TENURED FACULTY REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE, ADOPTED
DECEMBER, 1993; REVISED FEBRUARY 1996**

1. Evaluation Procedure

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 who are to undergo Tenured Faculty Review will be notified by the Department Chair 20 days prior to the Annual Evaluation. The Department Chair will send the College Dean a list of Department Members and the years in which they are to be reviewed.

Tenured-Faculty Review will be based on the results of the Merit Review (Annual Evaluation) Procedures. For purposes of this review, the composite data of the two Merit Review Advisory Committees who evaluated the Faculty Member under review will be used. In other words, for each year of the five-year review period, the number of Satisfactory (S), Exceptional (E), and Unsatisfactory (U) Performance Ratings from the two Merit Review Advisory Committees will be summed for each Evaluation Criterion (Teaching, Scholarship, and Service). To receive a composite Performance Rating of Satisfactory for any Evaluation Criterion for a specific year, the Faculty Member must have received an S or E from at least 75% of the members of the two Merit Review Advisory Committees. A Faculty Member receiving S or E Performance Ratings for all Evaluation Criteria (Teaching, Scholarship and Service) for all five years* of the post-tenure review period shall receive a Satisfactory Performance Rating for the Tenured Faculty Review and Development Procedure. A Faculty Member who has received three or more U composite Performance Ratings over the five-year review period or two or more U composite Performance Ratings in any one category over the five-year review period will be considered to have an Unsatisfactory Performance Rating for the five-year post-tenure review period, pending further review by the Committee-of-the-Whole (COTW).

Individuals receiving a Satisfactory Performance Rating for the five-year review period will be given written notification within seven days after the determination of their rating. Written notification of the Satisfactory Performance Rating will be sent to the Dean. Faculty Members receiving an Unsatisfactory Performance 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 for the meeting of the COTW. The Chair of the Retention & Tenure Committee (see Bylaws section 5.1) will schedule a meeting of the COTW within 21 days after the letter of notification has been sent to the Faculty Member being reviewed. Any data the individual wishes to submit to the COTW for consideration must be submitted in writing seven days prior to the meeting date.

The COTW will be composed of the Biology & Microbiology Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff Members who served on the three Merit Review Advisory Committees. At the meeting, the COTW will discuss and evaluate the data on which the original evaluation was made and any data subsequently submitted by the Faculty Member being evaluated. Separate votes for each Evaluation Criterion (Teaching, Scholarship, and Service) shall be cast by a show of hands on a motion that the Faculty Member=s performance was Satisfactory. For each Evaluation Criterion, at least a 75% majority vote is necessary for a Satisfactory Performance Rating. Any member of the COTW who evaluates the Faculty Member being reviewed as Unsatisfactory shall, upon request of the Chair, submit in writing the reasons for the rating. The Faculty Member being reviewed will be notified of the results of the COTW within seven days of the Performance Rating determination. If the COTW determines the individual's performance has been Satisfactory, the Chair will send a letter to the Dean transmitting that information. If the COTW determines that the individual's performance is Unsatisfactory, the Chair will (1) provide notification to the Faculty Member, (2) provide the Faculty Member with a list of concerns specific to the Evaluation Criteria, and (3) establish a Faculty Development Plan Committee (FDPC).

2. 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. Within two weeks after notification of an Unsatisfactory Performance Rating by the COTW, the FDPC will meet with the Faculty Member under review to discuss a Faculty Development Plan (FCP) to remedy the Evaluation Criteria of concern listed by the COTW in a specified amount of time. The FCP 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 FCP, 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 FCP 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.

APPENDIX F. FACULTY PROMOTION EVALUATION REPORT FORM

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

The department 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 Biology & 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 continuing, full-time academic staff. 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

A. Curriculum

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

B. Qualifications

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

C. Positions

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

D. Priorities

The priority system will be 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 E. will be used for staff selection.

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

¹Academic Staff with multiple-year appointments

²Academic staff with single-year appointments

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

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

F. Chairperson

The department chairperson will be guaranteed a one-half (2) appointment which shall include a teaching assignment. This 2 time appointment will be included as a zero (0) in the rotational system. Any additional summer appointment, whether it be for administration or teaching, will be included in the formula for the rotational system.

G. Retirement

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

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 ensuing academic year should not be recommended for summer session appointments, or if previously appointed to the summer session faculty, their appointments will be rescinded.

APPENDIX I. TEACHING BY ADJUNCT FACULTY

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

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

APPENDIX J. SALARY EQUITY ADJUSTMENT POLICY

(Initially approved 2/17/94; revised 10/27/95)

A. Definition

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

B. Process

1. Individual Inequities

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

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

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

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

2. Departmental Inequities

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

APPENDIX K. PROCEDURE FOR SELECTING THE BIOLOGY SENIOR OF THE YEAR

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

Eligibility: awarded to graduating seniors majoring in Biology or Microbiology.

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

- A. A list of seniors in biology and microbiology will be submitted to each biology 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 would be in the form of a short note of support sent to the Student Relations Committee.
- C. The Student Relations Committee would select the top 3 or 4 seniors and submit that list to the biology faculty for the final selection. Highlights of the recommendations for each senior will be presented prior to the vote.

APPENDIX L. PROCEDURE FOR SELECTING RECIPIENT OF THE LEE SCHOLARSHIP

- A. The candidates for the Lee Scholarship Award should be outstanding biology (biology or microbiology) majors with 66-89 credits by the end of the semester previous to when the award is given.

- B. A Lee Scholarship Subcommittee is appointed by the Chairman of the Student Relations Committee. This Subcommittee recommends candidates to the Department, which makes the final decision. The Subcommittee consists of a microbiologist, a field biologist, and a general biologist.

APPENDIX M. HIRING PROCEDURES

I. Position Committee Appointed

- A. Committee appointed by Department Chair
- B. Co-chaired by Department Chair
- C. Committee should represent a diversity of specialties and viewpoints.
 - 1. Solicit input/suggestions from faculty
 - 2. Write position description(s)
 - 3. Present to department for approval

II. Search and Screen Committee

- A. Appointed by Department Chair
- A. Co-chaired by Department Chair
- B. Committee composition
 - 1. Co-chairs
 - 2. Usually two from specialty area
 - 3. Usually two from other areas
- C. Committee Responsibilities
 - 1. Write Specific Position Description
 - 2. Review all procedures and Affirmative Action Guidelines
 - 3. Advertise Position after proper approval
 - 4. Committee Records
 - a) All materials concerning individual applicants shall be confidential.
 - b) The chair shall be the custodian of all application materials and shall be responsible for their maintenance and making them available to the Committee.
 - c) The Affirmative Action Officer shall compile information on affirmative action, and summary data on gender, ethnic background and geographic distribution of all applicants and nominees. This information shall be maintained on file until the search and screen process is complete.
 - d) The chair shall maintain a file of committee documents and records as required by the Human Resources and Diversity Office.
 - 5. Search and Screen Procedures
 - a) Applications and nominations will be sought by placing ads in appropriate publications, including *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Science*. In addition, Letters and position descriptions will be sent to appropriate individuals/organizations in order to insure a diverse pool of applicants. Committee members can distribute the official position description at appropriate meetings and

conferences. The Affirmative Action Officer may send position descriptions and notices to individuals/organizations as deemed appropriate.

- b) All applications must be in writing.
- c) As applications are received, the chair will respond to each applicant indicating the receipt of the application and the need for additional information or accommodation, if necessary. The chair will also inform the applicant of the disclosure statement and enclose a copy of the position description.
- d) The chair will send all applicants the Equal Employment Opportunity Request Form with return address of the Affirmative Action Office. Also, the chair will send information about the campus and the community.
- e) Initial Screening--see appended Standard Operating Procedure (SOP)
 - 1) The chair will maintain an updated list of all applicants and the status of their files.
 - 2) The Committee shall use the previously determined criteria to develop a pool of acceptable candidates.
- f) Second Screening--see appended SOP
 - 1) The second screening will be conducted by the Committee.
 - 2) After complete discussion of each candidate's credentials and application materials, the Committee shall vote to a) retain for detailed evaluation or b) remove from further consideration.
- g) Semi-Final Screening--see appended SOP
 - 1) The semi-final screening shall be conducted by the Committee.
 - 2) Telephone reference checks will be made on each of the semi-finalists. These contacts shall be made by committee members as assigned by the chair. For each call, a written record will be maintained.
 - 3) Committee members who made reference checks will share information obtained with the Committee. The chair or designee may seek further information about each candidate as needed.
 - 4) The Committee shall discuss and vote on each candidate to select those to be forward to the Department for approval. The semi-finalists will be ranked in order for presentation to the Department.
- 6. Departmental approval of acceptable candidates
 - a) Files made available to department
 - b) Department votes to invite 2-3 candidates to campus for interviews.
- 7. Chair invites candidates for interview and follows with written confirmations.
 - a) Informs candidates about seminar (see Appendix B)
 - b) Includes interview and activities in schedule.

III. Campus Visit

- A. Review job description (Chair=s responsibility)
 - 1. Likely class assignments
 - 2. Typical Loads
 - 3. Committee work (departmental and university)
 - 4. Research space, facilities
 - 5. UW-L tenure density policy
- B. Campus tour
- C. Introduced to and visit with individual faculty
- D. Present Seminar
- E. Department Interview (see appended sample questions)
 - 1. Search and Screen Committee
 - 2. Strongly encourage attendance of all interested faculty
- F. Visit with Deans
- G. Tour La Crosse area
- H. Social event in evening at faculty house or local restaurant (all faculty encouraged to participate)

IV. Offering of Position

- A. Search and Screen Committee meets to make recommendation to department
- B. Presents to department for approval
- C. Chair may ask for recommendation on salary, rank, and probationary period

V. Chair Communicates to Administration

VI. The work of the Search and Screen Committee and the Department of Biology and Microbiology shall reflect the fact that the University of Wisconsin System is an equal opportunity affirmative action employer.

VII. Ensure necessary forms, paperwork is received by Human Resources and Diversity.

**STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE
FOR SCREENING (REVIEW/RANKING) OF CANDIDATES**

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 speciality, whether the files are complete, etc. To arrive at a list of most highly qualified candidates, the Search/Screen Committee for the position of Aquatic Invertebrate Biologist agreed upon the procedure described in the remainder of this document. The procedure primarily involves three steps, each resulting with a smaller (more highly qualified) pool of the candidates. If deemed necessary by the committee, the procedure can be amended as the screening process proceeds. In order for an amendment to be accepted, two-thirds of the committee must support the amendment. Meetings of the Search and Screen Committee will be held in accordance with Wisconsin Open Meeting Laws. The meetings may move to Aclosed session@ if the following motion is made and passed--@I move to convene in closed session to consider possible employment and personal history about candidates for the position of _____ at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse as provided in Sections 19.85 (1)(c&f) of Wisconsin Statutes.@

The committee will create a list of selection/qualifications criteria based on the job description. The search/screen committee will also have a Arecording@ secretary who records (possibly on a computer) minutes, including why certain candidates were eliminated from the Aviable-candidate pool@ at each round of the screen/ranking process.

- 1. Initial screen.** Each member of the search/screen committee will review files of the entire pool of candidates and make an initial assessment (yes/no) of each candidate to determine whether each candidate should be considered further--this should be based on (1) whether the candidate meets the selection/qualifications criteria and (2) whether the candidate is a strong candidate among those who meet the minimum selection/qualifications criteria.

The committee will then meet and discuss each candidate. If any committee member believes that a candidate deserves further consideration (based on the selection/qualifications criteria), that candidate will be placed in the Apool of candidates@ to be considered in the second round of screen/ranking. The other candidates will be removed from further consideration, and the recording secretary of the committee will record the selection/qualifications criterion/criteria that each unsuccessful candidate did not meet.

If there are not a sufficient number of viable candidates in the candidate pool, a motion to re-open the search process may be made.

- 2. Second screen/ranking.** Each committee member will independently (without further input from other committee members) review the remaining pool of candidates, create a list of who he/she believes to be the top 15 candidates (or 10% of the initial candidate pool, whichever is greatest), and assign a value of 15 to the top candidate, a value of 14 to the next highest candidate, etc. Each committee member will submit his/her list to the committee co-chair who will summarize these individual lists, construct a matrix that includes the values each committee member assigned to candidates in their list of top candidates, and compute a composite ranking of candidates (the candidate with the greatest total score will be given a rank of 1, i.e., the top ranked candidate prior to further discussion). The committee will meet again, and the co-chair will present the summary matrix, e.g., refer to the following table.

<u>Candidate i.d.</u>	<u>Evaluations by committee members</u>					<u>Total Score</u>	<u>Candidate rank</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>		
One	14	14	15	15	15	73	1
Two	15	13	14	13	14	69	2
Three	13	15	12	14	13	67	3
...
Fifteen	1	1	2	0	0	4	15
Sixteen	0	1	0	2	0	4	16
...

The committee will then review and discuss each candidate in the matrix and agree on the candidates who should be in the pool of the top 15 candidates (or 10% of the initial candidate pool, whichever is greatest). Depending on the results of the discussion, the rankings compiled by the committee co-chair may change.

3. **Final pre-interview screen/ranking.** Each committee member will independently (without further input from other committee members) review the pool of the top 15 candidates, create a list of who he/she believes to be the top 10 candidates (or 10% of the initial candidate pool, whichever is greatest), and assign a value of 10 to the top candidate, a value of 9 to the next highest candidate, etc. Each committee member will submit his/her list to the committee co-chair who will summarize these individual lists, construct a matrix that includes the values each committee member assigned to candidates in their list of top candidates, and compute a composite ranking of candidates (the candidate with the greatest total score would be given a rank of 1, i.e., the top ranked candidate prior to further discussion). The committee will meet again, and the co-chair will present the summary matrix, e.g., refer to the following table.

<u>Candidate i.d.</u>	<u>Evaluations by committee members</u>							<u>Total Score</u>	<u>Rank</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>		
One	10	10	9	8	10	47		1	
Two	9	8	10	9	8	44		2	
Three	8	9	8	10	8	41		3	
...	
Ten	1	1	0	2	0	4		10	
Eleven	0	2	0	0	1	3		11	
...	

The committee will then review and discuss each candidate in the matrix and, based on that discussion, create a ranked list of the most highly qualified 10 candidates. Depending on the results of the discussion, the rankings compiled by the committee co-chair may change.

4. Telephone reference checks will be made on the top candidates (possibly top 5). All members of the Search/screen committee can participate in the reference checks--at least two members will take part in each call. One of the committee co-chairs will make assignments for the calls. A list of questions will be generated prior to making any calls. A written record will be maintained for each call.
5. Committee members who made reference checks will share the information obtained with the Committee. The Chair or Designee may seek further information about each candidate as needed.
6. The Committee shall discuss and vote on each candidate to select and rank those to be forwarded to the Department for approval.
7. The files of candidates on the ranked list will be made available to the Department. The Department will meet to discuss the list and then vote to invite 2-3 candidates to campus for interviews.
8. The list of 2-3 candidates the Department recommends for interviews will be sent to the Dean of SAH for approval.
9. After approval of the list by the Dean, the Department Chair or Designee will invite (verbally) candidates for interviews on campus--written confirmations of the invitations will follow. In the written invitation, the Chair will include a list and schedule of interview activities. Among the activities is the requirement of a seminar to be presented by the candidate.