



University of Tennessee, Knoxville

## TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange

---

[Minutes, Senate Meetings](#)

[Faculty Senate](#)

---

3-1-2010

### Faculty Senate - March 1, 2010 Meeting Agenda

Faculty Senate

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



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate - March 1, 2010 Meeting Agenda" (2010). *Minutes, Senate Meetings*.  
[https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_fsmins/14](https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_fsmins/14)

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, Senate Meetings by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact [trace@utk.edu](mailto:trace@utk.edu).

**SENATE MEETING  
MONDAY, MARCH 1, 2010  
3:30 P.M. UNIVERSITY CENTER  
SHILOH ROOM**

**AGENDA**

Toby Boulet, President  
Joan Heminway, President-Elect

Suzanne Kurth, Secretary to the Senate  
Becky Jacobs, Parliamentarian  
Stefanie Ohnesorg, Information Officer

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Establishment of Quorum (S. Kurth)  
Senate President's Report (T. Boulet)  
Chancellor's Report (J. Cheek)  
Provost's Report (S. Martin)

**MINUTES**

Faculty Senate Meeting, February 1, 2010 (for approval)  
Faculty Senate Executive Council Meeting, February 15, 2010 (information item)

**MINUTES POSTED ELECTRONICALLY**

Previously distributed minutes from the Undergraduate Council meeting of February 2, 2010, are available at  
<http://web.utk.edu/~ugcouncil/docs/minutes/UGCouncilMinutes2-2-10Final.pdf>  
Previously distributed minutes from the Graduate Council meeting of February 4, 2010, are available at  
<http://gradschool.utk.edu/GraduateCouncil/Minutes/20090204-GC-Minutes.pdf>

**PREVIOUS BUSINESS**

Proposed change to the Faculty Senate Bylaws (J. Heminway)  
Resolution on reporting of Athletics (T. Boulet)  
Resolutions from the Faculty Affairs Committee (S. Thomas)

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

Faculty Affairs Committee (S. Thomas)  
Undergraduate Council (D. Thompson)  
Graduate Council (V. Anfara)  
Committee on Nominations and Appointments (J. Heminway)

**NEW BUSINESS**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**ATTACHMENTS**

Senate President's Report  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, February 1, 2010 (for approval)  
Executive Council Meeting Minutes, February 15, 2010 (information item)  
Proposed Change to Faculty Senate Bylaws  
Resolution on Reporting of Athletics  
Summary of Resolutions from Faculty Affairs Committee  
Resolutions from Faculty Affairs Committee (Summary Sheet, Evaluation Letters)  
Resolutions from Faculty Affairs Committee (NTTF Best Practices, NTTF Terms of Appointment, Senior Lecturer)  
Position Statements for UTFC Candidates

**DISTRIBUTED BY:** Sharonne L. Winston, Administrative Assistant for the Faculty Senate  
812 Volunteer Boulevard  
974-2483

**PRESIDENT'S OFFICE:** Toby Boulet  
Department of Mechanical, Aerospace & Biomedical Engineering  
974-8376; [boulet@utk.edu](mailto:boulet@utk.edu)

The University of Tennessee Faculty Senate  
MINUTES  
February 1, 2010

Absent: Lt. Col. Michael Angle, David Atkins\*, Doug Blaze, Chris Cimino, Becky Jacobs, Jeff Kovac, Alex Long, Lloyd Rinehart

\*Alternate Senators: Jeanine Williamson for David Atkins

T. Boulet called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### Establishment of a Quorum (S. Kurth)

S. Kurth reported a quorum was present.

### President's Report (T. Boulet)

T. Boulet expanded on the information in his written report. He announced the dates for the brown bag lunches he and Provost Martin were holding (March 2 and April 28). He explained the purposed of the Safe Zone Training scheduled for February 24 was to educate and empower those who would like to serve as allies for LGBT people and issue. Participants in the three-hour session would engage in interactive and reflexive activities. He met with the consultant from the University of Wisconsin who is facilitating developing of the strategic plan for the campus and was favorably impressed. The Executive Council Minutes of January 11 describe Chancellor Cheek's position in detail. The Chancellor could not attend the Senate meeting because he was in Nashville at the Governor's invitation for the State of the State address. Boulet thanks those who responded to D. Bruce's Senate list server request for feedback concerning the reporting structure of Athletics. And, he noted that the Student Counseling Center had begun an LGBT support group. The initial meeting drew more students than expected. The LGBT resource center's grand opening was scheduled for February 25, 2:30-4:30 in Melrose Hall F-103.

### Provost's Report (S. Martin)

Provost Martin conveyed Chancellor Cheek's regrets at not being able to attend the meeting. She noted the Chancellor had made multiple trips to Nashville to advocate on behalf of the campus. She incorporated his planned remarks with hers. When Governor Bredesen announced the new collaboration with ORNL at the airport, he also stated the goal of UTK becoming a top 25 public University. The Chancellor has taken his charge seriously by developing metrics and making the Governor aware of the money needed to achieve success. A gap analysis that will dovetails with the strategic planning process to identify what needs to be done. Provost Holub convened a strategic planning effort. Strategic planning subcommittees accomplished considerable work. People have been moving forward with his goals and putting together a plan. Work is currently proceeding with a consultant who has drafted a strategic plan working with three faculty fellows (J. Heminway, E. Cortez, and D. Thompson) and with S. Gardial to get it out for review. The establishment of benchmarks is an integral part of the planning process. Martin will ask Boulet to recommend a faculty member to work on the new interdisciplinary initiative with ORNL intended to establish a PhD in Energy Science. UTK is working with ORNL.

Martin mentioned C. Plaut's comments on General Education. The campus is learning more about the implications of the legislation affecting making it easier for students to transfer between state public institutions. UTK is not going to be forced to admit students unlikely to succeed at the University. The next step is for Martin to work with Vice President Yegidis and the Provosts of the other campuses. The goal is to retain flexibility while maintaining and reforming the current General Education program.

Martin announced the 1<sup>st</sup> Annual Faculty Appreciation Week would be February 17-23. A night at McClung Museum including a reception was one of the planned activities.

B. Lyons said he applauded taking notes of faculty members' online comments. He asked if they had thought of using Blackboard to gather comments on strategic planning. Martin said they envisioned using focus groups and online venues. Lyons said he thought there would be more buy in if people were a part of the process and the document presented to them were really a rough first draft. M. Handelsman asked whether the top 25 initiative would depend on the whims of whoever was the current governor. Martin said the Chancellor had discussed it with the Board of Trustees [BOT] members. They were interested in the initiative and she thought it was unlikely that the next governor would not be supportive of it. She said having BOT support was important. P. Crilly noted Martin had made a comment that UTK's General Education requirements had not been reformed. Martin said she had been correct about that at the time she made the remark. Martin noted that S. McMillan was looking at more creative and innovative ways to deliver general education.

## **MINUTES**

### Faculty Senate Minutes

The minutes of the November 16, 2009, meeting were moved by M. Wirth and seconded by P. Crilly. Minutes approved.

### Faculty Senate Executive Council

The minutes of the January 11, 2010, meeting of the Executive Committee were distributed as an information item.

## **REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

### Budget and Planning Committee: Salary Reports (D. Bruce)

Reports were distributed prior to the meeting. D. Bruce first drew attention to the report comparing UTK salaries with SUG and THEC peer salaries. He noted that campus salaries were losing ground. The largest gaps were at the full professor level. (The previous year's data were there as well.) J. Shefner asked if national stagnancy had left faculty salaries in the same relative position. Bruce said last year the campus was gaining, but this year it was further behind than two years previously. Lyons commented that an important responsibility for administrators was to look at any available money to shore up gaps rather than using that money for across the board raises. He asked Bruce if he agreed and he did.

M. McAlpin asked about the gender study. Bruce said the Office of Equity and Diversity [OED] and the Commission for Women annually requested a report on faculty salaries by gender to address gender equity. Two statistical methods had been used. The first was a simple comparison of average female and male salaries by college and rank. In those analyses some cases stand out. The second method was a multiple regression analysis. Faculty salaries were

regressed on a limited number of variables (college, rank, highest degree, tenure, years at UTK, and gender). In the report D. Cunningham pointed out caveats about interpreting the analysis. Bruce said the best predictors of salaries were publications, service, teaching, institution at which degree was granted and department. If significant variables are omitted the resulting analysis is problematic. Bruce said as an individual he would draw no inferences from the report focused on gender equity and that just because it had been done from 1971 was no reason for it to be continued. S. Gardial was trying to work with L. Gross and others on resolutions to the problems with the current analysis. Bruce said he was convinced that looking at individual salaries, as the Provost's Office currently did, was the best way to proceed.

#### Committee on Nominations and Appointments: Elections (J. Heminway)

J. Heminway said the Committee set the timing and procedures for the regular Senate elections. By February 15 nominees were needed from each caucus for each Senate seat. The new Senators needed to be elected by spring break. She encouraged caucus chairs to work on recruiting candidates. The procedures had to be set for the University Faculty Council Representative. The two candidates (I. Lane and D. Patterson) would speak at the March 1 meeting. There would be a paper ballot at the next meeting.

The Faculty Senate President-elect had to be selected by the third meeting. An electronic consent procedure by the end of March was agreed on for the President-elect position. She was still seeking nominees.

#### Faculty Affairs Committee (S. Thomas)

S. Thomas said the presentation of two resolutions would constitute their first reading. The first resolution addressed an inconsistency in the faculty evaluation forms resolved by changing check boxes to signature lines. The second resolution addressed external letters of assessment for promotion and tenure. The revision of July 2007 has been followed, but it does not appear in the 2009 version of "Manual for Faculty Evaluation." Concerns had been raised about the practicality of identifying 10 reviewers and the dilemma of what to do, if there were not 10 letters. Thomas noted that any Senator could propose to amend either resolution when it was brought to the Senate for a vote at the next meeting. He encouraged Senators to send proposed amendments to him. P. Crilly asked whether it was being said that the only people who could do a peer review were academics. Martin replied that there was no alteration in the wording of that part of the document, in other words the practice had been to limit outside reviewers to people who were academics.

### **NEW BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

#### Proposed Change to Faculty Senate Bylaws (J. Heminway)

Heminway said being President of the Faculty Senate required a three-year commitment. It was difficult to identify candidates when one of the requirements was service as an "elected" member of the Senate within the past five years. The proposed amendment expanded the possible pool of candidates by expanding one qualification: "prior service on the Faculty Senate as an administrative member...or in another elected or appointed capacity." The other two requirements would remain in place. She said she wanted to have the *Faculty Senate Bylaws* amended at the March 1 meeting. She provided her e-mail address for people to provide comments [heminwa@tennesseeeu](mailto:heminwa@tennesseeeu). N. Mertz said she would like clarification about one category, administrative members, giving her Dean as an example. Mertz said the proposal did not say the administrator would have to step down. Heminway said she would have Boulet

send out the other two eligibility criteria. Lyons clarified that when talking about administrators, the statement addressed those serving at the level of dean or higher. Department heads were not considered administrators in this case.

Boulet said he met with the General Education Committee with S. McMillan. He was there to answer questions. There were none.

M. Breinig asked about the designation of caucus chairs. Heminway said she had recruited some caucus chairs. She tried to get senior people to play the role. She said she would be glad to send out the names of the caucus chairs, if people were interested.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn made, seconded and approved. Meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne Kurth, Secretary

Faculty Senate Executive Council  
MINUTES  
February 15, 2010

Present: Doug Birdwell, Toby Boulet, Chris Cimino, Rob Heller, Joan Heminway, Laura Howes, Suzanne Kurth, Beauvais Lyons, Susan Martin, John Nolt, Stefanie Ohnesorg, Ken Stephenson, Steve Thomas, Dixie Thompson

Guests: Scott Simmons (Graduate Assistant)

## **I. CALL TO ORDER**

T. Boulet called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

## **II. REVIEW OF MINUTES**

A motion to approve the minutes of the January 11, 2010, meeting was made by D. Thompson and seconded by J. Nolt. The minutes were approved. B. Lyons requested that the record show that an adequate explanation had not been received about the discrepancy in the inclusive statements in University publications. He noted that Sec, 1, Ch. 1 of the *Faculty Handbook* contains a welcoming statement promoting inclusiveness. Lyons asked whether the Executive Council, the Faculty Affairs Committee, or the Faculty Senate President should pursue the inconsistency. Boulet said the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Gay, Transgender (LGBT) Commission had raised the issue and he would schedule a meeting with the General Counsel's Office to pursue the issue. J. Heminway suggested there could be two statements: one statement meeting the federal requirements and a second being the current welcoming one. This would reduce the current multiple statements to two.

## **III. REPORTS**

### President's Report (T. Boulet)

T. Boulet's report had been distributed with the meeting agenda. He noted that the opening of OUTreach, the LGBT resource center in F103 Melrose Hall, would be Thursday, February 25 from 2:30-4:30. In response to Boulet's question about the number of faculty members/representation of faculty on the Athletics Board, R. Heller said that faculty members held 8 of the 39 positions on the Board. Heller indicated that it was not an activist organization. Faculty members chair the Board Subcommittees. J. Nolt indicated there was a bill pending in the legislature designed to open the Presidency of the University to additional candidates (a college degree minimum). It did not yet have a sponsor in the Senate, so there was no need for action. Nolt said Anthony Haynes would draw the Senate's attention to any such items.

### Provost's Report (S. Martin)

S. Martin indicated that Chancellor Cheek could not attend the meeting due to a death in his family. She said the Board of Trustees (BOT) would be meeting the following week in Martin. The proposal for differential tuition in four colleges would be put forward then. An overall tuition increase would affect planning. She noted that Boulet and Cheek spoke at the Task Force meeting. From the Task Force it would move to the next level. She identified two task forces. One would address the new relationship between Oak Ridge (ORNL) and the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (UTK). She noted the need to proceed carefully. The second task force would do a gap analysis to see what it would take for UTK to reach the top 25. The first decision would be to decide who is in the top 25. The Task Force would look at benchmarks.

By the time of the June BOT meeting, the strategic planning process would be informed by the top 25 analysis.

The Academic Efficiency and Effectiveness Task Force identified the lack of a uniform strategy during summer orientation as a problem. The students were learning about fun things to do but not getting enough information about how to be academically successful. The goal is to have a more academic message and not leave information about academics to the second day. Sally McMillan was working with the Registrar on proposing timetable changes, that is, changes in when classes meet. Currently, students seek classes that meet two days a week (Tuesday and Thursday). Other classes are meeting at nonstandard times on Monday and Wednesday. The Task Force will look at developing a more flexible timetable with different day combination, e.g., Monday and Wednesday. Changing the time schedule for classes could lead to more efficient use of classroom space and would help UTK assess its space needs. The possibility of creating a tracking process with BANNER to indicate when students are not taking the courses leading to their major is being explored. And, bottleneck courses were being reviewed. The advising recommendation is being implemented. Professional advisers will staff the Arts and Sciences Advising Center.

Heminway commented that she was pleased about the examination of orientation. She said the Task Force might consider carrying advising through from orientation to academic year advising. Martin said they wanted students to be more comfortable with the degree audit system (DARS). K. Stephenson asked whether there was any specific classroom building scheduled. C. Cimino said the plan was to have one when Stokely was razed, but he noted that development was not imminent. Lyons commented that it was great that the Registrar was looking at the scheduling of classes. He thought having student focus groups to give input would be useful. Lyons said he had encountered scheduling problems due to students' work schedules.

Martin agreed with Lyons that the lack of availability of classes throughout the week made it harder for students. She said McMillan would hold student focus groups. She noted the need to address how UTK can increase its retention and graduation rates. Rates have improved for students entering with lower ability, but they have leveled off for students entering with higher ability. Consequently, groups will address that discrepancy.

Nolt noted that spring was coming and he wondered about the status of the evaluations of Deans. Martin said she would address that next. Heminway said there was a need to know why students worked, e.g., was it due to the job market. Martin said as students are more economically stressed the University needs to support them as much as possible. Middle class students are being helped with scholarships. D. Birdwell said the merger involving the former Computer Science Department revealed nonstandard class time problems. He asked why nonstandard class times were permitted. He also noted that Monday and Friday classes should be considered. Martin said other institutions implemented timetable changes a couple of years ago. One consequence of making a switch may be that exceptions are nullified. Currently, faculty members claim long-standing exceptions.

Martin then addressed the evaluation of Deans. She said she used the academic year for evaluations. She noted that she got a late start this year, but she was in the process of completing them. As the process requires feedback to the faculty, the process takes longer.



She is working with each Dean on what to communicate to the faculty. She met with the Library Faculty. In some units, summary paragraphs may be provided to the faculty. She said she would distribute surveys this spring for fall evaluations. Boulet noted the *Faculty Handbook* specified written feedback should be provided. Martin said that actually different statements appear in different locations within that document. She indicated she liked the statement for Department Heads. Boulet said the *Faculty Handbook* specified there should be a written summary of the surveys, but if other statements were made elsewhere that made a difference. Nolt asked whether there were evaluations of Associate Deans. Martin said nothing was specified. Nolt said it would be good for the Faculty Affairs Committee to consider their evaluation.

#### **IV. OLD BUSINESS**

##### Resolution on the Senate's Position on Reporting of Athletics (T. Boulet)

Boulet distributed Lyons proposed addition to the resolution after the budget line: "Whereas, the planning and construction of Athletics facilities have an impact on academic programs on the UTK campus; and." The proposed change was accepted as a friendly amendment. Nolt moved to bring the resolution to the Senate and Birdwell seconded the motion. Lyons noted that Boulet gave a presentation to the Athletics Alignment Task Force. Boulet said he thought it was generally supported. The recommendation goes from that group to the Athletics Board and finally to the BOT. There was general discussion of what action might be taken. Motion approved.

#### **V. NEW BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

##### Faculty Affairs Committee (S. Thomas)

S. Thomas said the Committee had three resolutions. The first was to add a best practices statement for non-tenure track teaching faculty. The Provost, the Council of Deans, and the Faculty Affairs Committee had reviewed the resolution that supports a set of best practices but does not establish them as policy. Nolt asked why they were not proposed as policy. Thomas said there might be cases in smaller colleges where they might be burdensome. D. Thompson asked whether there was input from Department Heads. Martin said there was not. Thompson said Heads have to deal with faculty. Martin said the recommendations were what the campus currently was trying to follow and the administration understood they could create expectations. Nolt said there were a lot of concerns among lecturers, e.g., that they cannot do things like mentor College Scholars and are not eligible for various faculty development opportunities. Martin replied that the College Scholars rule was a college policy and faculty development opportunities are often related to departmental resources because much of the money comes from them. L. Howes applauded the establishment of periods of employment. She asked whether there was any discussion of tenure. Thomas said there was not, as the focus was on non-tenure track. Howes said there were lecturers tenured at one time. Birdwell said one person currently had tenure. Martin said that in the past people were tenured due to the number of years for a tenure decision having elapsed. Heminway asked whether the proposal addressed Vice President Joseph DiPietro's e-mail to Thomas, specifying that he question was about change in years in one place and not the other. Thomas said a portion in the third resolution distinguished the category of lecturer. He expressed discomfort with changing the Committee's report that proposed "typically." Thompson said she did not understand reapplication if it applied to people like one of her faculty members that has been at UTK 30 years. Thomas said the Committee's understanding was that it would be up to the Department Head and Dean. Martin said Chapter 4 of the *Faculty Handbook* already required at least a

minimal reapplication every year. Boulet said it could be very minimal. Lyons noted it might vary from unit to unit. Thompson asked about inclusion of sabbatical, as UTK currently does not have one for tenure-track faculty. Thomas said it was in the report when the Committee received it. Thompson asked whether it helped or hurt to have a set of best practices that could not be met. Thomas said the Committee was concerned about moving into a period of limited resources. The practices could be thought of as the groundwork for a later time. He was not certain how long the Distinguished Lecturer position had been in place. He asked whether any had been appointed and Martin said there had been. The standards are unclear. Ohnesorg noted that one person threatened a lawsuit because the category was available. Nolt said he thought such appointments took place at the departmental level. Martin said that was a good point and such designations relied on a sound evaluation process. Nolt pointed out that such an evaluation process had not been in place. Thomas said there might be implications for departments and tenured faculty as there are references to the standards employed for them. Martin said she understood the document was almost from another age. Some departments have funds. She said she was sensitive to the concern about creating false expectations, but she thought having best practices in place was important. Howes asked what percentage of the faculty was in non-tenure track and was told between 20-25% of full-time. Nolt pointed out that women were the highest percentage of faculty at the lowest level. Thompson asked whether the resolution would go through two readings, if it were sent to the Faculty Senate. Boulet said it had been the custom. Thomas moved the resolution on behalf of the Committee. Motion approved.

The second resolution originated from the Council of Deans and was intended to avoid the need to make annual appointments for research, clinical, distinguished and senior lecturers. Howes asked whether the wording "current contract" in the resolve part should be "letter of appointment," as that is what people receive. Thomas said that was his wording. He accepted "letter of appointment," as a friendly amendment. The resolution from the Committee was approved as amended for reading at the next Senate meeting.

The third resolution introduced senior lecturer as a valid rank changing the paragraph for "Distinguished Lecturer" to read "senior lecturer" instead of "lecturer or above." And, "normally for a period of three to five years" was changed to "typically for a period of five years." Boulet noted that if the Senate passed by the change it might require General Counsel approval. Martin said it would depend on what the General Counsel's Office said. Birdwell asked whether the change would preclude bringing someone in as a Distinguished Lecturer, who had not been at UTK previously. Thomas said the five years could be worked around. Heminway said the visiting title could be used, if the appointment were for one year. Birdwell said he wondered about having an escape clause. Lyons said the *Faculty Handbook* had a number of visiting titles. Thomas said the criteria for the "visiting" designation were unclear. Boulet said qualification could be specified like those for granting tenure. He said the Committee could look into the possibility of addressing criteria. Birdwell expressed interest in having an escape clause. Motion from the Faculty Affairs Committee approved.

#### Elections (J. Heminway)

Heminway provided an update on the upcoming elections. The two candidates for the University of Tennessee Faculty Council (I. Lane and D. Patterson) were scheduled to speak at the March 1 Faculty Senate meeting. Trying to recruit two candidates for Senate President-elect that met the criteria specified in the *Faculty Senate Bylaws* and represented diversity had

been difficult. In some cases, there was only one nominee for a Senate seat rather than two. Heminway said there were a number of reasons for the problems. One problem was that service on the Senate was not valued. Also, there was a conception that all the Senate does is pass what is put in front of it. The Deans and Department Heads could address the problem. In the College of Law the Dean made sure there were candidates. She noted there was inconsistency in the *Bylaws* about appointment of the Information Officer. Heminway said she needed clarification about what body to put the nomination of the Information Officer and Secretary before. The suggestion she made about changing the existing statement about the qualifications for President-elect were attached to the minutes of the last meeting. The proposed change eliminated the requirement of having served as an elected member of the Senate. She proposed adding "prior service on the Faculty Senate as an administrative member...or in another elected or appointed capacity". At the last Senate meeting, the question was raised about the basis for excluding Deans. Heminway said that they were excluded because of the 50% faculty status requirement. Thomas moved and Thompson seconded the resolution adding the additional service categories and deleting the elected Senator requirement. Motion approved officially sanctioning the motion read at the February Senate meeting.

#### Strategic Plan

The goal is to have focus groups. Committee Chairs should have it reviewed by their committees.

Thompson asked whether she should present the Undergraduate Council minutes at the next meeting, as they were posted. Changes affecting General Education are contained in them. It was agreed she would make comments.

Adjournment was moved, second and approved. Meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m.

## **UTK Faculty Senate President's Report**

March 1, 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 March 1 to draft a recommendation. As discussed previously, the Executive Council has drafted a resolution supporting a realignment of the reporting path for Athletics and will ask for a vote on this resolution at the meeting of the Faculty Senate on March 1.

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.

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.

At its winter meeting at UT Martin, the Board of Trustees considered several items of interest to the UTK campus. Among these are the awarding of an honorary from UTK, differential tuition for three UTK colleges and the process by which the board will search for the next president of the UT System.

## **Proposed Change to Faculty Senate Bylaws**

**March 1, 2010**

In Article II, Section 10 Election of Officers, in the qualifications for candidates for President-Elect, change

“prior service as an elected faculty member of the Faculty Senate within the last five years”  
to

“prior service on the Faculty Senate (as an administrative member, an elected faculty member, or a committee, council, or task force member, or in another elected or appointed capacity) within the last five years.”

## **Resolution Concerning the Reporting of UT Athletics**

**March 1, 2010**

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, the planning and construction of athletic facilities have an impact on academic programs on the UTK campus; 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; and

WHEREAS, in April of 2004, the Faculty Senate passed a resolution stating that the President of the UT System should “delegate to the Chancellor of the Knoxville campus the same authority and autonomy enjoyed by the Chancellors on the other campuses, including control of campus budgets, facilities, and infrastructure and responsibility for all athletic programs;” now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the UTK Faculty Senate supports a realignment so that Athletics reports to the UTK Chancellor.

## **Summary of Resolutions from the Faculty Affairs Committee**

### **For ACTION on March 1**

#### **Resolution 1: Summary Sheet: Recommendations for Promotion and/or Tenure**

Purpose: To clarify that the Chancellor is making a recommendation on tenure to the Board of Trustees and indicating a decision on promotion that does not require review by the Board.

Action: Replace the form on page 45 of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* with text accompanying the resolution.

#### **Resolution 2: External Letters of Assessment**

Purpose: Incorporate into the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* the guidelines for obtaining **External Letters of Assessment** under which the campus has been informally operating since July 2007.

Action: Replace Part IV. B.4 of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* with guidelines posted on the Provost's website.

### **For INFORMATION on March 1**

#### **Resolution 3: Non-Tenure Track Teaching Faculty Best Practices**

Purpose: Incorporate into the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* non-binding recommendations for the supervision and development of non-tenure-track teaching faculty in the form of a "best practices" document.

Action: Add the report entitled "Best Practices and Recommendations Regarding the Supervision and Development of Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Faculty" to the Best Practices Statements section of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*.

#### **Resolution 4: Definition of Non-Tenure Track Teaching Faculty Ranks of Senior Lecturer**

Purpose: As recommended in the NNTF best practices report, to define the new rank of "senior lecturer" as a step on the career ladder between the ranks of lecturer and distinguished lecturer.

Action: Revise *Faculty Handbook* section 4.2.1 to include "senior lecturer" and revise section 4.2.1 to define the relationship of senior lecture to lecturer and distinguished lecture.

#### **Resolution 5: Terms of Appointment for Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

Purpose: To eliminate the need for some non-tenure faculty to be reappointed on an annual basis. With the exception of distinguished lecturers, for whom the terms of appointment may be up to five years, the *Faculty Handbook* specifies "a definite term of one year or less" for other non-tenure track teaching faculty and for all non-tenure track research and clinical faculty.

Action: Revise *Faculty Handbook* sections 4.1.1, 4.1.2 and 4.1.3, allow senior lecturers to have terms of appointments of up to three years and all non-tenure track research and clinical faculty to have terms of appointments of up to five years.

**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 the form in *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* used for promotion and/or tenure recommendations and recommend adding to the form signature lines to clarify that the Chancellor makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees concerning tenure but confers promotion without the need for approval by the Board;

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 form on page 45 of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* entitled “**Summary Sheet: Recommendation for promotion and/or Tenure**” and believes the requested change is reasonable and may be made by replacing the present check boxes on this form with signature lines; now, therefore, it is

RESOLVED, that the form on page 45 of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* entitled “**Summary Sheet: Recommendation for promotion and/or Tenure**” is replaced with the form accompanying this resolution.



## Summary Sheet: Recommendations for Promotion and/or Tenure

Name of faculty member: \_\_\_\_\_

Present rank: \_\_\_\_\_ Candidate for: ☐ Tenure ☐ Promotion to \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_ Highest degree earned: \_\_\_\_\_

Original rank at UTK: \_\_\_\_\_ Subsequent promotions (year, rank): \_\_\_\_\_

### RECORD AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE

Date of original appointment as a full-time probationary faculty member: \_\_\_\_\_

Years of full-time teaching experience at instructor rank or above before UTK probationary period: \_\_\_\_\_

Years of full-time teaching at UTK, as of the May 31st prior to the review: \_\_\_\_\_

Total years of teaching: \_\_\_\_\_

Latest year for tenure review as stipulated in appointment letter: \_\_\_\_\_

### RECOMMENDATIONS

#### DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY

Date of departmental discussion: \_\_\_\_\_

Result of discussion: For: \_\_\_\_\_ Against: \_\_\_\_\_ Abstain: \_\_\_\_\_

Recuse (attach explanation for conflict of interest): \_\_\_\_\_

Is there a dissenting report? ☐ Yes (please attach) ☐ No

Is there a response from the candidate ☐ Yes (please attach) ☐ No

INTERDISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE OR DIRECTOR (where appropriate)

For: \_\_\_\_\_ Against: \_\_\_\_\_ (Provide letter)

Approve \_\_\_\_\_ Disapprove \_\_\_\_\_  
(Provide letter)

DEPARTMENT HEAD

Provide a statement on the professional record and a summary recommendation.

#### COLLEGE COMMITTEE

For: \_\_\_\_\_ Against: \_\_\_\_\_ Abstain: \_\_\_\_\_

Recuse (attach explanation for conflict of interest): \_\_\_\_\_

*A copy of the report of the departmental and college committees must also be attached. In cases where this report disagrees in any substantial way with the departmental recommendation, this report must go beyond a listing of the vote to indicate as fully as possible the reasons for the differences.*

Approve \_\_\_\_\_ Disapprove \_\_\_\_\_  
(Provide letter)

DEAN

CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER

CHANCELLOR (RECOMMENDATION ON TENURE)

CHANCELLOR (DECISION ON PROMOTION)

**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* concerning the process for obtaining external letters of assessment; 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, guidelines for obtaining external letters of assessment were revised in July 2007, were distributed and posted on the Provost’s website, and have been used on the Knoxville campus since that time but have never been formally incorporated in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*; now, therefore, it is

RESOLVED, that Part IV. B.4 of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* is deleted and replaced in full with the text accompanying this resolution.

#### **4. External Letters of Assessment**

The department head or designate (e.g., chair of a departmental tenure and promotion committee) is responsible for the process of obtaining letters from external evaluators. The head, or designate, should initiate the process of obtaining external letters of assessment far enough in advance of the review process that letters are in the dossier and available to peer review committees and administrators at all levels of review. Candidates for tenure and promotion should not contact prospective or actual external evaluators under any circumstances.

a. **Qualifications of External Evaluators.** External evaluators should be distinguished individuals in the candidate's field who are in a position to provide an authoritative assessment of the candidate's research record and to comment on its significance in the discipline. Whenever possible, letters should be solicited from individuals at peer institutions or aspirational peer institutions, in particular, from faculty employed at AAU institutions. If individuals at non-peer institutions are solicited for letters, the department head must explain the reasons for the choice of these individuals (including without limitation evidence of the reviewer's exemplary experience and standing in the candidate's field). Evaluators will normally hold the rank of professor and must have attained at least the rank to which the candidate aspires. Evaluators must be able to furnish an objective evaluation of the candidate's work and may not be former advisors, post-doctoral supervisors, or close personal friends of the candidate or others whose relationship with the candidate could reduce objectivity. If the evaluator has had a collaborative scholarly or research relationship with the candidate, the nature of that collaboration and the relative contributions of the candidate must be clearly described by the evaluator. A reviewer's appearance on an academic panel or roundtable with the candidate or attendance at a symposium or conference with a candidate, taken alone, does not constitute a relationship with the candidate that could reduce objectivity. Questions concerning the eligibility of potential evaluators should be referred to the office of the Dean and, where appropriate (e.g., where the department is a college or where the Dean is uncertain about how to resolve the matter), Provost well in advance of making a request from the individuals in question. Each evaluator will be asked to state expressly in his or her review letter the nature of any association with the candidate.

b. **Method for Obtaining External Assessments.**

- The department head or designate, in consultation with departmental faculty, assembles a list of potential external evaluators.
- The department head or designate requests the names of potential evaluators from the candidate.
- The department head or designate also requests names of individuals the candidate wants excluded and the reasons for the exclusions.
- The department head or designate will solicit 8-10 letters. No more than half of the letters solicited should come from the list suggested by the candidate.
- The dossier will normally include no fewer than five letters from external evaluators.

- All letters solicited and received must be included in the dossier unless the Office of Academic Affairs approves their removal from the review process.
- The dossier will include a log documenting all requests for letters from external evaluators. The log documents the date on which each external letter was requested by the department head or designate and the date on which the letter was received. All requests should be entered regardless of whether a response was obtained. The log will also indicate which evaluators come from the candidate's list and which are from the list of the department head or designate.
- The department head or designate will send to the external evaluators information and documentation for use in preparing the external assessment including the candidate's *curriculum vitae*, appropriate supporting materials concerning the candidate's research or creative activity, and the departmental and collegiate statements of criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

c. Letters from external evaluators must be submitted by regular mail on institutional letterhead and carry the evaluator's signature. Letters submitted via e-mail or facsimile are acceptable in cases of critical timing, but they should be followed by a mailed original. The mailed original then should be cross-checked against the e-mailed or facsimiled copy, and when it has been established that there have been no changes, the mailed original should be included in the candidate's dossier.

d. The department head or designate is responsible for providing and including in the candidate's dossier a brief biographical statement about the credentials and qualifications of each external evaluator; special attention should be given to documenting the evaluator's standing in his or her discipline as part of the biographical statement.

**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)<sup>1</sup>

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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 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, typically for a period of 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.

**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 letter of appointment.

- 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.

January 15, 2010

Professor Joan Heminway  
Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Appointments  
384 Law Complex: George C Taylor Wing  
1505 Cumberland Avenue  
Knoxville, TN 37996-1810

Dear Professor Heminway,

Thank you for considering my interest in the position of UTK representative for the University of Tennessee Faculty Council. I would be honored to represent our campus and continue the good work and good will established by Drs. Beauvais Lyons in recent years.

I have been interested in the Council since hearing about its formation several years ago. I became intrigued with the issues and operations of other campuses in the state after conducting a research project with Dr. Grady Bogue, in which we studied salary challenges and salary discrepancies at institutions within the state's two systems of higher education (Faculty and Administrator Salaries in Tennessee: Trends 1992-2002. *Report prepared for University of Tennessee Faculty Senate and University of Tennessee Board of Trustees*, July 2004). Although each campus faces individual challenges, the combined strength of the faculties seems to hold the most promise for facing large problems and making significant gains in higher education in the state. As you know, there is no shortage of "big problems" in Tennessee today. The University Faculty Council and the Tennessee University Faculty Senates organization appear to be solid steps in a positive direction.

I believe that my background, experience and expertise provide unique qualifications for this position. First, I have been an engaged faculty member, faculty leader, administrator and student at the University of Tennessee... all at the same time! I joined the faculty here in 1997 and was able to quickly provide leadership for educational efforts in the college of veterinary medicine and small animal teaching hospital. In 2005, I was asked to lead the Teaching Council of the Faculty Senate and in so doing, served as Chair of the Council and as a member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for four years. In addition to learning the issues and policies of the Faculty Senate, I served during multiple campus transitions and challenges, from leadership changes to budget crises. As a part-time Director of Educational Enhancement in the College of Veterinary Medicine since 2002, I also served on our college Executive Committee. During this tenure on two types of Executive Committees, I was struck by the animosity and distrust that exists between faculty and administrators, perpetuated by both sides. I believe that distrust to be counterproductive to accomplishing common goals and favor a dialectic and collaborative approach. Although I no longer serve in a Faculty Senate capacity, I have continued my involvement with the UT educational mission in ongoing work with the Tennessee Teaching and Learning Center and the UT Learning Consortium.

I recently completed a Doctorate in Education in the College of Education, Health and Human Sciences here at UTK. This experience provided me the perspective of a graduate student, increased interaction with different departments in UTK, and extensive preparation in higher educational leadership, including exposure to the structure of higher education in this state and others. Formal coursework included coverage of the history of American higher education, legal foundations of higher education, organizational theory, and educational policy. The program also provided a longitudinal curriculum in leadership development, training I have augmented with other opportunities over the last seven years.

Finally, as a faculty member in the College of Veterinary Medicine, I come to the table with multiple perspectives on the university faculty experience, including that of traditional research and teaching faculty, and that of faculty engaged in nontraditional efforts such as hospital service and income generation, extension service, and outreach activities. I feel confident that I can represent both UTK faculty and Institute of Agriculture faculty effectively, and can grasp the unique perspectives of faculty in such diverse arenas as the UT Health Science Center, UT Space Institute and Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

In summary, my familiarity with the local, statewide and national issues in higher education, my commitment to the principles of integrity and collaboration, and my ability to empathize and communicate with both faculty and administrators qualify me to serve on the Faculty Council. Thank you for your consideration and for your continued efforts at the university.

Sincerely,

India F. Lane, DVM, MS, EdD  
Associate Professor of Internal Medicine  
Director, Educational Enhancement

David A. Patterson, Ph.D., Professor of Social Work  
Nominee for the University Faculty Council

The University of Tennessee System's University Faculty Council Charters states it is “dedicated to upholding and exercising the principles of academic freedom, shared governance, tenure, and the faculty's primary responsibility for the university's curriculum.” This is accomplished through consultation and communication with the UT System President and his/her staff, the Board of Trustees, the faculties of each of the campuses, and the leadership of the respective campuses. We are at a crucial juncture in the history of the University of Tennessee. The ongoing economic crisis will likely result in post-stimulus funds program reductions and restructuring of academic units. The Board of Trustees has charged Interim President Jan Simek with reorganization of the UT System. A search for a new UT System President will likely begin within the next year. The consequences of each of these factors will both shape the conduct of the academic and research mission of UT Knoxville and can be shaped by the input and efforts of an active, engaged University Faculty Council. If elected to the Council, I intend to work on the following initiatives: 1) ensure that faculty have a continuing voice and role in the University's preparations for a post-stimulus funding academic environment, 2) advocate for a presidential search process that is inclusive, transparent, comprehensive, and responsive to faculty concerns, 3) promote the long-term, best interest of faculty and students of UT Knoxville in discussions of re-organization of the UT System, 4) make sure that the University Faculty Council remains an active and engaged body of faculty governance.

David A. Patterson, Ph.D. is a professor of social work in The University of Tennessee College of Social Work. He received his B.S. from Kent State University, the M.S.W. degree from the University of Utah, and a Ph.D. in social work from the University of Utah. Over the past 19 years, he has taught graduate classes in forensic social work, substance abuse treatment, group psychotherapy, research, and applied information technology. He is the Principle Investigator and Director of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development funded Knoxville Homeless Management Information System (KnoxHMIS). The KnoxHMIS is in its sixth year of operations. Dr. Patterson has authored two books, *Personal Computer Applications in the Social Services* and *Data Analysis with Spreadsheets* as well as numerous peer reviewed articles and book chapters. Dr. Patterson is on the editorial boards of the *Journal of Technology in Human Services*, *Best Practices in Mental Health*, and *Currents: New Scholarship in the Human Services*. He is a past-President of the UT Knoxville Faculty Senate and a former member of the University Faculty Council.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE  
KNOXVILLE

**FACULTY SENATE AGENDA  
MARCH 1, 2010, 3:30 P.M.  
UNIVERSITY CENTER  
SHILOH ROOM**

**President's Office: 607 Dougherty Engineering Building  
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-2210 (865) 974-8376**