

**RESOLUTION FROM THE FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
OF THE FACULTY SENATE  
PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION AT A MEETING OF THE  
FACULTY SENATE TO BE HELD ON  
April 2, 2012**

WHEREAS, under Article III, Section 2.G. of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate “is responsible for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Faculty Handbook* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*,” and for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*,” and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate has created a new document, the *Resources Manual* which is to house, among other documents, best practices recommendations; and

WHEREAS, under Section 8.3 of the *Faculty Handbook*, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee “is responsible for recommending changes, which should have input from the chancellor, the vice president, and their administrative staff including deans for consideration by the Faculty Senate Executive Council and final consideration by the full Faculty Senate,” and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed—and sought (i) input from the chancellors of UTK and UTIA and (ii) consideration by the Faculty Senate Executive Council on—the various sections of the *Faculty Handbook* and the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* related to this issue; now, therefore it is

RESOLVED, that

a) the best practices statements in the Best Practices section of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, “Assessment and Review of Faculty Teaching,” “Evaluating Faculty Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity,” “Evaluating Faculty Service,” “Faculty-To-Faculty Mentoring” and, “Best Practices and Recommendations Regarding The Supervision and Development of Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Faculty” be removed from the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* and placed in the *Resources Manual*; and

b) Section I.A.3 of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* be revised as follows (strikeout is deletion, underline is insertion):

**3. Mentor**

The department head assigns a faculty mentor or a mentoring committee for each tenure track faculty member. The mentor should be a senior member of the same department or another unit, who can serve as a model and as a source of information for the tenure-track faculty member. Department heads should not serve as mentors for faculty within their own departments. The mentor or mentoring committee may participate in the annual retention review in a manner to be determined in collegiate and/or departmental bylaws

(see the Best Practices for Faculty-to-Faculty Mentoring ~~annexed to this manual~~ in the *Resources Manual*).

c) Section II.A.5 of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* be revised as follows (strikeout is deletion, underline is insertion):

**5. No Ex Parte Communications During Annual Review Process.** The annual review process exists to provide fair and objective feedback and relevant support to faculty members on a regular and constructive basis. Accordingly, the procedures for the annual review are designed to create and preserve specific lines of communication between faculty and administrators. As a means of preserving this process, until the Annual Review Form has been returned to the faculty member by the Chief Academic Officer in accordance with Part II.B.9., neither the faculty member under review nor any administrator managing or conducting the review is permitted to communicate substantive information about the review with others employed by the University, whether participating in or outside the review process, except as specified in the *Faculty Handbook* or this manual or as agreed between the faculty member and the department head. For example, a department head shall not communicate with a dean about the substance of a faculty member's review except through the Annual Review Form. Nothing in this paragraph is intended to prohibit a faculty member under review from (a) consulting with his or her mentor regarding the substance or process of the review, as provided for in ~~the "BEST PRACTICES FOR FACULTY-TO-FACULTY MENTORING (Last Revised by Faculty Affairs on May 1, 2006)"~~ incorporated in this manual, in the Resources Manual, (b) consulting with a University ombudsperson, (c) consulting with representatives of the Office of Equity and Diversity, or (d) pursuing possible rights of appeal available under Chapter 5 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

d) that the Table of Contents in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* be revised to delete the references to Best Practices Statements, and

e) that Section 4.3 of the Faculty Handbook be revised as follows (strikeout is deletion, underline is insertion):

#### **4.3 Evaluation**

As is the case for tenured and tenure-track faculty, the performance of all non-tenure-track faculty members will be evaluated annually, with a written record of the evaluation maintained in departmental and human resources files. The criteria for evaluating non-tenure-track faculty for purposes of hiring and retention must be adopted by a vote in accordance with departmental bylaws and made available to all faculty.

~~The annual performance review for retention should be based on the best practices guidelines for evaluating instruction, which are outlined in BEST PRACTICES FOR ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW OF FACULTY TEACHING contained in the Resources Manual~~ Manual for Faculty Evaluation (probationary faculty section). In the case of non-retention, every effort should be made to notify the faculty member as soon as possible.

Research and clinical faculty are subject to annual performance reviews appropriate to the positions and as outlined in departmental and college bylaws.