

BYLAWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MICROBIOLOGY

I. INTRODUCTION

These bylaws, adopted by the faculty of the Department of Microbiology, reflect the position of the department in the teaching, research, service and administrative functions of the department. In general, the actions of the department are determined by the recommendations of its various standing and *ad hoc* committees, subject to approval of the entire faculty. In some cases, all decisions of the committee are brought before the entire faculty, while in others, the committee decision is adopted as official in the absence of objection after a reasonable time; these instances are made explicit in the following sections. According to the policy of the college, any decision of the faculty may be set aside by the department head, except in matters of curriculum.

II. DECISION MAKING PROCEDURES

- A. Decisions, subject to the conditions specified in the introduction, are made by the voting members of the faculty at meetings called by the department head or associate head. Before each meeting, an agenda is prepared by the department head or associate department head and distributed to the faculty. Additional items may be added to the agenda at the time of the meeting.
- B. Voting members of the faculty are those permanent, full-time faculty members who hold the rank of Assistant Professor or above. Decisions are made by a majority vote of the voting members present at the meeting.
- C. Decisions can be made only if a quorum is present. A quorum consists of three-fifths of the voting members of the faculty. A voting member who, at the time of a meeting, is unavailable for a period of five days or more will not be counted as a voting member for purposes of establishing a quorum. In any case, a quorum will be not fewer than eight.

III. STANDING COMMITTEES

Standing committees are appointed by the department head. Appointments are normally for staggered, three-year terms. The department head designates the chairman of each standing committee.

The Microbiology Department has the following standing committees:

1. Curriculum Committee
2. Graduate Admissions Committee
3. Graduate Advisory Committee
4. Seminar Committee
5. Self-Study Committee
6. Comprehensive Examination Committee

IV. PROCEDURES FOR SELECTION OF NEW FACULTY

When the Department determines that there is a need for a new faculty member, and when permission has been obtained to advertise a new faculty position, a search committee will be named by the head. The search committee arranges solicitation of applications, screening of applicants, and invitation of several to visit the department, give seminars, and be interviewed by the staff and appropriate members of the College

and University administration. Finally, the faculty are asked to indicate their preference among the candidates. The head, unless compelling reasons dictate otherwise, will recommend the person preferred by the faculty.

V. PROCEDURES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Department decisions and recommendations concerning the probationary period, tenure and promotions, and cumulative performance review shall be made in accordance with the procedures defined in the *Faculty Handbook* and adhere to the "Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure" approved by the UT Board of Trustees at its meeting of June 18, 1998. Tenured faculty members who are at or above the rank of the faculty member under review will examine evidence of teaching effectiveness, quality of scholarly work and service of an individual and recommend action based on these issues. Usually the department head's recommendation to the Dean will reflect the majority will of the faculty voting on these recommendations. If the department head's recommendation does not reflect the majority will of the voting faculty, the department head is to advise appropriate colleagues of this departure from their expressed will, and they are to prepare a report for the Dean explaining why they do not agree with the head's recommendations.

- A. Probationary faculty undergoing review for promotion to associate professor and awarding of tenure are expected to have established an independent research program and to have achieved a national level of recognition for scholarly work. Promise for continued scholarly production and growth is required. Teaching, as measured by student and peer review, must reflect effectiveness at dissemination of concepts as well as factual materials at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Service responsibilities are to have been commensurate with those to be reasonably expected of a probationary faculty member developing as a recognized scholar and effective teacher.
- B. Faculty under consideration for promotion to the rank of professor are expected to have achieved an international level of recognition for scholarly work and to have maintained an independent research program. Promise for continued scholarship at the described level is required. Teaching effectiveness as described above is expected as are service responsibilities at a level commensurate with those to be expected of a leading member of the faculty and field.
- C. Faculty at all levels will meet individually with the head in a formal "annual performance and evaluation review" as described in the *Faculty Handbook*. The head will prepare a document summarizing the review and including an evaluation of the faculty member's teaching, research, and service activities over the past year as well as planning for what should occur during the coming year. The document will contain the head's overall assessment of the faculty member's performance as "Exceeds Expectations for Rank," "Meets Expectations for Rank," "Needs Improvement," and "Unsatisfactory Performance for Rank."
- D. In agreement with In the "Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure" approved by the UT Board of Trustees in June of 1998, tenured faculty in the department will have an individual comprehensive, formal, and

cumulative performance review every five years. A promotion review may substitute if performed within 2 years of a scheduled performance review; however, as stated in the "Policies....", no more than seven years may elapse between such reviews. The 3-member peer review team will contain one member from outside the department and will be selected by the head with input from the faculty member and peer faculty. The evaluation of performance will be based on scholarly works, invited appraisal letters from external reviewers (selected as described above for the review team), annual performance reviews, student and peer evaluations of teaching quality, and service. The peer review committee will make an overall evaluation using the five categories of outstanding, very good, good, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory. The head will use this report as advisory in preparing a summary report for the Dean.

- E. The annual performance report and the cumulative report will form the bases for merit pay increments as established by the University. In the case of one unsatisfactory cumulative review or two such consecutive annual performance reviews and with the concurrence of the Dean, a review committee will be formed to provide a second evaluation to form the basis for additional considerations as outlined in the "Policies...."

VI. PROCEDURES FOR CURRICULAR CHANGE

Most curricular changes are effected through the mechanism described in Article II of these by-laws, upon recommendation of the curriculum committee, as described in Section I of the Appendix.

Major changes involving the entire curriculum and requiring more intensive study are adopted after a more complex procedure. The department head assigns specific faculty members to develop proposals for evaluation and possible implementation. These proposals are circulated for comment and possible revision. A period of time, two or three days, is then set aside for the faculty to meet as a committee of the whole for purposes of in-depth discussion of the proposal. When a consensus is reached, those responsible for the proposals are assigned to draft a formal proposal, embodying the consensus, which is then acted upon by the faculty under normal procedures.

VII. ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD

The department head is responsible to the College for the conduct of departmental business. This responsibility is combined with the necessary authority to make decisions as to teaching assignments, committee appointments, apportionment of space (for offices, teaching and research), expenditure of departmental funds, recommendations for hiring, tenure, promotions and salary increases among department personnel, as well as to represent the department in matters involving other departments, persons, or agencies, and to implement the decisions of the department. Committee and faculty recommendations are normally followed by the head, although circumstances may require the head to exercise his/her own judgment. The head should inform the faculty as fully as possible of all decisions which concern them individually or the department as a whole.

VIII. ASSOCIATE DEPARTMENT HEAD

The associate department head is appointed by the department head. He/she is responsible for those administrative functions delegated to him by the department head.

IX. AMENDMENT AND RATIFICATION

These by-laws may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the faculty present at a faculty meeting, provided that the item has been placed on the agenda and the text of the change has been given in writing to the faculty with the announcement of the agenda.

These by-laws shall be ratified by a majority vote of the faculty.