

APPENDIX: EVALUATION AND PROMOTION OF NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

A. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND PLANNING REVIEW (APPR) OF NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY (NTTF)

1. Policies governing APPR for NTTF can be found in Section 4.3 of this handbook.

2. APPR timetable: All NTTF at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, are evaluated annually on their performance during the previous academic calendar year. NTTF at the University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture are evaluated annually on their performance during the previous calendar year. In both instances, the one-year period is referred to as the “Evaluation Period.” Deadlines for submission of APPRs are set by the chief academic officer and published annually in the Faculty Evaluation Calendar.

3. No *ex parte* Limitations on communications during APPR: The annual review process exists to provide fair, objective, and constructive feedback and relevant support to faculty members. As a means of preserving the integrity of the process, until the APPR has been fully executed by the chief academic officer, 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 involved in the review process, especially those charged with making a recommendation at subsequent stages of review, *without the consent of all others involved in the review process*. For example, a department head shall not communicate with a dean about the substance of a faculty member’s review except through the transmission of the APPR materials. 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, (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 this handbook.

4. Procedure for APPR for non-tenure-track faculty

a. Preparation for the APPR: The department head or designee manages the process of annual review of non-tenure-track faculty in a timely way to ensure compliance with all deadlines for submission of the review forms to the dean and chief academic officer. Colleges may establish their own calendars for the NTT APPR process as long as they do not conflict with this handbook or the Faculty Evaluation Calendar, as published by the chief academic officer. In the event of a conflict, this handbook or the Faculty Evaluation Calendar governs.

1) **Adequate Notice to NTTF:** The department head or designee will inform the departmental NTTF of the schedule for the reviews, any materials that should be prepared and submitted for the reviews, and schedule the annual review conference with each NTTF member at least two weeks in advance of the date of the conference to allow faculty adequate notice to prepare the required materials.

- 2) **Documents prepared by the faculty member.** The faculty member prepares and submits the following documents in advance of the conference with the department head or designee.
 - a) a summary of the past year's work and accomplishments as stipulated in the current letter of appointment and further developed in the previous year's annual review;
 - b) any additional work or professional activities that have provided a benefit to the university;
 - c) a list of specific plans and goals for the upcoming year;
 - d) a current curriculum vitae;
 - e) any documentation requested by the department head or required by departmental or collegiate bylaws that evidences the faculty member's activities during the evaluation period, which may include documentation of accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, service, or other area of performance as stipulated in the current appointment letter.
- b. The Department Head's Evaluation.** The department head or designee will conduct a scheduled conference with the faculty member (a) to discuss the faculty member's goals and accomplishments during the evaluation period, with primary focus on accomplishments in the areas of effort enumerated in the faculty member's most recent departmental appointment letter [or the previous year's APPR documents](#) and, at the faculty member's discretion, address any other work which has benefited the university; (b) formulate goals for the coming year; (c) formulate an updated assignment of effort for the coming year, consistent with the faculty member's assigned responsibilities and goals. The department head or designee documents the APPR on the online Faculty Review System, with attachments as necessary. The department head or designee's review must rely on and include only documented and substantiated information available at the time of the review; it should not be based on rumor or speculation. The review will be based on procedures and standards set forth in this handbook and all applicable bylaws.
 - 1) **Assigning ratings for the faculty member's performance:** The department head or designee indicates on the online Faculty Review System whether the performance of the faculty member for the entire evaluation period far exceeds expectations for rank, exceeds expectations for rank, meets expectations for rank, falls short of meeting expectations for rank, or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank, based on previously established objectives for that faculty member, departmental bylaws, and the current appointment letter.
 - 2) **Performance and goals-setting narrative.** The department head or designee writes a narrative that (a) describes and discusses the faculty member's progress on attaining the previous year's goals and the faculty member's performance in the areas of effort stipulated in the current appointment letter, and (b) records the faculty member's assignment for the coming year.
 - a) **Exception to the requirement for a narrative:** [For faculty members who hold multi-year appointments, the department head or designee may, but is not](#)

required to, write a narrative for a faculty member in any year in which the faculty member meets expectations, unless (i) the faculty member requests that the department head write a narrative in that year, or (ii) it has been three years since the department head has written a narrative for that faculty member, or (iii) the faculty member is up for reappointment.

- 3) **Department head or designee's signature:** Upon completing the APPR, the department head or designee signs the review, at which point it is transmitted to the faculty member for his or her review.
- 4) **Faculty member's review of the APPR and the right to submit a written response:** The faculty member shall be allowed 14 days from the date of receipt of notice that the department head or designee has signed the APPR to review the APPR and submit any written response. The response should be uploaded to the Faculty Review System, where it will be accessible to the department head, the dean, and the chief academic officer. If the faculty member fails to upload a response within 14 days, she or he relinquishes the right to respond.
- 5) **Faculty member's signature:** The faculty member signs the APPR. The faculty member's signature indicates that he or she has read the review, but the signature does not necessarily imply agreement with the performance and goals-setting narrative, performance evaluation, or other contents.

c. Dean's review of the APPR.

- 1) **Reviewing and signing the APPR:** The dean or the dean's proxy reviews the APPRs submitted by each department head or designee and signs them in the Faculty Review System, indicating either concurrence with or dissent from the department head's rating of each faculty member.
 - a) **Dissent from the department head or designee's rating.** In cases where the dean does not concur with the department head or designee's rating, the dean (i) assigns a different rating, indicating whether the performance of the faculty member far exceeds expectations for rank, exceeds expectations for rank, meets expectations for rank, falls short of meeting expectations for rank, or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank, based on previously established objectives for that faculty member, departmental bylaws, and the current appointment letter; and (ii) prepares a written rationale summarizing the reasons for his or her dissent from the department head or designee's rating. The dean's rating and rationale is recorded in the Faculty Review System, where it is available to the faculty member, the department head or designee, and the chief academic officer.
- 2) **Faculty member's and department head or designee's right to respond.** The faculty member and the department head or designee each shall be allowed 14 days from the date of receipt of notice of the dean's final rating and rationale to submit a written response. Any responses should be uploaded to the Faculty Review System, where they will be accessible to all participants in the APPR. If no response is received after 14 days from the date of receipt of the dean's rating and rationale, the faculty member and department head or designee relinquish the right to respond.

- d. **Chief academic officer's review of the APPR.** The chief academic officer or the chief academic officer's proxy reviews the APPR, indicates a final decision on the rating to be assigned to the faculty member (far exceeds expectations for rank, exceeds expectations for rank, meets expectations for rank, falls short of meeting expectations for rank, or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank) and signs the APPRs in the Faculty Review System. In cases where the chief academic officer does not concur with the rating given by the dean, the chief academic officer (a) assigns a different rating, indicating whether the performance of the faculty member far exceeds expectations for rank, exceeds expectations for rank, meets expectations for rank, falls short of meeting expectations for rank, or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank, based on previously established objectives for that faculty member, departmental bylaws, and the current appointment letter; and (b) prepares a narrative summarizing the reasons for his or her dissent from the dean's rating. The faculty member, the dean, and the department head or designee have access to the chief academic officer's rating and rationale through the Online Faculty Review System.
- e. **Fully executed APPR and faculty member's right to appeal.** The chief academic officer's signature signals that the APPR is fully executed. The faculty member's right to appeal the final APPR rating is described in chapter 5 of this handbook.

B. PROMOTION PROCESS FOR NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

1. **Criteria for Promotion.** The criteria for promotion to a rank are the same as those given in section 4.2 of this handbook. APPRs form the basis of a cumulative record that prepares NTTF for promotion. The criterion for promotion of NTTF is excellence in performing the primary responsibilities established in the initial appointment document and recorded in the annual performance and planning reviews. (See 4.5.2 of this handbook.)
2. **Timing:** NTTF members are eligible for promotion to senior lecturer/associate professor (depending upon initial classification) typically after a minimum of five years of regular (full-time) service at the rank of lecturer/assistant professor. A senior lecturer/associate professor is eligible for promotion to distinguished lecturer/professor typically after three to five years of regular (full-time) service at the rank of senior lecturer/professor. The faculty member and department head or designee should discuss promotion as part of the APPR process, well in advance of the suggested dates for submission of the application for promotion, in order to give the candidate sufficient time to gather the required materials and assemble the dossier. The final decision to apply for promotion rests with the faculty member.
3. **Review Period:** The review period for promotion covers the last five years of performance or the entire time since the last promotion review.
4. **Process for Promotion.** Effective evaluation of a candidate's qualifications and professional contributions requires the academic judgment of the candidate's colleagues and responsible administrators. When the faculty member's position is in a department within a college, there are three levels of review: the department or other unit level, headed by the faculty member's immediate supervisor; the dean of the college in which that unit sits; and the chief academic

officer. In the process description below, the department head is understood to refer to the supervisor of the unit in which the faculty member is appointed.

- a. **Faculty Review:** The promotion process begins when a dossier is submitted for consideration for promotion. According to the Faculty Handbook (4.5), a departmentally designated group of faculty (the review committee) will review and evaluate promotion applications in accordance with departmental and college bylaws. Typically, faculty members (both NTT and TT) who hold higher rank than the candidate are eligible to be members of this group, unless otherwise specified by college or departmental bylaws. The departmentally designated review committee will review the application and record a vote in favor of or against promotion by majority vote (unless some other voting mechanism is established by college or departmental bylaws). The vote of the departmentally designated review committee is advisory to the department head or designee.
- b. **Department Head's Review:** After making an independent judgment on the promotion application, the department head either inserts a positive written recommendation in the dossier and advances it to the next level of review, or notifies the candidate in writing that the department declines to recommend promotion.
- c. **Appealing Departmental Non-Recommendations.** Candidates not recommended for promotion by their departments may appeal that decision to the next level. If a candidate chooses not to appeal, the application is considered to be withdrawn and the promotion process ends. (See section h below.)
- d. **College Level Review and Recommendation.** The dean may establish a college-wide committee for review and recommendation regarding promotion of non-tenure-track faculty. The recommendation of any college-wide committee is advisory to the dean. After making an independent judgment on the promotion application, the dean will either insert a positive written recommendation in the dossier and advance it to the next level of review, or notify the candidate in writing that the college declines to recommend promotion. Candidates not recommended for promotion by their colleges may appeal that decision to the chief academic officer. If a candidate chooses not to appeal, the application is considered to be withdrawn, and the promotion process ends. (See section h below.)
- e. **Campus Level Review and Final Promotion Decision.** The chief academic officer reviews recommendations forwarded by the dean and serves as the final decision maker regarding promotion. The chief academic officer will notify successful and unsuccessful candidates in writing of the decision regarding promotion. Candidates not recommended for promotion by the chief academic officer have all rights of appeal, as specified in chapter 5 of this handbook.
- f. **Notification of Candidates during the Process.** Candidates will be notified upon completion of review at each level (department, college, campus). A candidate whose application for promotion is denied will be provided a written explanation of the grounds for the denial at the time of notification.
- g. **Candidate's Right to Respond.** A candidate has a right to submit a written response to each level of review, whether the recommendation is positive or negative. The candidate

must submit any response within ten working days of notification. The response will be inserted in the dossier.

- h. **Appealing Negative Reviews.** A promotion application that is not approved will be forwarded to the next level of review only if the candidate submits a written appeal to the next level within ten working days of the date of the written notification of a negative promotion decision. The appeal must make an explicit request for further review of the application and give reasons for that request.
- i. **Reapplication in Case of Non-promotion.** Candidates not recommended for promotion [by the chief academic officer](#) must wait one academic year before re-applying.

4. Assembly of the Promotion Dossier. Dossiers are typically limited to 50 pages, not including the *curriculum vitae* and a cover sheet, which records the decisions at the various levels of review. Candidates for promotion will work with their department heads or designees to assemble a dossier in support of promotion according to the guidelines listed below. This dossier must describe the responsibilities assigned to the candidate and must include an appropriate subset of the following materials:

a. Items to be supplied by the candidate:

- i. A cover letter that describes the candidate's principal assignment and any secondary assignments over the course of the evaluation period. The letter should provide a brief overview of the candidate's achievements in each of the relevant areas of effort (teaching, research/service/creative activity, service). A more extensive description of achievements should be provided in the candidate's statement, which comes at the beginning of each of the areas of effort.
- ii. A complete, up-to-date *curriculum vitae*.
- iii. Documentation of the candidate's achievements in each of the performance areas, as assigned in the appointment letter, and, when applicable, modified in APPR documents, arranged in the order given under 5, below.

b. Items to be supplied by the department head:

- i. A description of the candidate's responsibilities
- ii. A copy of applicable appointment letter and any subsequent modifications to the appointment letter for the review period including assigned percentage of effort distribution in each area of effort (teaching, research/scholarship/ creative activity, service).
- iii. Documentation of department and/or college's investments in the faculty member's professional development and/or service activities including conference and workshop travel support, course-load reductions, etc.
- iv. Copies of all evaluations during the review period.

5. Documentation of excellence in assigned performance areas. Candidates for promotion must include in their promotion dossiers appropriate documentation of their achievements during the review period in their assigned performance areas only. The documentation must be compiled in the order given below.

- a. Candidates for promotion with assigned responsibilities in teaching must provide the following, as applicable:**
- i. **Candidate's statement:** The statement describes the candidate's teaching philosophy and practices, reflects on teaching ability and effectiveness, and includes the percentage of effort assigned to this category;
 - ii. **Scheduled classes taught:** A list of courses taught at UTK for each term or semester (including summer term). Include the following information:
 - 1) enrollment;
 - 2) percent effort for co-taught classes;
 - 3) identify honors courses;
 - 4) identify clinical assignments or other forms of direct student supervision, if appropriate.
 - iii. **Quantitative end-of-course student surveys:** A concise tabulation of results of end-of-course student surveys; candidates may provide a contextualization and interpretation of these data according to best practices for survey data analysis.
 - iv. **Peer review of teaching reports:** At least two formal peer review of teaching reports [for promotion to the senior or associate ranks and one for promotion to the distinguished or professor ranks](#); and any other faculty input concerning teaching effectiveness, including any statements from colleagues who have visited the candidate's classroom for the purpose of evaluating his/her teaching, or who are in good position to evaluate fairly and effectively clinical or field assignments or advising. Internal letters about teaching effectiveness should be included in this section.
 - v. **Optional indicators of excellence:**
 - 1) Narrative end-of-course student survey materials: If a summary of student comments from end-of-course student surveys is included, the summary should be broadly representative of all the student comments received. These comments should be compiled by the department head from standard end-of-course student surveys.
 - 2) other evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., performance of students in subsequent courses, tangible results and benefits of the candidate's work with students, samples of student-work);
 - 3) list of professional development activities related to teaching, advising, mentoring, including, but not limited to, the following examples:
 - a). A record of participation in, and description of, teaching seminars and workshops (short description of activity with titles, dates, sponsor, etc.), including indication of role, e.g., student, invited participant, etc.;
 - b). A list of papers presented at technical and professional meetings on education (meeting and paper titles, listed chronologically in standard bibliographic form) and indication of whether the candidate was the presenter, whether the paper was refereed, and whether the paper was invited;

- c). List of projects, grants, commissions, and contracts (date, title, agency, amount) relating to teaching;
 - 4) a description of advising or mentoring efforts and achievements, including service on student honors, thesis, or dissertation committees and supervision of student research;
 - 5) honors and awards received for teaching, advising, and mentoring;
 - 6) representative syllabus;
 - 7) evidence of course or curricular development work in assigned courses;
 - 8) evidence of pedagogical innovation in assigned courses;
 - 9) sample assignments, presentations slides, or course materials that demonstrate excellence in teaching the assigned courses.
- b. Candidates with assigned responsibilities in Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity must provide the following, as applicable:**
- i. **Candidate's statement.** The statement describes the candidate's research/scholarship/creative achievement approach and/or agenda and includes the percentage of effort assigned to this category;
 - ii. **List of scholarly publications:** Publications should be listed in standard bibliographic form, preferably with the earliest date first. Citations should include beginning and ending page numbers or total number of pages, where appropriate. For multiple-authored works, the contribution of the candidate should be clearly indicated (e.g., principal author, supervised person who authored the work, etc.). Publications should be grouped in the following categories and in the order given:
 - 1) Articles published in refereed journals;
 - 2) Books;
 - 3) Scholarly and/or creative activity published through a refereed electronic venue;
 - 4) Contributions to edited volumes;
 - 5) Papers published in refereed conference proceedings;
 - 6) Papers or extended abstracts published in conference proceedings (refereed on the basis of abstract);
 - 7) Articles published in popular press;
 - 8) Articles appearing in in-house organs;
 - 9) Research reports submitted to sponsors;
 - 10) Articles published in non-refereed journals;
 - 11) Manuscripts accepted for publication (include letters of acceptance at the end of this section);
 - 12) Manuscripts submitted for publication (include where and when submitted).
 - iii. **Creative activity.** This section should document exhibitions, installations, productions, or publications of original works of architecture, dance, design,

- electronic media, film, journalism, landscape architecture, literature, music, theatre, and visual art. Performance of original dance, literary, musical visual arts, or theatrical works, or works from traditional and contemporary repertoires of the performing arts should be chronicled with critiques.
- iv. **Projects, grants, commissions, and contracts** (date, title, agency, amount). These should be grouped in the following categories and in the order given:
 - 1) Completed;
 - 2) Funded and in progress;
 - 3) Under review.
 - v. **Papers presented at technical and professional meetings** (meeting and paper titles, listed chronologically in standard bibliographic form); indication of whether the candidate was the presenter, whether the paper was refereed, and whether the paper was invited.
 - vi. **Record of participation in, and description of, seminars and workshops** (short description of activity, with titles, dates, sponsor, etc.); indication of role in seminar or workshop, e.g., student, invited participant, etc.
 - vii. **Record of invitations to conduct workshops, master classes, seminars, etc. at other institutions.**
 - viii. **Optional indicators of excellence:**
 - 1) other evidence of research or creative accomplishments (patents, new product development, international and intercultural expertise or experience, new art forms, new computer software programs developed, notable citations and / or reviews of creative work or scholarship, etc.);
 - 2) honors or awards for research/scholarship/creative achievement;
 - 3) grants and contracts for instruction or for training programs, with an indication of the candidate's role in preparing and administering the grants and contracts.
 - 4) list of professional development activities related to research/scholarship/creative achievement.
- c. **Candidates with assigned responsibilities in service must provide the following, as applicable:**
- i. **Candidate's statement.** The statement describes the candidate's achievements in institutional, disciplinary, and/or professional service, and includes the percentage of effort assigned to this category.
 - ii. **Service activities:** The candidate provides a summary of his/her service record arranged according to the following categories:
 - 1) **Institutional Service**
 - a) Service to the department, including mentoring or coordinating GTAs for large-enrolling, multi-section classes, or other course coordination;

- b) Records of committee work and/or leadership at department, college, and university levels;
- c) Accounts of participation in university-wide governance bodies and related activities;
- d) Records of contributions to the University's programs, at home and abroad, to enhance equal opportunity, cultural diversity, and international and intercultural awareness.

2) **Disciplinary Service**

- a) Records of membership and/or leadership, and active participation in professional and learned societies related to the academic discipline (e.g., offices held, committee work, journal refereeing, and other responsibilities);
- b) A list of honors or awards for service activity within the academic discipline.

3) **Professional Service**

- a) Records of service to public and private organizations or institutions in which the candidate uses their professional expertise;
- b) Accounts of service to governmental agencies at the international, federal, state and local levels;
- c) Accounts of service to industry, e.g., training, workshops, consulting;
- d) Participation in community affairs as a representative of the university.

iii) Optional indicators of excellence

- 1) Honors or awards for service activity within the institution, discipline, and/or profession

6. Documentation of excellence outside of assigned performance areas: NTTF whose appointments are entirely in one area may include optional indicators in non-assigned areas if that work can be shown to contribute to excellence in the assigned area.