

Non-Tenure Track Issues Meeting Minutes
9/11/17
Approved Oct. 25, 2017

PRESENT:

Chris Craig, Stephen Marz, Phyllis Thompson, Jennifer Tourville, Crystal McAlvin, Laurie Knox, Kristina Gehrman

ABSENT: Scott Wall (has a class conflict)

Meeting began at 3:34 on a rainy afternoon

- CM began by discussing official charge for NTTI committee
- Discussed what NTTI will be doing, what they have done (last year's annual report)

Introductions of members present

Old business discussion:

- Faculty handbook revisions in Chapter 4
 - Past co-chairs made most of/all of revisions to Chapter 4; reviewed whole handbook
- Faculty Affairs changing: 4.2.6 and 4.2.8; joint and adjunct faculty
 - Terminology revisions; wording to be the same throughout the chapter; adding various names for ranks
- Michelle emailed Friday and Faculty Affairs are reviewing NTTI revisions
 - Next meeting they may have results from FA
- CC wanted to clarify if this was an issue NTTI should focus on right now
 - CM: no, it's on the backburner for now
- Old business: "Elements as to annual evaluations"
- General discussion of Elements
 - Elements should be monitored and put into the larger discussion of how the evaluation and promotion process is being implemented
 - KG: I could see Elements being a big issue; faculty members list their own stuff; if not then contents can get lost; *who* inputs information into Elements is important

Brooke Killion, Graduate Research Assistant to the Faculty Senate, explained her bylaws audit project and offered to audit NTTI within the bylaws audit. This will involve copy and pasting sections from the bylaws into a separate table when bylaws discuss annual review, appointment, and miscellaneous. Page numbers and Section numbers will be cited. The first draft of the audit should be complete by late October.

General discussion regarding Manual for Faculty Evaluation (2016) and Guidelines for the Lecturer Promotion (2017):

1) Provost's "Manual for Faculty Evaluation":

- Updated 2016
- Four pages (31-36) on the evaluation process for NTT faculty.
- On the Provost's website and is an official (presumably Senate-approved) supplement to the Faculty Handbook.

<http://cdn-provost.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/10/2016/10/Manual-for-Faculty-Evaluation-2016.pdf>

2) "Guidelines for the Lecturer Promotion--2017 Version"

- Also on the provost's website, but filed in a different place.
- Seven pages long and parallels but is not equivalent to the information in the Faculty Manual.

<http://cdn-provost.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/10/2017/02/Guidelines-for-UTK-Lecturer-Promotion-Process-2017-Version.pdf>

- "This revision was reviewed and approved XXXX."* : Committee would like clarification as to who reviewed this document and when it was approved

*JT explains her personal experience with her promotion process and that she was directed to use the "Guidelines for the Lecturer Promotion" version. CA was likewise directed, but her dossier was then returned to her to be reformatted to conform to College of Arts & Sciences guidelines, which claim that their list of required materials comes from the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* pp. 31-35.

Brooke will remind Beauvais Lyons that we'd like to ask him for help answering the following QUESTIONS

1. Where did this 2017 revision come from?
2. Who wrote it?
3. Is it moving through channels that we don't know about to get approved by the Faculty Senate as an amendment to the Manual for Faculty Evaluation?

-All agreed that in order to trace how departments are implementing the Provost's guidelines for NTT Faculty evaluation and promotion, NTTI must first find out exactly what the guidelines are.

CC: what are the steps to address the disconnect?

LK: first step is to find out where the versions of the documents came from

-And then the manual should be updated and taken through the correct channels for approval by the FS.

In the meantime:

-Which document trumps everything?

SM pointed out helpfully that the NTT Faculty Advisory Council mentioned in the Feb. 17 Guidelines actually BECAME the NTTI committee in a resolution from the FS in 2013.

Chris Craig discussed the lack of clarity in the handbook regarding service:

CC provided an example: NTT faculty are not required to do "Service" but the college guidelines typically refer to handbook. The handbook has an area where the person being considered for promotion lists Service. Are NTT faculty *not* being considered for promotion because they did not do any service?

LK observed that in departments where lecturers teach the majority of lower-level classes, it is especially important for the strength of the institution for NTTF to participate in service and important for lecturers' professionalism to do so. "The University doesn't know what role it wants us to play."

-CC proposed that he would like to contact informally those familiar with the process of the NTT promotions committee in Arts and Sciences, and if at that point it seems there is a real discrepancy between candidate and committee expectation for promotion, to seek from the College office clarification about that discrepancy.. He asked for the committee's approval. There was general consent.

TASKS FOR NTTI before the next meeting:

Chris Craig:

Have an informal discussion with select ii select individuals involved in NTT promotion in Arts and Sciences about the role that service plays in the promotion of lecturers and report back to us

All committee members:

1. Read the relevant sections in the Faculty Manual (pp. 31-36) and the Guidelines for Lecturer Promotion Feb. 17 revision, looking for substantive differences between the two. Post comments about differences that you notice on the "google doc" version of the guidelines that KG created for us here:
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1sqmN8WN45ry8ShbjPkwwHj93nP3s1r2eE XjNaA4CX00/edit?ts=59b6f32b>
2. Collect all the documents you can get your hands on in your own units related to the lecturer evaluation and promotion process, as a first step toward tracing how policies at are being implemented from the top down and toward discovering "gems" of good practice.

Laurie and Crystal:

1. Contact Matthew Theriot and meet with him for clarification regarding the contradictions on the Provost's website
2. Follow up with Beauvais Lyons to find out what he knows, if anythingk about the 2017 "Guidelines" doc

3. Set of a google docs folder where we can collect documentation of evaluation and promotion policies from various units.

Crystal:

1. Book Strong Hall 220 for the rest of our Fall 2017 meetings, if possible.

After some discussion of schedules and conflicts, meetings were set for the following dates this semester:

3:30-5 Oct. 25--with lots of homework in between

3:30-5 Nov. 15

3:30-5 Dec. 6

We like meeting in Strong Hall, and Crystal has agreed to book the room!