



9-16-2013

## Faculty Senate - Lecture Promition Guidelines: Proposed For Adoption at September 16, 2013 Meeting

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_fsresolutions](https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_fsresolutions)



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate - Lecture Promition Guidelines: Proposed For Adoption at September 16, 2013 Meeting" (2013). *Senate Resolutions*.  
[https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_fsresolutions/2](https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_fsresolutions/2)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Senate Resolutions by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact [trace@utk.edu](mailto:trace@utk.edu).

**RESOLUTION FROM THE FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
OF THE FACULTY SENATE  
PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION AT A MEETING OF THE  
FACULTY SENATE TO BE HELD ON  
March 4, 2013**

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, Following upon Board of Trustees approval of the addition of the rank of “senior lecturer” and authorization of one, three, or five-year terms of appointment for non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF), UTK initiated a promotion process for lecturers during the 2011-12 academic year; and

WHEREAS, the promotion process for lecturers needs to be codified in the *Faculty Handbook* and the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*;

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 the language in Section 4 of the *Faculty Handbook* be changed as indicated and that a new Part VI be added to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* to document the lecturer promotion guidelines as follows:

**New language = underlined**

**Deleted language = ~~strikethrough~~**

**Additions and changes to the Faculty Handbook:**

4.4 Promotion

The Board of Trustees authorized a professional development framework for promotion of non-tenure track teaching faculty at its meeting of June 24, 2011. The Recommendation and approved text appear at Tab 17 in the Board materials for that meeting.

#### 4.4.1 Lecturer promotion

##### 4.4.1.1 Lecturer Expectations

Lecturers are expected to provide excellent instruction. Section VI.B.1. of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* includes a non-exhaustive list of practices that characterize excellent instruction.

##### 4.4.1.2 Lecturer Promotion Criteria

Because a lecturer's principal responsibility is teaching, the primary criterion for promotion is excellence in teaching. Because lecturers may perform research and / or service, as needed, research and / or service may be considered when recommending a lecturer for promotion. However, even in cases where there is evidence of excellence in research and / or service, excellence in teaching will remain the principal criterion for promotion of instructional faculty.

After serving at the rank of lecturer, typically for a minimum of five years, a lecturer who has satisfied the criteria specified in Section VI.B.2.a. of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* may be put forward by the department for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer. Promotion to the rank of senior lecturer may be accompanied by an appointment that is automatically renewed for up to three years.

After serving at the rank of senior lecturer, typically for a period of three to five years, a senior lecturer who has satisfied the criteria specified in Section VI.b.2.b. of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* may be put forward by the department for promotion to the rank of distinguished lecturer. Promotion to the rank of distinguished lecturer may be accompanied by an appointment that is automatically renewed for up to five years.

Like all academic appointments, these multi-year appointments consist of annual appointments that are automatically renewed for the specified term, unless terminated for cause, or by operation of some other provision in the *Faculty Handbook* (such as relinquishment or forfeiture or other extraordinary circumstances, as those terms are defined in Board policy and in the *Handbook*).

##### 4.4.1.3 Lecturer Promotion Process

The lecturer promotion process begins when the candidate submits a dossier for consideration. Review occurs in turn at the departmental, college, and campus levels; the candidate shall be notified in writing of the decision at each level. For colleges without departments, the review should follow the same procedure used for the promotion and tenure process. Candidates denied promotion at the departmental level may appeal the decision to the college. Candidates denied promotion at the college level may appeal the decision to the Provost. Sections VI.B.3 and

VI.B.5 of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* specify the promotion process, notification process, and appeal process.

#### 4.4.1.4 Contents of the dossier

A cover sheet that records the decisions at the various levels of review must accompany the dossier. Section VI.B.4. of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* specifies in detail the required contents of the dossier, which should not exceed 50 pages, excluding the cover sheet and the candidate's *curriculum vitae*.

4.45 Salaries

4.56 Appeals

## Additions to the MFE

### **PART VI: PROMOTION OF NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY**

#### **A. GENERAL INFORMATION**

The Board of Trustees authorized a professional development framework for promotion of non-tenure track teaching faculty at its meeting of June 24, 2011. The Recommendation and approved text appear at Tab 17 in the Board materials for that meeting.

#### **B. LECTURER PROMOTION PROCESS**

A lecturer is eligible for promotion to senior lecturer typically after a minimum of five years of regular (full-time) service at the rank of lecturer. A senior lecturer is eligible for promotion to distinguished lecturer typically after three to five years of regular (full-time) service at the rank of senior lecturer. In addition to a change in title, promotion in rank may be recognized by a base salary adjustment. Promotion in rank may also include the offer of a three or five-year term appointment.

**1. Expectations for Instructional Faculty.** “Non-tenure-track teaching faculty are hired for specific teaching assignments. They generally are not expected to conduct research or perform public or disciplinary service as a condition of their employment. However, research or service activities may be included as part of their effort, depending on the needs of the department and the skills and desires of the faculty member.” (Faculty Handbook Section 4.2.1). Lecturers at the University of Tennessee are expected to provide excellent instruction. Among the characteristics of excellent instruction are the following practices: establishing, applying, and maintaining rigorous expectations for student performance; facilitating student learning through effective pedagogical techniques; using instructional materials appropriate to the program and discipline; providing current information and materials in the classroom and / or laboratory; engaging students in an active learning process; incorporating collaborative and experiential learning in regular classroom instruction; constructing appropriate and challenging assessment activities; providing timely and useful feedback to students; revising course content and scope as required by advances in disciplinary knowledge or changes in curriculum; revising teaching strategies in accord with innovations in instructional technology.

**2. Criteria for Promotion to Lecturer Ranks.** Because a lecturer’s principal responsibility is teaching, the primary criterion for promotion is excellence in teaching. Because the *Faculty Handbook* allows that lecturers may perform research and / or service, as needed, however, research and / or service may be considered when recommending a lecturer for promotion. Even in cases where there is evidence of excellence in research and / or service, excellence in teaching will remain the principal criterion for evaluation of instructional faculty.

a. Promotion to Senior Lecturer: After serving at the rank of lecturer, typically for a minimum of five years, a lecturer who has satisfied the following criteria may be put forward by the department for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer: evidence of “outstanding teaching,”

typically of undergraduate courses, as documented in student evaluations, peer evaluations, annual supervisor / departmental evaluations; professional development, as evidenced by appropriate activities in support of the expected instructional practices listed in Section VI.B.1., above; evidence of notable contributions to the university's instructional mission, within the faculty member's assigned role.

b. Promotion to Distinguished Lecturer: After serving at the rank of senior lecturer, typically for a period of three to five years, a senior lecturer who has satisfied the following criteria may be put forward by the department for promotion to the rank of distinguished lecturer:

i. Evidence of consistent "excellence in teaching," typically of undergraduate courses, as documented by student evaluations, peer evaluations, annual supervisor / departmental evaluations;

ii. Continuing professional development, including some or all of the following activities: attendance at campus, regional, national, or international meetings directed at improving instruction; development of new courses and / or revision of existing courses; incorporation of innovative course materials or instructional techniques; scholarly or creative work in the scholarship of teaching as well as in the discipline; awards or other recognition for teaching;

iii. Evidence of outstanding contributions to the university's instructional mission, within the faculty member's assigned role.

iv. Evidence of institutional or disciplinary service, within the NTTF member's assigned role, such as advising or mentoring undergraduate students, supervising GTAs, course coordination, or other forms of institutional service, such as serving on committees.

**3. Process for Promotion.** An adequate evaluation of a promotion candidate's qualifications and professional contributions requires the academic judgment of both the candidate's faculty colleagues and responsible administrators. When the NTTF's position is in a department within a college, there are three levels of review: the department or other unit level, headed by the NTTF's immediate supervisor; the dean of the college in which that unit sits; and the provost. For colleges without departments, the review should follow the same procedure used for the promotion and tenure process. In the description below, the department head is understood to refer to the supervisor of the unit in which the NTTF is appointed.

**a. Departmental Level Review and Recommendation.** The non-tenure-track teaching faculty member and department head or designee should discuss promotion as part of the annual performance review, 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.

i. The promotion process begins when a dossier is submitted for consideration for promotion to senior or distinguished lecturer. According to the *Faculty Handbook*, “A departmentally designated group of faculty will review and evaluate appointments to the rank of senior [and distinguished] lecturer, in accordance with departmental and college bylaws” (4.2.1.). This designated group of departmental faculty must be at the same or higher rank than the candidate under review. They shall review the candidacy and record a vote in favor or against promotion by majority vote (unless some other voting mechanism is established by college or departmental bylaws). The vote of the departmentally designated faculty group is advisory to the department head.

ii. After making an independent judgment on the promotion candidacy, the department head shall 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 department declines to recommend promotion.

iii. 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 VI.B.5. below.)

**b. College Level Review and Recommendation.** The dean may establish a college-wide committee for review and recommendation regarding promotion of NTT teaching faculty. The recommendation of any college-wide committee shall be advisory to the dean. After making an independent judgment on the promotion candidacy, the dean shall 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 Provost. If a candidate chooses not to appeal, the application is considered to be withdrawn and the promotion process ends. (See Section VI.B.5. below.)

**c. Campus Level Review and Final Promotion Decision.** The Provost reviews recommendations forwarded by the dean and serves as the final decision maker regarding promotion to senior/distinguished lecturer. The Provost will also notify successful and unsuccessful candidates in writing of his/her decision regarding promotion. Candidates not recommended for promotion by the Provost’s may appeal to the Chancellor. If a candidate chooses not to appeal, the application is considered to be withdrawn and the promotion process ends.

**4. Contents of the Dossier.** A cover sheet that records the decisions at the various levels of review must accompany the dossier. Candidates for promotion must provide a complete *curriculum vitae* and assemble a dossier in advance of the process. The candidate will work with the department head or designee to assemble a promotion dossier according to the guidelines listed below. This dossier must describe the responsibilities assigned to the lecturer/senior lecturer and must include an appropriate subset of the following materials. The dossier, excluding the cover sheet and the candidate’s *curriculum vitae*, should not exceed 50 pages.

a. Items to be supplied by the candidate (*Asterisks indicate required items*):

i. A complete *curriculum vitae*\*

ii. Statement of teaching philosophy and professional goals\*

iii. A summary of student evaluations and grade distributions (listed in chronological order, earliest to most recent) consisting of a table of responses to the first four questions from the SAIS from all classes taught during the five years prior to the date of the application for promotion and a table of final grade distributions from all classes taught during the five years prior to the date of the application for promotion.\*

iv. Evidence of teaching excellence such as narrative comments from student evaluations (**Note:** If candidates submit narrative comments, they must submit all comments received during the review period to the department head, who will make a selection that includes both “best liked” and “least liked” qualities. The selection should be broadly representative of the entire body of student comments.); a list of honors and awards for teaching, advising, or mentoring; a representative syllabus, ideally from the most recent instance of the candidate’s most frequently taught course; evidence of course or curricular development; evidence of pedagogical innovation; an account of supervision of undergraduate research; a description of mentoring or coordinating GTAs for large-enrolling, multi-section classes; a description of participation in teaching workshops or pedagogical training .

v. Evidence of excellence in contributing to the university’s instructional mission in the categories of administrative responsibilities within the program or unit; program or course-coordination across multiple sections; support for extra-curricular student organizations and activities; participation in the unit’s governance activities and committees; professional outreach activities in the campus, community, or discipline; other evidence of professional excellence.

b. Items to be supplied by the department head (*Asterisks indicate required items*):

i. Description of the candidate’s responsibilities\*

ii. Evaluations consisting of copies of annual evaluations during the review period (since the last promotion or for the last five years, as applicable)\*; Copies of at least two peer/faculty evaluations of instruction during the review period for promotion to senior lecturer. For promotion to distinguished lecturer, one peer/faculty evaluation performed after promotion to senior lecturer is required\*; and any other annual evaluations.



**5. Notification of Candidates during the Process and Candidates' Right to Respond.**

a. Candidates will be notified upon completion of review at each level (department, college, provost).

b. 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.

c. Promotion applications that are not approved will not be forwarded to the next level of review unless 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.

d. 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 the response within ten working days of notification. The response will be inserted in the dossier.

e. Candidates not recommended for promotion must wait one academic year before resubmitting the application.