

Resource Manual

Preamble

This *Resources Manual* is intended to be a repository of best practices suggestions and helpful resources for faculty, staff and administrators. The documents contained herein reflect the careful consideration of Faculty Senate. In these documents, a "best practice" is a method or technique that, through experience, research or evaluation has shown to achieve reliable and superior results. A "best practice" is expected to evolve over time and is to be used as a guide rather than prescribed practice, procedure, policy, or contractual obligation. These resources are provided by the University of Tennessee Knoxville Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost for internal use only and are not approved or endorsed by the UT Board of Trustees or Office of General Counsel.

These statements reflect the work of several Faculty Senate committees and were initially included as appendices to the 1999 Manual for Faculty Evaluation. Following additions and revisions drafted by the Faculty Affairs Committee, the current Best Practices Statements were presented to and approved by the Faculty Senate for inclusion in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation.

BEST PRACTICES FOR ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW OF FACULTY TEACHING (INCLUDING ADVISING AND MENTORING)

This statement reflects input from the Teaching Council, Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Executive Council of the Faculty Senate. This document incorporates changes approved by the Faculty Senate on May 1, 2006. The section on “Academic Advising and Mentoring Expertise and Assessment” was proposed by the Academic Advising Leadership Group and approved by the Faculty Senate on September 19, 2011.

This document is intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating faculty members. These ideas are promoted by the Teaching Council and the Faculty Affairs Committee and should be considered as recommendations.

Goals and Approach for the Review of Teaching

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, is dedicated to excellence in teaching. Excellence means effectively providing learning experiences that prepare students for the challenges of a complex, ever-changing, and diverse workplace and society. To promote and identify excellence, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, must have an effective process for review of teaching. The goals of the review process are to: (1) improve the quality and emphasize the importance of teaching across the campus, (2) reward excellence in teaching with positive incentives, (3) recognize the quality of faculty teaching to those within and outside the university, (4) promote the scholarship of teaching, (5) recognize teaching as one aspect of outreach, (6) encourage the connection between teaching and research, (7) provide means for protecting intellectual freedom, and (8) foster high standards among faculty in the university community.

The effectiveness of teaching is cited specifically as a key criterion in the *Faculty Handbook* in matters of professional advancement including retention, promotion and tenure. The process of regular assessment of teaching should be included in the bylaws of all units where teaching is conducted. Review of teaching should be multi-faceted, including inputs from the faculty member being reviewed, peers, and students. As the various departments across the University are quite diverse in function and size, details of the review process will vary by discipline to accommodate diversity in teaching techniques and content. This process of teaching assessment and review should be designed to minimize burdens for faculty, administrators, and students.

Assessment and Review

Assessment is a critical step to improve the quality and status of teaching. For the purposes of this document, assessment of faculty teaching includes feedback about strengths and areas for improvement based on inputs from the faculty member being reviewed, as well as from peers, and students. Faculty members should gain an understanding of their strengths and areas for improvement through self-examination, dialogue with peers, and feedback from students. An assessment should not include a

performance rating.

Review is an indicator of whether a faculty member's teaching exceeds, meets, or fails to meet a specified standard articulated in department bylaws. The review and the resulting performance measure are necessary to recognize excellence in teaching. Review will be the responsibility of the department head and will result in a specific performance measure, which synthesizes the results of the self, peer, and student reviews.

Teaching Review Process

Self Assessment

Self assessment allows faculty members to reflect on their teaching both for their benefit and to facilitate dialogue about their teaching with others. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members should conduct two forms of self assessment of their teaching. As part of their annual review document, faculty should write a brief narrative with a description and analysis of their teaching. In preparation for a peer assessment of teaching, faculty should compile a more extensive document as outlined below.

A self assessment review produced in conjunction with a peer assessment of teaching would include a person's teaching philosophy and may also include, but not be limited to, self-assessment results from previous reviews, teaching goals, methods for achieving these goals, and plans for achieving teaching excellence. The document may be supported by a teaching portfolio that illustrates implementations or successes of the philosophy, documents activities such as short courses that improved teaching skills, considers alternative teaching objectives and methods, or possibly other aspects of teaching for the faculty member being reviewed. For tenure-track faculty, their mentor may offer advice in preparing the self assessment document. The self assessment document should be given to the peer review team at the beginning of the review process.

Peer Assessment

Peer assessment provides faculty members with feedback from their peers that will assist them in identifying strengths and areas for improvement in their teaching. Peer assessment of teaching can foster constructive dialogue about teaching that can benefit not only the faculty member under review, but the members of the peer assessment team.

A peer teaching review should be conducted for a tenure-track faculty member typically twice during their probationary period, and for a tenured faculty member at least once prior to consideration for promotion. Department bylaws may specify more specific intervals for peer assessment, as well as whether or if full professors are reviewed. Where special circumstances arise, a faculty member has the right to request reconvening of a peer assessment team or formation of a new peer assessment team in the interval between scheduled peer reviews. Peer assessment of teaching should also be conducted as part of a "triggered" cumulative review of tenured faculty as described in the Faculty Handbook (3.8).

The peer assessment team should consist of three tenured faculty members. One is selected by the faculty member under review, one by the department head, and the third is agreed upon by the two. Departments are encouraged to have at least one faculty member from outside the department included on peer assessment teams.

Department bylaws should address the process of peer assessment of teaching. The peer review team should offer feedback that: (1) considers whether the courses of the faculty member have appropriate content and offer students sufficient opportunity to acquire appropriate skills; (2) considers whether the grading system and review/assessment tools are consistent with course content and student skill development; (3) examines the teaching methods of the faculty member for effectiveness; and (4) recognizes the potential risks and benefits inherent in innovative teaching methods. Feedback is facilitated by meetings with the faculty member to discuss teaching before, after, and otherwise as needed or requested during the assessment process.

Feedback may be based on: (1) examination and discussion of materials for the course (e.g., handouts, tests, web pages, etc.); and (2) observation in the classroom or instructional setting for at least one course being taught during the semester of the peer assessment. The peer review team will produce a report and discuss the content with the faculty member being reviewed. After discussing the report with the department head, the faculty member being reviewed has the right to submit a written response to the report. The report and response (if any) should be part of promotion and tenure considerations.

Student Review

Student review of teaching is mandated. To increase the feedback component of the student review, written student comments should be solicited in addition to any mandatory questionnaire. Results of the open-ended student comments would be returned to the faculty member after grades are sent to the central administration. The faculty member may choose to include a summary of open-ended comments as part of their promotion and tenure dossier or as part of a self-assessment of teaching. While student review of instruction occurs each semester, it should not receive greater weight than self or peer assessments during the faculty review processes.

Annual Review by the Department Head

Annual reviews should include a brief self assessment the results of student reviews and the peer assessment of teaching if it was held during the preceding year. The three criteria and performance measures for the annual review should include:

- 1) Assuming that a department has agreed to the roles of its courses, do courses of the faculty member have appropriate content and are students given opportunity to acquire the appropriate skills?

- (2) Are the grading system and review/assessment tools consistent with course content and student skill development?

(3) Are the teaching methods of the faculty member effective?

The assessment results – particularly the peer assessment – should be given considerable weight in the annual review by the department head. The standards for the review are to be constructed by each department.

After an annual review, the faculty member has the right to an additional previously unscheduled peer assessment with self assessment, if she/he believes it to be appropriate.

The results of the annual teaching reviews will be documented by the department head in terms of the standards established by the faculty of that department and using the campus-level system of performance categories.

Academic Advising and Mentoring Expertise and Assessment

When an academic unit provides for the evaluation of advising and mentoring activities by specifying in unit bylaws (1) the expectations for these activities on the part of faculty and (2) the standards for evaluating these activities, then these activities are considered as a part of the evaluation of the faculty member's teaching ability and effectiveness as provided for in those bylaws. To assist this evaluation, the faculty member should provide substantiating materials, which may include a statement of his/her philosophy regarding advising and mentoring and its implementation and a list of advising responsibilities (including graduate, undergraduate, and student organization advising) and accomplishments, as provided in the unit bylaws or consistent with the expectations and standards specified in the unit bylaws. These substantiating materials may include evidence of, e.g.: honors or awards received for advising or mentoring; development activities relating to advising or mentoring (e.g., attendance at advisor/mentor development seminars or conferences); supervision of graduate dissertations/theses and undergraduate honor theses or directed or independent research/scholarship; and participation in formal advising or mentoring programs offered through the University or other education-oriented or professional organizations.

In addition, a faculty member's department head may conduct an assessment of the faculty member's advising and mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students with input from students and peers, as appropriate. The department head may utilize the "Student Assessment of Major/Departmental Advisor" developed by the Academic Advising Leadership Group (AALG). Information concerning advisor assessment can be found at <http://www.utk.edu/advising/for-advisors/advisor-assessment>.

BEST PRACTICES FOR EVALUATING FACULTY RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE ACTIVITY

(Last revised by Faculty Affairs on May 1, 2006)

This section is intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating faculty members. These are promoted by the Research Council and should be considered as recommendations.

Goals

One of the three basic missions of the University is research, which is the foundation and key to all learning that occurs at the University. Research may be simply learning at the most advanced, creative, and systematic edges of knowledge where discovery and imagination constantly recast the relation between the known and the unknown. This best practices document follows the formulation of the *Faculty Handbook* for research as research, scholarship and creative activity, so as to recognize the broad diversity of faculty contributions to this institutional mission. While the research of discovery is a major contributor to this mission, the research of application and integration are central to the contribution of some colleges and departments to the mission. Interdisciplinary collaboration in research, scholarship, and creative activity also contribute to the mission, and should be strongly encouraged where appropriate.

Research, scholarship, and creative activity should not be measured only in terms of quantity but also in terms of quality. In each discipline, certain outlets and venues for research, scholarship, and creative activities are considered to be more prestigious and to demonstrate greater merit than others. Publication, presentation, exhibition, or performance through these settings should be recognized as demonstrating a high standard of merit. Because standards of merit vary greatly, primary assessment of quality measures should be made within a discipline, or across contributing disciplines, where appropriate. While the appropriate mix of research, scholarship, and creative input and output activities may be specific to a given discipline, some general dimensions of research, scholarship, and creative achievement can be identified:

Input Activities

Faculty members must engage in input activities to achieve research, scholarship and creative activity outputs by which they will be judged. These input activities could include:

- Selecting realistic yet challenging topics for research, scholarship and creative activity;
- Using appropriate methods and techniques in meeting objectives;
- Optimizing the outputs of research, scholarship and creative activity relative to inputs, such as time, personnel, materials, facilities and equipment;

- Internalizing responsibility for research, scholarship and creative achievement program effectiveness;
- Expending personal effort in the research, scholarship and creative activity effort;
- Investing in professional growth and development;
- Providing leadership in research, scholarship and creative activity efforts;
- Adhering to high standards of professional conduct in research, scholarship and creative activities;
- Integrating short-term and long-term goals into a comprehensive strategy of research, scholarship and creative activity;
- Conducting on-going projects to a timely conclusion;
- Committing appropriate efforts to seeking external funds;
- Securing appropriate external funds;
- Providing effective oversight to externally funded activities;
- Committing appropriate efforts to joint research, scholarship and creative activity.

Output Activities

Faculty members are evaluated in research, scholarship and creative activities. Faculty members are encouraged to consider the following questions when assessing performance:

- Are research, scholarship and creative activity outputs provided to collaborators in a timely manner?
- Is the research, scholarship and creative activity innovative and does it serve important constituencies?
- Does the research, scholarship and creative activity demonstrate merit?
- Is the research, scholarship and creative activity output commensurate with research responsibilities and available sources?
- Does the research, scholarship and creative activity contribute to the mission of the department, college and University?
- Does the research, scholarship and creative activity contribute to the goals of the discipline at large?
- Does the research, scholarship and creative activity contribute to the betterment of the larger community and the people of Tennessee?
- Are the research, scholarship and creative activity outputs communicated effectively to appropriate audiences through appropriate vehicles (print and electronic journals, non-traditional peer-reviewed venues, conference proceedings, presentations, performances, etc.) in a timely manner;
- Has the research, scholarship, creative activities resulted in awards, key-note presentations, major teaching assignments, grants and other forms of recognition;
- Are the research, scholarship and creative activity outputs protected as university property and used, when appropriate, to advance institutional entrepreneurial goals?

BEST PRACTICES FOR EVALUATING FACULTY SERVICE

(Last reviewed by the Faculty Affairs Committee on May 1, 2006)

Chapter 2.2.4 of the *Faculty Handbook* affirms that faculty members are expected to offer professional knowledge, skills, and advice from their disciplines to their communities (University, profession, and public). Service activities, whether compensated or not, that draw on professional and disciplinary expertise, relate to the teaching and research and outreach missions of the University, and, typically, imply a connection to the University. The scope and nature of university, professional and public service may vary somewhat by discipline as articulated in college and department bylaws. Compensated Outside Activities are not regarded as service as they are not evaluated as part of the faculty member's annual review.

Sharing professional expertise with those outside the academy is both an educational experience and a test of the results of research, scholarship and/or creative activity. It follows that not all "services" faculty members perform will be relevant to the University's judgment of their work. Activities in which faculty engage that do not involve their professional expertise - activities centered on the family, neighborhood, church, political party, or social action group - are commendable as being the normal commitments of citizenship, but are not components of the annual review of a faculty member. When involved in those activities, faculty members do not typically present themselves as representatives of the University.

Institutional Service

Service to the University may include, but is not restricted to, the following activities:

- Participation in the review of the teaching and research of peers;
- Service as mentor to a tenure-track faculty member;
- Active service on the Faculty Senate or other department, college, campus or university committees;
- Participation in the development of interdisciplinary or inter-university programs and/or courses.

Disciplinary Service

Service to the disciplinary specialty (local, regional, national or international in scope) may include, but is not restricted to, the following:

- Active service in leadership structure or on a committee of a professional organization;
- Service on the editorial board of a journal;
- Maintenance of web site or moderation of listserve;
- Service as a reader for a journal, university press or funding agency/foundation.

Professional Service

Faculty members benefit the community beyond the institution by lending their professional expertise to aid or to lead organizations that create beneficial linkages between the university and the community. These activities may include, but are not restricted to:

- Advising on matters within the professional expertise of the faculty member;
- Conducting workshops or presentations in one's area of expertise;
- Enhancing K-12 education;
- Engaging in creative activities and research projects which are intended to benefit the public;
- Evaluating community sponsored programs or activities.

While service is, like teaching and research/scholarship/creative activity, a required component of the professional life of a faculty member, the type and amount of service a faculty member engages in will vary from year to year and from department to department. Specific service expectations will be negotiated by the faculty member and the department head at the annual planning and review conference. For tenure-track faculty or faculty who do not meet expectations for rank, service is not a substitute for the establishment of a solid record of independent research and/or creative activities and quality instruction, and as such, service activity may need to be limited in its type and amount until the faculty member has a record of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity that meets expectations.

BEST PRACTICES FOR FACULTY-TO-FACULTY MENTORING

(Last Revised by Faculty Affairs on May 1, 2006)

Introduction

Faculty-to-faculty mentoring assists tenure-track faculty members to balance and improve their performance in research/scholarship/creative activity, teaching, and service. The aim of mentoring is to support junior faculty members in becoming productive and successful members of the university community.

This best practices document developed from a survey of junior faculty initiated by the Faculty Senate with the assistance of the UT Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Three recommendations emerged:

1. New hires should meet with the unit leader to assess mentoring needs. Mentors(s) should be chosen during the first semester of employment.
2. The faculty member, mentor(s), and unit leader should meet to clarify roles, responsibilities, and how these will be carried out.
3. The unit leader is responsible for monitoring existing arrangements, reassessing needs, and facilitating changes. Monitoring mentoring relationships should be done annually.

With these and other recommendations, the Faculty Senate Professional Development Committee compiled the following recommendations to strengthen and enhance faculty-to-faculty mentoring.

Description

Through this mentoring program, tenured faculty (mentors) are matched with new faculty (mentees) to orient them to UTK, serve as sources of information, and assist them in the early stages of their academic careers. Mentors will create a positive, supportive environment in which they can guide mentees in developing strategies for attaining tenure and promotion.

Matching Mentors and Mentees

- The Department Head will consult with a potential mentor(s) to confirm his/her willingness to serve as a mentor.
- Prior to assignment, new faculty may meet with potential mentor(s) to assess compatibility.
- A new faculty member may request more than one mentor, if desired, to advise on different aspects of his/her appointment (e.g., teaching, research, grant writing, professional practice, interdisciplinary activities). Mentors do not have to be in the same department as the new faculty member.

- The Department Head will, in consultation with the new faculty member, formally assign the mentor within the first semester of the new faculty member's appointment.
- The mentoring relationship may be discontinued by either party, at any time, for any reason. If this occurs and the new faculty wishes to have a new mentor, the Department Head will again work with the faculty member to assign a new mentor.
- The mentoring relationship does not have a set duration. It is likely, however, that most mentoring activities (with one or more mentors) will carry on throughout the new faculty member's probationary period.

Mentor Qualifications

- Mentors may be selected from tenured Associate or Full Professors, and should be professionally mature and successful.
- Mentors should have experience within the department and should be able to acquaint the new faculty member with departmental culture and expectations for research, teaching, extension, service, and professional practice.
- Mentors should have an appreciation/understanding for the discipline of the new faculty.
- Mentors should be based primarily on campus during the first year of mentoring and readily available during subsequent years.

Roles and Responsibilities of Mentors

Mentors should be considered professional "friends" who have the best interests of their mentee at heart and who will advocate for their mentees. Their roles include coach, career guide, role model, instructional resource, or confidant, depending on the needs of their mentees and the nature of their mentoring relationship. This may include:

1. Meet with Department Head and mentee to clarify roles and responsibilities, and how these will be carried out.
2. Take initiative for contacting their mentees and staying in touch.
3. Devote time to the relationship and be available when requested.
4. Assist mentees with various questions, needs, or concerns.
5. Share their knowledge and experience and track mentee's progress.
6. Maintain confidentiality of information shared by their mentees.
7. Treat mentees with respect and consideration, and foster collegiality.

Suggested Mentoring Activities

- Develop research concepts, and provide editing and critical review of proposals. Advice may include on-campus administrative procedures.
- Help with teaching procedures including development of courses, preparation of a syllabus, and identification of teaching resources.
- Discuss student issues including motivation, academic ethics, student resources, and academic support services on campus.
- Discuss long- and short-term career goals and interests.
- Share experiences on managing time, handling stress, and balancing workload effectively.

- Discuss preparations for retention reviews and tenure.
- Identify professional development opportunities.
- Help in understanding departmental protocols and procedures.
- Address special needs, questions, and help in troubleshooting difficult questions.

Benefits to Mentors

Tenured faculty members who agree to mentor make a commitment to devote their time and effort to help new faculty become successful. Mentors experience the unique satisfaction of guiding new colleagues, sharing their ideas about teaching and research, and helping their department and UT develop excellent faculty.

Roles and Responsibilities of Mentees

1. Mentees can take on various roles such as friend, protégé, new colleague, or junior faculty, depending on their needs, academic experience, and the nature of the mentoring relationship.
2. Meet with potential mentor(s) to assess compatibility and personality.
3. Meet with Department Head to finalize selection of mentor(s).
4. Meet with or exchange memos with Department Head and mentor(s) to clarify roles and responsibilities, and how these will be carried out.
5. Create annual professional development plan.
6. Meet in person regularly with mentor, and frequently by phone and email.
7. Seek support and guidance; don't try to "go it alone."
8. Devote time to the mentoring relationship.
9. Make use of opportunities provided by mentor(s).
10. Keep mentor informed of academic progress, difficulties, and concerns.

Benefits to Mentees

Mentees have an experienced guide(s) to help them through the formative years of professional development. This crucial relationship will provide the mentee with the opportunities, connections, and networking that is necessary for success, in an atmosphere, that fosters respect, consideration, and collegiality.

BEST PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE SUPERVISION AND DEVELOPMENT OF NON-TENURE-TRACK TEACHING FACULTY

(Approved by Faculty Senate on March 29, 2010)

Chapter 4 of the *Faculty Handbook* recognizes three types of non-tenure-track faculty positions: teaching, research, and clinical. Faculty members in each type of position contribute to the instructional, research and service missions of the university in different ways. This document focuses on the particular contributions and related needs of the non-tenure track teaching faculty. It was prepared by Drs. Susan Martin, John Zomchick, and Sarah Gardial during FY2009, based on the earlier discussions with an ad hoc Task Force on Lecturers. It has been reviewed and revised based upon input from the Council of Deans and the Faculty Senate's Faculty Affairs Committee. This document contains recommendations that each academic department is encouraged to implement as fully as possible. However, it is recognized that special needs of individual units may require exceptions or modifications.

As parts of a research intensive university, the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (UTK) and the University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture (UTIA) increasingly depend on the best efforts of a valuable cadre of non-tenure-track teaching faculty (NTTF) (normally holding the title of Lecturer) a) to expand our overall instructional capacity b) to create instructional efficiencies that allow our tenure-track faculty to engage more extensively in research, scholarly, and creative activities, c) to be, in some instances, the primary source of instruction for teaching-intensive classes with high demand, including many general education courses, d) to provide administrative and student support outside of the classroom, and e) to complement our tenure-track faculty by bringing valuable professional experiences to classrooms and curricula.

The growth in numbers and importance of our NTTF in the last ten years makes it imperative that UTK/UTIA continue to extend existing practices of moving towards hiring predominantly full-time, benefit-eligible NTTF, endowed with all the rights and responsibilities that are currently enumerated in chapter 4 of the *Faculty Handbook*. It is in university's best interests to devise and promulgate policies that recognize these individuals as important contributors to our instructional mission. This being the case, it is time to bring a more consistent and professional approach to hiring, retaining, and developing these faculty members. This "best practices" document should lead to improved hiring, employment, and supervision protocols; enhanced instructional support and feedback; increased opportunities for advancement and professional development; and greater acknowledgement of their contributions to our mission.

1. Minimum qualifications

UTK/UTIA adhere to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) requirements regarding professional qualifications of faculty. (See Appendix A) In

general, preference is given to hiring lecturers who have earned a terminal degree in the discipline. Within the framework of the SACS requirements, individual units may establish more narrowly or broadly defined sets of guidelines tailored to the academic needs of the unit and sensitive to the limitations of the job market in their particular discipline, subject to approval by the college dean and the Provost.

2. Search Process

There is currently no requirement that departments follow university search procedures in the recruitment of lecturers. This report recommends that, when new lecturer positions are needed, searches use a combination of national, regional, and local recruitment strategies to develop a pool of qualified candidates. These strategies include:

- annual advertisement in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (see process described below)
- advertisement through disciplinary list servers
- soliciting candidates through networks of local contacts

Process for National Advertising

The position of Lecturer is a renewable, year-to-year, non-tenure track appointment. The Office of the Provost, the Office of Equity and Diversity (OED), and the Office of Human Resources (HR) have developed a process designed to recruit persons interested in Lecturer positions. This process is summarized below:

- Each spring (March), the Office of the Provost will contact all departments and request a listing of anticipated Lecturer positions potentially needed for the upcoming academic year.
- The Office of Human Resources will publish the listing of anticipated positions along with appropriate qualifications in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and with the Office of Equity and Diversity for posting on HigherEdjobs.com and InsideHigherEd.com.
- All applicants interested in the anticipated positions will submit resumes to the Office of Equity and Diversity. Upon receipt of the resume, OED will:
 - properly notify applicants of receipt of the resume and request completion of the UT Self-identification Form; and,
 - notify departments of the resumes and encourage their review and consideration.
- Resumes submitted for the anticipated lecturer positions will be maintained by OED for a period of one year. The pool should be refreshed each year through the same combination of recruitment techniques.

Process for Appointment

Units will develop procedures for screening and appointing lecturers consistent with Chapter 4 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

- Departments will select candidates for review, conduct campus interviews, and notify all appropriate offices (College, Office of the Provost, and Human Resources) of persons pending job offers.
- Official letters of offer will be sent by the Office of the Provost.
- The Office of Human Resources will work with the department to schedule New Hire Orientation.
- The Office of Human Resources will submit a copy of the job acceptance letter to the Office of Equity and Diversity so that the OED search file can be closed.

Process for Reappointment

Because the position of lecturer is a renewable, year-to-year, non-tenure track appointment, all lecturers must be re-appointed annually. The following is the recommended process for the reappointment of lecturers.

- All current lecturers are notified of the opportunity for positions for the next academic year as early in spring semester as possible and given a timeline to apply
- The department reviews and screens applications from current as well as new or returning applicants (from whatever source including the national ad process described above)
- After selecting the lecturers to be appointed for the next year, the department notifies all appropriate offices of new appointments
- Letters of reappointment are issued by the Department Head

3. Term of Initial Appointment

UTK/UTIA follow most of our peer institutions in confirming one year as the normal term for an initial appointment. Our preference is to hire full-time lecturers with benefits to the extent possible.

4. Workload and Evaluation for Lecturers

Workload

- Lecturers appointed at 100% teach 12 credit hours per semester. Some departments, with the approval of the dean and the vice provost for academic affairs, may substitute number of students taught for credit hours. Because there can be no single formula that will cover all such substitutions, it is the responsibility of the department to show that the proposed number of students taught per semester is comparable to the work load of lecturers who teach 12 credit hours.
- Lecturers may have their teaching workloads adjusted in order to perform administrative or other important service tasks, essential to the efficient operation of the unit. Such tasks might include, but are not limited to, student advising,

coordination of a course or set of courses with multiple sections and instructors, committee service, or professional development that requires a substantial commitment of time.

- In every case, workload adjustments will be determined by the administrative head of the unit and are subject to review by the college dean and the Provost.

Evaluation

- Every lecturer must be evaluated annually, but not every annual evaluation must be equally extensive. Individual units should determine the appropriate kinds of evaluations, including intervals for extensive and less extensive evaluations.
- The nature of the evaluation will be determined by the responsible unit. It is strongly recommended that lecturers in the unit participate in establishing and, where appropriate depending on the size of the lecturer population, reviewing evaluation criteria and processes.
- Lecturers will be evaluated based on their workload. For lecturers whose sole responsibility is instruction, the evaluation should cover most if not all of the following elements.
 - a. Peer evaluation of classroom instruction
 - b. Review of SAIS scores
 - c. Review of course materials, both print and electronic
 - d. Review of grading, including examples of graded assignments, where appropriate
- Lecturers should also be given the opportunity of showing evidence of professional development as part of their annual review. While such examples will vary according to discipline, they might include attendance at professional conferences, participation in workshops aimed at improving course delivery (including the innovative use of technology in the classroom), outside professional activity related to the discipline, and so on.
- Annual evaluations of lecturers are to be kept on file in the responsible unit. In the event that a lecturer seeks promotion to the next level on the career ladder, these evaluations will become part of the promotion dossier
- Annual evaluations should be the basis for merit raises, when such raises are available, as well as provide a basis for decisions regarding staffing and contract renewal.

5. Professional Development

Across the board at our peer institutions, professional development opportunities for NTTF seem to vary by department and are dependent on funding. Following are items typically included under the category of professional development.

- Travel support for professional conferences (all peer institutions appear to offer some level of travel funding for lecturers)
- Faculty development workshops (both departmental and via Centers for Teaching)
- Awards (for teaching, release time, etc.)
- Mentoring by senior faculty
- Professional leave (LSU)¹

Likewise, professional support for UTK/UTIA NTTF varies by unit. Some examples of campus, college, and departmental initiatives are listed in Appendix B. While the relative dependence on NTTF support and financial resources will obviously vary by college, and even by department within a college, every effort should be made to utilize professional development as a way of attracting, retaining, and developing these faculty members.

Recommendations

- Lecturers should be provided with the means to remain professionally active in their field, including travel to professional conferences. Departments should be encouraged to establish faculty development funds that support professional conference travel for lecturers, especially when related to pedagogical duties. When department funds are not available, the College/University should provide opportunities for lecturers to compete for funding.
- Departments should be encouraged to expand faculty development opportunities (workshops, mentoring, teaching exchanges, peer class visits, etc.) to support and enhance the teaching of lecturers. There should be continued development of pedagogical workshops (like “Best Practices in Teaching”) through the Teaching and Learning Center that would create a dialogue about teaching that crosses rank and discipline.
- Lecturers are currently eligible for certain existing teaching awards. The University, as well as its Colleges and Departments should consider creating new awards to recognize outstanding teaching, scholarship, and service by Lecturers.

¹ Faculty leave policy at LSU:

Full-time faculty at the rank of instructor (or equivalent) or above who have completed six years of service on the campus without having received leave with pay may petition for sabbatical leave for study and research to enable them to increase their professional efficiency and usefulness to the University.

- The University should explore ways to make Lecturers eligible for course release time to work on course development and other mission-appropriate forms of professional development.
- Lecturers are currently eligible for certain grants and may participate in studies as PIs. Grants on pedagogy and innovations in teaching should be further encouraged.

6. Governance

Colleges, schools, departments, and other academic units should review what roles (if any) they wish to extend to lecturers or other non-tenurable faculty in terms of governance. The use of the term "faculty" without any modifiers may be ambiguous, and academic units and faculty organizations should be clear as to whether they intend to include or exclude lecturers when using that term to describe who qualifies for membership and voting privileges. Academic units can consider which privileges of membership, such as voting privileges, should be extended to lecturers and to what extent. Units may also wish to decide whether lecturers should be eligible to serve on advisory or other governance committees. Faculty organizations should examine whether they wish to include lecturers in their membership and whether lecturers should be allowed to vote in the organization's elections.

7. Reappointment and Career Ladders

A Career Ladder Proposal for Lecturers

In view of retaining and hiring excellent teaching faculty, we recommend a three-tiered career ladder parallel to that of professorial faculty. This career ladder would include the titles of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer and Distinguished Lecturer. Pay raises would be associated with promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer and promotion from Senior Lecturer to Distinguished Lecturer. Promotion is based on a review of teaching, service, professional development, and collegiality. Tenure will not be awarded at any of these ranks, and all service at any instructor rank will be excluded from the probationary period should the faculty member later be appointed to a tenure-track position.

Lecturer Rank

The initial hire for a NTTF lecturer would typically be at the lecturer rank. A NTTF may stay at this level for an indefinite period of time on renewable, one-year contracts. The following criteria should be considered for performance at this rank.

- Good instruction as evidenced by student evaluations, supervisor reviews, peer reviews, and annual departmental evaluations.
- Participation in department meetings and workshops related to programs of instruction.
- Well-developed instructional materials as required by the program.

- Adherence to the policies and procedures outlined the University of Tennessee Teaching Guide.

Senior Lecturer Rank

After five years as a Lecturer, faculty members would be eligible to apply for a position as Senior Lecturer. Promotion to the rank of senior lecturer may be accompanied by a renewable contract of up to three years. The main criterion for promotion to Senior Lecturer would be:

- Demonstration of outstanding teaching of undergraduate courses as evidenced by student evaluations, supervisor evaluations, peer evaluations, and annual departmental evaluations.

Other criteria used to determine promotion would be those related to the enhancement of teaching. They would include participation in the following types of activities.

- Professional development
- Course or curricular development
- Advising or mentoring
- Administration or service
- Scholarly or creative work

Distinguished Lecturer Rank

Senior Lecturers who have demonstrated significant achievement in two or more of the areas outlined above since their promotion to Senior Lecturer may apply for a position as Distinguished Lecturer. The time frame for this promotion would be flexible, but a three-to-five year period of time as a Senior Lecturer before initiating the promotion process is suggested. Promotion to the rank of distinguished lecturer may be accompanied by a renewable contract of up to five years.

Promotion Process

Promotion in rank for any NTTF is neither a requirement of continued employment, nor an entitlement for years of service without evidence of exceptional merit, continued professional development, and contribution in the assigned role. An approved promotion in rank is recognized by a change in title, increasing length of appointment contract, and a base salary adjustment.

NTTF members are eligible for promotion in rank in accordance with guidelines established by academic departments and approved by the appropriate dean and the Office of Academic Affairs. Such guidelines should outline the process and criteria for promotion to rank; they should be widely available along with other departmental and college documents related to promotion and tenure.

Consideration for promotion in rank shall include preparation of a dossier using a common university format, which may be based on relevant elements of the promotion and tenure dossier format for tenure-track faculty members. Typically such a dossier would include a statement of professional direction and accomplishment, a full *curriculum vitae*, and documentation of contribution to the instructional program. Colleges and departments may request supplemental materials. Guidelines for dossier development and departmental policies and procedures for the promotion process must be approved by the department, the appropriate dean, and the university's Office of Academic Affairs.

Dossier review will occur at the separate levels: the department, the college, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Final approval of all promotions rests with the Office of Academic Affairs.

Given that promotion decisions do not carry the same "up or out" decision associated with tenure, a negative recommendation on a promotion request need not translate into termination of employment. Faculty members may remain at the present rank as long as their performance warrants continue employment and serves departmental needs.

Appendix A: SACS Statement
(From *Principles of Accreditation*, Section 3: Comprehensive Standards)

3.7.1 The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution. When determining acceptable qualifications of its faculty, an institution gives primary consideration to the highest earned degree in the discipline in accordance with the guidelines listed below. The institution also considers competence, effectiveness, and capacity, including, as appropriate, undergraduate and graduate degrees, related work experiences in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. For all cases, the institution is responsible for justifying and documenting the qualifications of its faculty.

Credential Guidelines:

- a. Faculty teaching general education courses at the undergraduate level: doctor's or master's degree in the teaching discipline or master's degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (a minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline).*
- b. Faculty teaching associate degree courses designed for transfer to a baccalaureate degree: doctor's or master's degree in the teaching discipline or master's degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (a minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline).*
- c. Faculty teaching associate degree courses not designed for transfer to the baccalaureate degree: bachelor's degree in the teaching discipline, or associate's degree and demonstrated competencies in the teaching discipline.*
- d. Faculty teaching baccalaureate courses: doctor's or master's degree in the teaching discipline or master's degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline). At least 25 percent of the discipline course hours in each undergraduate major are taught by faculty members holding the terminal degree—usually the earned doctorate—in the discipline.*
- e. Faculty teaching graduate and post-baccalaureate course work: earned doctorate/terminal degree in the teaching discipline or a related discipline.*
- f. Graduate teaching assistants: master's in the teaching discipline or 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline, direct supervision by a faculty member experienced in the teaching discipline, regular in-service training, and planned and periodic evaluations.*

Appendix B: Examples of UTK/UTIA NTFF Professional Development Opportunities

Travel Support

English: \$2100 per academic year.

Math: Limited funds available when there is extra money, but this is not advertised and lecturers must ask for funding.

Speech Comm: Will fund travel to academic conferences to present refereed papers at one-half the conference room rate and expenses for travel to the conference.

Management: \$2000 in travel funds (can vary according to budget).

MFL: Limited funds available on a first come, first served basis (no funds this year due to budget constraints and funding needs for 300-level courses).

Faculty Development Workshops

“New Faculty Orientation” for both TT and NTT faculty across the campus (in August before classes begin).

Campus-wide “Best Practices in Teaching” workshops through the Tennessee Teaching and Learning Center.

English: Fall teaching workshops are held the week before classes begin, with an end-of-fall workshop in December and informal brown-bags and discussions of teaching throughout the year.

Math: Lecturers may be invited to the GTA training sessions. All new instructional personnel (all ranks) watch video on avoiding sexual harassment. Mandatory meetings each semester about courses that lecturers teach. Follow-up meetings during the semester with course coordinators.

Speech Comm: Participation in training sessions required or individual sessions with coordinator.

Management: Four-day intensive course on teaching for new or inexperienced lecturers.

MFL: Four-day fall workshop combining preparation for the semester with more general workshops on teaching techniques. Short meetings (one or two days) at the beginning of spring semester devoted to practical matters.

Awards and Grants

A variety of awards and grants are available, both at the college- and campus-level. These include the following.

ITC “Faculty First” Grants available to all faculty, TT and NTT.

Professional Development and Research Awards (Office of Graduate Studies):
“Grants of up to \$5,000 will be awarded to faculty members who have specific needs for funds to support research or creative projects.... Priority will be given to applications from full-time, tenure and tenure-track faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor or above. Non-tenure-track lecturers and instructors may also apply.”

Chancellor’s Excellence in Teaching Award (open to all ranks)

College Lecturer Teaching Awards (e.g., A&S, CCI, and CBA).

Ready for the World Citation Award and RFTW project proposal funding (up to \$5,000).

English: an award recognizing teaching excellence by providing release-time awards for lecturers to conduct research, develop a new course, or take a graduate course; also release time for lecturers serving on time-intensive committees or in administrative positions.

Management: funding from the Dean and Dept. Head to take classes relevant to pedagogical interests and course development