



University of Tennessee, Knoxville
**TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative
Exchange**

Minutes, Executive Council/Committee
Meetings

Faculty Senate

2-15-2010

Faculty Senate - Executive Council February 15, 2010 Meeting Agenda

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_exmins



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate - Executive Council February 15, 2010 Meeting Agenda" (2010). *Minutes, Executive Council/Committee Meetings*.
https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_exmins/17

This Meeting Minutes 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 Minutes, Executive Council/Committee Meetings by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

UTK Faculty Senate Executive Council

Eighth Floor Board Room, Andy Holt Tower

February 15, 2010

AGENDA

I. Call to Order

Introductions

II. Review of Minutes

Minutes of the Executive Council meeting of January 11, 2010 (Attachment 1)

III. Reports

President's Report (T. Boulet) (Attachments 2, 3)

IV. Old Business

Resolution on the Senate's position on reporting of Athletics (T. Boulet) (Attachment 4)

V. New Business

Resolutions from Faculty Affairs Committee (S. Thomas) (Attachments 5, 6, 7)

Attachments

- 1 Minutes of Executive Council meeting of January 11, 2010
- 2 President's report
- 3 House Bill 3542
- 4 Draft resolution on reporting of Athletics
- 5 Resolution on NTTF best practices
- 6 Resolution on NTTF contracts
- 7 Resolution on rank of Senior Lecturer

Faculty Senate Executive Council
MINUTES
January 11, 2010

Present: Marianne Breinig, Doug Birdwell, Toby Boulet, Donald Bruce (via phone), Chris Cimino, Jimmy Cheek, Rob Heller, Suzanne Kurth, Beauvais Lyons, John Nolt, Stefanie Ohnesorg, Lloyd Rinehart, Ken Stephenson, Steve Thomas, and Dixie Thompson

Guest: Scott Simmons (Graduate Assistant)

I. CALL TO ORDER

T. Boulet called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

Minutes of the November 2, 2009, meeting was to be distributed by email.

III. REPORTS

President's Report (T. Boulet)

T. Boulet added to his written report that information about how to register for Safe Zone training at the Conference Center would be forthcoming. He also had brought a better copy of the Strategic Planning Model diagram. He indicated Chancellor Cheek had hired a consultant for the project.

Chancellor's Report (J. Cheek)

Chancellor Cheek drew attention to the Governor's announcement about the joint UT/ORNL Center. The interdisciplinary doctoral program in energy science would involve \$6 million in non-recurring start up funds. He also noted Governor Bredesen also announced he wanted UT to be a top 25 university. A gap analysis needed to be conducted, so that plans could be made about how to close gaps. Cheek said the Governor's declaration was a major step forward. The Governor also indicated that criteria for students transferring to UTK would be more stringent than to other institutions in the state. In addition, Bredesen addressed performance funding, particularly the need to focus more on the number of students graduating rather than the number enrolling. Although UTK's current graduation rate is the highest of all the state schools, it could do better.

Athletics. With regard to the Athletic Department's reporting structure, Cheek said B. Lyons had written a good epistle about athletics. He indicated he was aware that Boulet was working on the issue. In February, Cheek planned to speak to the Task Force.

Efficiency. Cheek said he had reduced his budget about 15%, partly by eliminating positions, e.g., Human Resources Director. During the same time period the University of Tennessee system was working on making some changes, notably changing the organization of Human Resources under Linda Hendricks. Cheek talked with President Simek about the lack of a human resources person in his cabinet. The result is he planned to appoint her to be Vice Chancellor for Human Resources for UTK, a no-cost appointment.

Ombudsperson. J. Nolt has pushed for resolution and a solution has been reached for at least one year with the appointment of Bill Nugent as faculty Ombudsperson. The Ombudsperson

Search Committee was informed that the search was on hold for a year and Cheek hoped that the temporary arrangement would work in the long run because of the tight budget.

Budget. Tuition has to be increased (e.g., by 9%) because that is the only available source of money, as the colleges' budgets cannot be raided further. Cheek said his major issue was faculty salaries. For three years there had been no raises. He did not know what could be done to change that but he was trying. If there were salary raises, there probably would be both a minimum amount and a cap set. He noted it was unlikely that raises would be forthcoming. There had been forward movement on setting differential tuition rates for three colleges. Another issue was full time enrollment. If UTK wants students to graduate in a timely manner, students need to pay for 15 hours. (Georgia made that move beginning with the current academic year.)

Questions. B. Lyons had a question about the appointment of Hendricks. He noted that last fall the Executive Council had discussed with the Chancellor the need for searches when filling Vice Chancellor positions. He expressed concern about what precedent her appointment might be setting. Cheek said there was no way to do a search. He needed someone at the cabinet level. She was the only person who could fill the position.

Lyons asked another question about the distribution of funds received from charging differential tuition rates, specifically whether the other colleges teaching 40% of the credit hours taken by the students in the three colleges would get any of the additional funds. Cheek said when he arrived on campus the plan was to reduce Nursing's enrolment by 50%. Students came to see him in the fall about the importance of maintaining enrollments in that College. Differential tuition appears to be the solution. He explained to Lyons that not enough money would come from differential tuition to solve the problems of the three colleges and to support the college providing 40% of their students' instruction, so it would only go to the three colleges.

Lyons also raised a question about the University's non-discrimination statement. He said the statement used for employees and the statements appearing in other locations, such as the commencement program were not the same. J. Heminway said the General Counsel was reluctant to change the non-discrimination statement because the University could not offer benefits to partners.

D. Birdwell said he was supportive of the Governor's goal of increasing the University's ranking and that it might be a good time to do so because outstanding people might be recruited from universities in states with severe economic problems, e.g., California. Birdwell asked about the categories used by Human Resources for approximately the past 8 years. The categories do not differentiate adequately among professionals. Birdwell said he had to go through special procedures and endless paperwork to appropriately pay people in research positions. Cheek said he would have Hendricks get in touch with K. Stephenson (Research Council) to work on the problem. He noted the categories also had been an issue with the Baker Center.

Birdwell said he was glad there would be a new program with ORNL, but he thought quality could be an issue. He asked whether there would be 200 people at the laboratory qualified to be on UTK's faculty. Cheek said there was a need to have a process similar to the one that involves [UC] Berkeley in the hiring of personnel. Birdwell suggested that after a time some deterioration in the lab personnel could occur due to the structure of the lab, i.e., the focus on

short term funding and the high cost of infrastructure there. He further argued that ORNL does not attract as high quality personnel as the University does and as a result caution has to be exercised to not starve campus programs. Cheek indicated there was a need to attract high quality students and see that they have high quality experiences, using Berkeley as a model. M. Breinig noted that her department, Physics, had experience working with ORNL. She said such arrangements are not free in that they require a lot of supervision from UTK faculty. It takes resources and time to supervise such programs and to prevent students in them from becoming alienated. Birdwell noted that one problem in the past with creating joint appointments had been that after a year or two the lab indicates it is going in another direction and the campus had to pick up 100% of the people's salaries.

L. Rinehart said achieving a top 25 ranking involves more than just money; it also involves cultural change. Cheek said the campus has to continue to emphasize its traditional strengths, but to make it clear that research and graduate training are critical. Birdwell said business processes were another critical area leading to the squandering of time.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Senate's Position on Reporting of Athletics (T. Boulet & D. Bruce)

[D. Bruce participated via phone.] Bruce said he thought timing was the big issue for the Senate report and March 1 would be better than February 1. Bruce said he, through the work of the task force chaired by T. Diacon, had plenty of information and deliberations were going well. On February 5 Boulet will make a presentation to the task force. He noted there appear to be overwhelming sentiment for moving to the campus. J. Nolt said he was not clear about what advantage there would be in delaying the report until March, as the report could be an impetus to change in February. Bruce said it would be a bit awkward to recommend that the Faculty Senate "get ahead" of the task force in taking a position. He thought it would be more powerful for the Senate to pass a resolution supporting the recommendation of the task force. Nolt pointed out that changing the reporting structure was a long standing position of the Faculty Senate. Bruce said he thought that Boulet would make that point in his February 5 presentation. J. Heminway tried to create a compromise approach. Nolt moved that a resolution be discussed in February and that a vote be taken in March. Motion seconded. Lyons asked about the need for a specific resolution. Heminway explained that there would not be a specific resolution; instead Boulet would present the proposed position in anticipation of a vote on a specific resolution in March. Motion approved.

Boulet asked Bruce about an additional issue. According to C. Cimino, the Athletic Department budget is already part of the UTK budget. So, the issue is that the Athletic Department currently gets directives from both the campus and the system. Boulet planned to make that clear. Lyons noted that the Women's Athletic Department was on the E & G side of the budget, although state money was not spent on it. Birdwell said he was concerned about why gifts to academic units could not be considered. The answer was it was an IRS [Internal Revenue Service] issue.

Budget and Planning Committee: Salary Study (D. Bruce)

Heminway said she was concerned about the OIRA (Office of Institutional Research and Assessment) study of salaries. She thought there should be a better method for examining gender differences in salaries and noted S. Gardial had offered to pursue better methodological techniques with L. Gross. Heminway asked whether it was reasonable to ask the committee to pursue that issue.

Lyons asked Bruce about the living wage study. The Senate had resolved to have an annual snapshot. Bruce said he did not realize that there has been a resolution binding the Committee to obtaining such data. He said the committee already had a full agenda and because of the lack of salary raises nothing had changed. Lyons emphasized the need to look at the situation in terms of the Senate Bylaws.

Faculty Affairs Committee (S. Thomas)

S. Thomas brought two resolutions from the Committee. One involved changing check boxes to signature lines. Some unofficial guidelines were incorporated into the formal text and some text was replaced. Heminway indicated she endorsed the resolutions. With regard to external letters of assessment, she thought there were already enough challenges finding appropriate reviewers in esoteric areas. Lyons said he thought part of the material sent to potential reviewers should be the written criteria for progression to the rank in question. As an outside reviewer he found such criteria very important. So, he suggested adding that the criteria being sent become a requirement. Rinehart said he preferred using his own standards. D. Thompson noted the document already stated that the criteria should be sent to reviewers. She noted departments need flexibility in selecting the institutions reviewers might come from. Thomas said he would like to proceed with the resolutions as submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee: a change in the signature format and a change in the requirements for external assessors. Both resolutions were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Boulet noted that a gender neutral restroom resolution would be appearing before the SGA [Student Government Association]. Lyons proposed having a report. Boulet clarified that the goal was to have them included in new construction. Hodges Library would be the one existing building that would be at issue. Birdwell asked whether it should not just say new construction, as such restrooms should be in the plans.

Adjournment was moved by Birdwell, seconded by Heminway and approved. Meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

UTK Faculty Senate President's Report

February 15, 2010

On February 5, the Faculty Senate President and the Chancellor addressed the task force considering whether Athletics should report to the UT System or to the UTK campus. The task force will next meet at 2:00 p. m. on Monday, March 1, to draft a recommendation. As discussed previously, the Executive Council will consider drafting a resolution supporting a realignment of the reporting path for Athletics. A proposed draft of such a resolution is included with today's agenda under "New Business."

On the afternoon of February 6, the Faculty Senate President attended a meeting of the Alumni Legislative Council. The group heard from President Jan Simek and received information from a variety of sources regarding the current session of the Tennessee General Assembly. One of many bills in some stage of consideration is House Bill 3542, a copy of which is included with today's agenda. John Nolt will comment on the bill.

On February 9, the Faculty Senate President met with Dan Murphy, the current Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) to discuss various matters related to athletics at UTK. Two items of particular interest were appropriate representation for the Faculty Senate on the Athletics Board and the nature of the board should the reporting path for Athletics change.

The grand opening of *OUTreach*, the LGBT resource center, will be from 2:30 - 4:30 on Thursday, February 25. The center is located in room F103 Melrose Hall.

HOUSE BILL 3542

By Maddox

AN ACT to amend Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 49, Chapter 8 and Title 49, Chapter 9, relative to higher education administration.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE:

SECTION 1. Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 49, Chapter 8, Part 1, is amended by adding the following language as a new section:

Section 49-8-119. Any person with ten (10) or more years of service in one (1) or more of the following positions in state government shall be eligible to serve as president of any institution in the state university and community college system: secretary of state; comptroller of the treasury; treasurer; member of the governor's cabinet; or, cabinet level staff. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, no such person shall be required to hold an advanced degree; provided, that such person holds a baccalaureate degree from an accredited university.

SECTION 2. Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 49, Chapter 9, Part 1, is amended by adding the following language as a new section:

Section 49-9-113. Any person with ten (10) or more years of service in one (1) or more of the following positions in state government shall be eligible to serve as chancellor of any institution in the university of Tennessee system: secretary of state; comptroller of the treasury; treasurer; member of the governor's cabinet; or, cabinet level staff. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, no such person shall be required to hold an advanced degree; provided, that such person holds a baccalaureate degree from an accredited university.

SECTION 3. This act shall take effect upon becoming a law, the public welfare requiring it.

Whereas, at almost all other major public universities, athletic programs are under campus control and there is no compelling reason to have it otherwise at UTK; and

Whereas, student-athletes are students first and athletes second, academic education is the primary reason that they are here and all aspects of their academic lives are already managed by the campus; and

Whereas, the Athletics budget is already managed through UTK accounts; and

Whereas, educating the people of Tennessee about the value that UTK brings to Tennessee would be better served by having the UTK Chancellor control communications about all UTK programs, including Athletics;

Therefore, be it resolved that the UTK Faculty Senate supports a realignment so that Athletics reports to the UTK Chancellor.

**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 1, 2010**

WHEREAS, under 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 Office of the Provost recommended that the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee review and recommend proposed revisions to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* to include as a “best practices” statement in the *Manual* a report by the Task Force on Lecturers; and,

WHEREAS, as outlined on page 2 of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, “[r]evisions to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, if any, are made in consultation with and the approval of the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for final approval by the full Faculty Senate;” and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed the task force report and believes the recommendations it contains would be useful in leading to more consistent treatment of our non-tenure-track teaching faculty; now, therefore, it is

RESOLVED, that the text accompanying this resolution is added to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* in the Best Practices Statement with the title “Best Practices and Recommendations Regarding the Supervision and Development of Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Faculty.”

Best Practices and Recommendations Regarding the Supervision and Development of Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Faculty

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 Provost's office

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.
- The University should explore ways to make Lecturers eligible for course release time to work on course development and other mission-appropriate forms of

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.

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

**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 1, 2010**

WHEREAS, under 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 Office of the Provost recommended that the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee review and recommend proposed revisions to the *Faculty Handbook* to change the provisions requiring all non-tenure track faculty appointments to be renewed annually; 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 Committee and final consideration by the full Faculty Senate;” and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed—and sought (i) input from the Chancellor and the Vice President of Agriculture and (ii) consideration by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on—the various sections of the *Faculty Handbook* related to this issue;

now, therefore, it is

RESOLVED, that sections 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3 of the *Faculty Handbook* are revised as follows.

- 1) The present second and third paragraphs in section 4.1.1 (Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Positions) are deleted and replaced by this one paragraph.
All initial non-tenure-track teaching appointments will be made at the rank of instructor for a definite term of one year or less. Appointments are renewable subject to availability of funds and satisfactory performance. Each lecturer must complete a reapplication process each year, preferably by March 1. Non-tenure-track teaching faculty promoted to the rank of senior lecturer or distinguished lecturer may have appointments lasting up to three years or five years, respectively, and must complete the reapplication process in the final year of their current contract.

- 2) The second paragraph in section 4.1.2 (Non-Tenure-Track Research Positions) is amended by replacing the words “one year or less” with “up to five years” so that it read in full as:

All non-tenure-track research appointments will be made for a definite term of up to five years, subject to continued availability of external funding. Appointments are renewable subject to continued availability of external funding and satisfactory performance

- 3) The second paragraph of section 4.1.3 (Non-Tenure-Track Clinical Positions) is amended by replacing the words “one year or less” with “up to five years” so that it read in full as:

All non-tenure-track clinical appointments will be made for a definite term of up to five years. Appointments are renewable subject to availability of funds and satisfactory performance.

**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 1, 2010**

WHEREAS, under 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 Office of the Provost recommended that the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee review and recommend proposed revisions to the *Faculty Handbook* to change allow for a new rank of “senior lecturer” for non-tenure track faculty teaching faculty; 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 Committee and final consideration by the full Faculty Senate;” and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed—and sought (i) input from the Chancellor and the Vice President of Agriculture and (ii) consideration by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on—the various sections of the *Faculty Handbook* related to this issue;

now, therefore, it is

RESOLVED, that sections 4.1.1 and 4.2.1 of the *Faculty Handbook* are revised as follows.

- 1) The final paragraph 4.1.1 (Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Positions) is amended by adding the phrase “senior lecturer” between “lecturer” and “distinguished lecturer” in the list of ranks or titles for non-tenure track teaching faculty.
- 2) Section 4.2.1 (Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Faculty) is amended by inserting the following paragraph between the paragraphs for “Lecturer” and “Distinguisher lecturer.”
Senior lecturer: This rank is for those who hold a degree appropriate to their disciplines (or its professional equivalent) and who have demonstrated outstanding teaching at the rank of lecturer, normally through five or more years of service. A departmentally designated group of faculty will review and evaluate

appointments to the rank of senior lecturer, in accordance with departmental and college bylaws.

- 3) Section 4.2.1 (Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Faculty) is further amended by changing the paragraph for “Distinguisher lecturer,” replacing the words “lecturer or above” with “senior lecturer,” and inserting the words “normally for a period of three to five years” at end of the first sentence, so it reads in full as follows.

Distinguished lecturer: This rank is for those who hold a degree appropriate to their disciplines (or its professional equivalent) and who have demonstrated excellence in teaching at the rank of senior lecturer, normally for a period of three to five years. A departmentally designated group of faculty will review and evaluate appointments to the rank of distinguished lecturer, in accordance with departmental and college bylaws.