



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

---

[Minutes, Senate Meetings](#)

[Faculty Senate](#)

---

3-29-2010

## Faculty Senate - March 29, 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 29, 2010 Meeting Agenda" (2010). *Minutes, Senate Meetings*.  
[https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_fsmins/13](https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_fsmins/13)

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 29, 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)  
Complete College Tennessee Act of 2010 (T. Diacon)

**MINUTES**

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

**MINUTES POSTED ELECTRONICALLY**

Previously distributed minutes from the Undergraduate Council meeting of March 2, 2010, are available at  
<http://web.utk.edu/~ugcouncil/docs/minutes/UGCouncilMinutes3-2-10.pdf>  
Previously distributed minutes from the Graduate Council meeting of March 4, 2010, are available at  
<http://gradschool.utk.edu/GraduateCouncil/Minutes/20100304-GC-Minutes.pdf>

**PREVIOUS BUSINESS**

Resolutions from the Faculty Affairs Committee (S. Thomas)

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

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

**NEW BUSINESS**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**ATTACHMENTS**

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, February 1, 2010 (for approval)  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 1, 2010 (for approval)  
Executive Council Meeting Minutes, March 15, 2010 (information item)  
Senate President's Report  
Resolutions from Faculty Affairs Committee (NTTF Best Practices, NTTF Terms of Appointment, Senior Lecturer)

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 purpose 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 dovetail 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 of 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

The University of Tennessee Faculty Senate  
MINUTES  
March 1, 2010

Absent: Bill Blass, Bill Bradshaw, Ernest Brewer, Jim Conant, Steven Dandaneau, Jim Drake, Denise Jackson, Becky Jacobs, Yuri Kamychkov, Jeff Kovac, Baldwin Lee, Beauvais Lyons, Brent Mallinckrodt, Lane Morris, Jay Pfaffman, Lloyd Rinehart, W. Tim Rogers, Rupy Sawhney, Juergen Schumacher, Montgomery Smith, Carla Sommardahl, Marlys Staudt, Michael Stewart, Sam Swan, Patricia Tithof, Scott Wall, Michael Wirth, Pia Wood, Yang Zhong, Svetlana Zivanovic

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.

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

T. Boulet added an item to his distributed report. At the Board of Trustees' [BOT] meeting the timeline for the search for a new President was announced. There will be a short public phase to the search. The advantage of this procedure was in recruiting candidates who would not want their candidacy to be made public.

#### Chancellor's Report (J. Cheek)

J. Cheek reported on the BOT meeting held the previous week. He said the BOT understands the University of Tennessee, Knoxville [UTK], as indicated by its unanimous support of the significant proposal (for differential tuition) from UTK. The campus had awarded only two honorary degrees. The bestowing of a third honorary degree to former Vice President Gore was approved. Gore would speak and receive the award at the May 2010 commencement. The BOT also approved assigning names to two buildings on White Avenue that were frequently confused. Cheek noted that the legislature was in session. P. Crilly asked about taking action on smoking in front of non-smoking entrances to buildings. A policy was adopted but real enforcement of the ban has been elusive. Cheek said the administration had been looking at the problem, but a strategy had not yet been developed. Cheek said if Crilly would tell him about specific places where violations were occurring, he could send someone to check those locations from time to time. Cheek said the discussion raises the question about considering creating a smoke-free campus at some future time.

#### Provost (S. Martin)

S. Martin indicated that she did not have a report. Budget and strategic planning were the topics for the March 2 brown bag lunch with Martin and Boulet. T. Wang asked if BANNER would be up for fall. Martin said testing was underway, but it would not be available until spring 2011. Opportunities for training on the system will be would be announced. K. Reed said Graduate Admissions would be going up on the system over the spring and summer.

### **MINUTES**

#### Faculty Senate Meeting

Minutes of the February 1, 2010, meeting were distributed late and there was a problem with the attendance record, so no action on them was taken at the meeting.

Faculty Senate Executive Council

Minutes of the February 15, 2010, meeting were distributed as an information item.

**MINUTES POSTED ELECTRONICALLY**

Undergraduate Council. The minutes of the February 2, 2010, meeting were available online.

Graduate Council. The minutes of the February 5, 2010, meeting were available online.

**PREVIOUS BUSINESS**

Proposed Change to Faculty Senate Bylaws (J. Heminway)

J. Heminway noted that at the last meeting N. Mertz helped clarify one of the issues. One proposal she received was to eliminate all criteria as they were meaningless. She disagreed that they were meaningless. If the changes were approved, there would remain a double check, the Committee on Nominations and Appointments. J. Clark proposed everyone who is nominated should attend Senate meetings.

There were no questions. Motion to amend the Bylaws passed.

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 on Reporting of Athletics (T. Boulet)

Boulet reported there was support for a realignment that would have campus athletics report to the Chancellor. The Task Force on Athletics met earlier on March 1 (Martin and D. Bruce serve on that Task Force). Motion carried unanimously.

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.

Faculty Affairs Committee (S. Thomas)

S. Thomas brought to the body two resolutions that were presented at the February Senate meeting. The first involved changing check boxes to signature lines and the second a change in the number of external reviewers required for candidates for promotion. He reported that he had received no comments since the resolutions were presented February 1. The resolution was passed.

Thomas introduced a second resolution designed to incorporate into the Manual for Faculty Evaluation revised guidelines for obtaining external letters of assessment. G. Fox said she found it troubling that the campus is asking for 8-10 letters of endorsement. Thomas noted that the proposed wording is 8-10 letters will be solicited. Fox asked if the letters in a candidate's file could be cherry picked. Thomas noted that a log is kept documenting requests for and receipt of letters. Only if the Office of Academic Affairs gave approval could letters be removed. Fox said focusing on obtaining 100% of a smaller number of evaluations would be a better strategy. She noted that as a senior faculty member she receives a great many such requests for evaluation. She did not offer an amendment as she had not raised her concerns prior to the meeting, but she would not vote for the resolution.

B. Jones referred to letters solicited in c, specifically asking if solicitation could be via email or mail. He was informed there had to be a letter, although another communication means might be used first. He then asked who constituted the "departmental faculty." Thomas said they were whoever the bylaws specified was eligible to vote on a decision. T. Wang asked if there was any provision that indicated the solicited letters had to be taken seriously. She said she had some questions having been on the Appeals Committee. She asked whether it was set up for the evaluation letters to be taken seriously or to be cast aside. Was there any protection? Thomas said the letters received became part of the dossier that is sent up the chain of command. T. Wang said her concern was that the letters be treated as reliable sources of information. Heminway reminded Thomas that departmental bylaws should address letters. Jones noted that c talked about letters received rather than the solicitation of letters. Thomas asked Jones his view. Jones proposed requiring formal letters. Thomas said that stipulation could be inserted in part b. Jones moved that letters should be solicited via mail. J. Lounsbury seconded. Thompson said email was an easy way to solicit letters and quickly learn if a proposed evaluator were willing. C. Myers asked why Jones wanted letters. Jones replied that letters made it official. T. Wang asked whether email could also be involved. Boulet replied that she was clarifying whether it would be acceptable to solicit via email, if the email were followed by a mailed letter. Thomas summarized: an initial contact by email followed by a letter. Jones and Lounsbury agreed to that friendly amendment. Thompson said with that

procedure you would send the packet of materials for review with a formal letter to those who agreed to be evaluators. Thomas stated the proposal as: 8-10 evaluators would be solicited and anyone who agreed to write an evaluation would be sent a formal letter with accompanying documentation. Jones and Lounsbury agreed to this statement of the motion. C. Plaut said the motion treaded on departmental bylaws and did not serve any purpose. L. Craig said PDFs could be sent as a way of addressing the number of letters. Motion failed.

G. Pighetti said 5 was too many to have as a minimum, as a 50% response rate was hard to obtain. She moved a three person minimum, so instead of reading "no fewer than 5" it would read "no fewer than 3." Lounsbury seconded. N. Hristov asked whether the proposed change would be acceptable to the Provost. Martin said the Provost's Office initiated the proposal. At a minimum five letters are needed to get a better view. If one letter were negative it would be hard to balance it out if there were only two others. A more balanced view is obtained with more letters. Hristov asked whether the resolution would be binding, if it were accepted. Martin said it had been in place for several years. Martin was then asked if she thought the procedures had been successful and she said in her opinion it had. P. Wang pointed out that the word "normally" preceded the words "include no fewer than five." Martin said then it would not be a problem. She indicated the goal in asking for eight to ten was to obtain five. M. Sims said from the perspective of a person being reviewed the policy better serves them. Lounsbury asked why, if you could get five, should you have to ask for 8 to 10. Why not establish the burden as obtaining 5 rather than solicitation of 8 to 10. Martin said in the experience of the campus administration it took that many requests. Motion failed.

Discussion of the original resolution resumed. D. Birdwell said he was bothered by the 8-10 requirement, as that type of instruction should be in a document providing guidance to department heads. Birdwell moved to delete the whole bullet referring to 8-10. Wang seconded. They both accepted a friendly amendment to simply delete "8-10 letters." Martin said the concern was that without some number being specified that not enough letters would be obtained. Very few dossiers are submitted with 8-10 letters of evaluation. She also noted that requesting 8-10 meant that both the candidate's and the department head's proposed evaluations could easily be used. N. Mertz said it was helpful to say 8-10, but couldn't it just be helpful instruction. L. Parker noted it said "will *normally* solicit 8-10 letters," so it was not a requirement. Another possible problem that was raised pertained to small fields. If 10 people reviewed a person for promotion and tenure, there would not be someone new available to evaluate the person later for promotion to full. T. Paulus said having the statement in the "Manual for Faculty Evaluation" was helpful in establishing transparency for the candidate. A friendly amendment to add "normally" was accepted by the motion makers (Birdwell and Wang). T. Wang said it addressed solicited letters. She wondered about solicited and unsolicited letters being added to dossiers. Thomas said that was not pertinent to the motion on the floor. Jones said there was language addressing insertions. Motion approved.

Birdwell said he had another amendment based on his Appeals Committee experience. He thought both copies (fax or email and mailed) needed to be included in the dossier. Wang seconded. P. Crilly asked why would there be a difference. Birdwell said emailed letters sometimes vary from formal letters and thus potentially constitute two different documents. Crilly said he agreed with the intent of the motion, but asked why a discrepancy might occur. Thomas said the issue was not "why." M. Breinig said the document currently does not say anything about whether they are different. Birdwell confirmed that even if they were not

different both copies should be included. Thomas suggested: "if...is received *also both would be retained.*" The next sentence would be deleted. Motion approved.

Birdwell said he had another question about AAU universities and peer universities. He asked whether there should be a statement establishing it as a "peer or better." Boulet asked if the Provost's Office had a view on the topic. He proposed that criterion of "peer or better" be pursued through the Provost's Office and the Faculty Affairs Committee. Thomas said he wanted to proceed because such a referral would be moot, if the motion failed. A friendly amendment was made to have it sent back to the Faculty Affairs Committee to consider the AAU institution designation. It was declared a substitute motion. The motion failed: 11 for and 41 against.

T. Wang asked what did the requirement mean, e.g., were those not employed at AAU institutions perceived as less credible. Thomas said it did not mean that but rather addressed whose judgment was seen as best. J. Koontz commented that the most qualified evaluator might not be at a peer or better institution.

Main motion passed with the amendment to Part IV. B.4.c.

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.

## **REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

### Faculty Affairs Committee (S. Thomas)

Thomas presented for first reading three resolutions. The first involved adopting a set of best practices for non-tenure track teaching faculty distributed with the meeting agenda. If adopted the best practices would be an appendix to the "Manual for Faculty Evaluation." The second

resolution proposed the addition of the position "senior lecturer" to the "Manual for Faculty Evaluation." The third resolution provides a definition of "senior lecturer" with reference to "lecturer" and "distinguished lecturer."

#### Undergraduate Council (D. Thompson)

Thompson discussed actions taken at the February meeting. The Policy Committee approved a statement on advising for students with fewer than 30 hours. An additional Engineering program was approved for a five-year BS/MS program. Additional specification on course attendance for students called to military service was approved. Credits earned to remove a high school deficiency will now count as hours toward graduation. The Curriculum Committee approved changes and additions. The General Education Committee added courses and developed a new statement addressing transferability for those receiving Associates degrees from state institutions. D. Bruce moved and P. Crilly seconded. Minutes approved.

#### Graduate Council (V. Anfara)

V. Anfara reported on the February 4, 2010, meeting. The Appeals Committee had 4 appeals pending. The Credentials Committee is explicating doctoral directive status expectations. The revision addresses a limited number of years of approval for non-tenure track faculty. Some curricular changes were made related to BANNER. B. Fenwick discussed responsible conduct of research and raised the question of whether graduate students should go through training for conducting responsible research. A special committee approved awarding an honorary degree to former Vice President Gore.

T. Wang asked with reference to B. Fenwick's document whether there was an equivalent document on responsible conduct as a teacher. Anfara deferred to K. Reed. Reed said there was not. T. Wang said she was concerned about the male-dominated College of Engineering, i.e., concerned about inappropriate behavior, particularly sexual harassment. Reed said they have a regular program for teaching assistants. T. Wang said her concern was about having clear examples. Anfara said he would take her concerns back to the Graduate Council. Motion to approve the minutes made, seconded and passed.

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

T. Boulet reminded everyone to vote. J. Heminway said ballots would be mailed out soon and there would be about a week to vote. She said as there was one candidate for President-elect; Senators could vote for him or submit another name.

The candidate for President-elect, Vince Anfara, was introduced and briefly expanded on his written statement noting, for example, that he had chaired the Graduate Council for two years. Birdwell asked him how well the duties of Senate President and Department Head would mesh. Anfara said he did not foresee any problem with the time commitment, as he has had a substantial one with Graduate Council.

The position statements for the two candidates for the University of Tennessee Faculty Council (UTFC) were distributed with the agenda. India Lane and David Patterson each gave brief presentations.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

D. Atkins reported he had distributed via e-mail a resolution concerning requirements to be President of the University of Tennessee in response to the state legislature engaging in codifying minimum requirements for higher education leadership. After he distributed the resolution, he changed it. As the legislature had not passed any legislation, the resolution did not need to address a particular piece of legislation. Birdwell seconded the motion. C. Myers asked whether it should be President Boulet or "the President of the Faculty Senate agreed." The mover and seconded agreed to the substitution. Motion passed.

*Original Resolution:* Proposed Resolution Supporting the UT Board of Trustees Current Process for Selecting UT System President and UTK Chancellor

Whereas UTK faculty are governed by the UT System President and UTK Chancellor and provide advice in the selection of both, and

Whereas the UTK Faculty Senate holds that requirements for the UT President and UTK chancellor should be set, not by the legislature, but by the Board of Trustees in consultation with faculty and administrators, and that an advanced academic degree is an appropriate qualification for both the UT President and UTK chancellor.

Be it therefore resolved that: the Faculty Senate directs President Boulet to communicate to the legislature, strategically and at his discretion, the UTK Faculty Senate's disapproval of any bills which attempt to set specific qualifications for the UT Presidency or Chancellorship.

*Amended Resolution:* Resolution Supporting the UT Board of Trustees Current Process for Selecting UT System President and UTK Chancellor

Whereas UTK faculty are governed by the UT System President and UTK Chancellor and provide advice in the selection of both, and

Whereas the UTK Faculty Senate holds that requirements for the UT President and UTK chancellor should be set, not by the legislature, but by the Board of Trustees in consultation with faculty and administrators, and that an advanced academic degree is an appropriate qualification for both the UT President and UTK chancellor.

Be it therefore resolved that: the Faculty Senate directs the President of the Senate to communicate to the legislature, strategically and at his or her discretion, the UTK Faculty Senate's disapproval of any bills which attempt to set specific qualifications for the UT Presidency or Chancellorship.

S. Thomas made and C. Cochran seconded a motion to adjourn. Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne B. Kurth, Secretary

Faculty Senate Executive Council  
MINUTES  
March 15, 2010

Present: Vince Anfara, Doug Birdwell, Toby Boulet, Jimmy Cheek, Rob Heller, Joan Heminway, Laura Howes, Suzanne Kurth, Beauvais Lyons, Susan Martin, John Nolt, Stefanie Ohnesorg, Ken Stephenson, and Steve Thomas

Guests: Ed Cortez (facilitator for VOL Vision discussion), John Koontz (for Dixie Thompson), Scott Simmons (Graduate Assistant)

### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

T. Boulet called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

### **II. REVIEW OF MINUTES**

A motion to approve the minutes of the February 15, 2010, meeting was made by S. Thomas and seconded by V. Anfara. Minutes approved.

### **III. REPORTS**

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

T. Boulet's report had been distributed with the meeting agenda. He said since then he had received a call from Coach Dooley indicating he would like an opportunity to engage in dialogue with the faculty in the fall. Boulet asked for opinions about whether such a meeting should be with the Executive Council, the Athletics Committee, or the Senate as a whole. He and R. Heller agreed to work on a plan.

#### Chancellor's Report (J. Cheek)

A committee is already in place working on plans for achieving a top 25 ranking for UTK. Dean Burstein is chairing the committee and Boulet is a member of the committee. Cheek was pleased that the Board of Trustees (BOT) approved differential tuition for three colleges. The campus budget for the coming year would be \$12 million dollars. He noted the cut had been anticipated, but it meant total cuts in recent years would total \$52 million.

D. Birdwell asked when the cuts would take effect given the use of stimulus funds. Cheek said plans were in place to deal with \$40 million in cuts, but not the recent \$12 million. He said it was important to maintain enrollment levels or there would be more financial loss.

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

S. Martin said the good news was that Chancellor Cheek recognized that Academic Affairs could not withstand any more cuts. She said everything possible was being done to support the teaching mission. She reported that S. McMillan is trying to implement some of the ideas (e.g., about course scheduling) generated by the Academic Efficiency and Effectiveness Task Force. She noted McMillan had convened a non-tenure track faculty group. She indicated she would be forming a search committee for Architecture as Dean McRae had announced he would be resigning at the end of the next academic year.

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

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

S. Thomas said the Committee's resolution about lecturer appointments presented at the last meeting had been modified by adding the word "typically" to indicate appointments initially were typically at that level. And, a paragraph had been added indicating what to do in cases that were not typical. J. Koontz asked if salary levels were set for the positions. Thomas said they were not.

##### Nominations and Appointments (J. Heminway)

J. Heminway encouraged people to vote. She requested that candidates for Information Officer and Secretary be put forward for an electronic vote. S. Ohnesorg had agreed to be a candidate for Information Officer. Boulet pointed out the *Faculty Senate Bylaws* state appointments to both positions require Executive Council approval. At another point the *Bylaws* indicated that they should go to the Nominations and Appointments Committee. A motion to approve nominees for Information Officer and Secretary electronically was made by Birdwell, seconded and approved.

Adjournment was moved, second and approved. Meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m. for a VOL Vision discussion.

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

March 29, 2010

The schedule for the Chancellor's Top 25 task force has been set with the aim of completing a report before the next meeting of the Board of Trustees in June.

On March 15, the Executive Council held its Vol Vision discussion.

On March 18, the UT System's newly appointed Compensation Advisory Board held its first meeting. Vice President Joe DiPietro chairs the group. Provost Martin and Toby Boulet are also among the members. The group is charged with reviewing and making recommendations regarding all aspects of compensation to employees of the UT System.

John Nolt has been appointed as the UT System's faculty representative on the Master Plan Steering Committee for Tennessee's 2010-2015 plan for higher education, a committee of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC). This committee will decide how to implement the Complete College Tennessee Act of 2010. Section 4 of the act requires that THEC "shall consider the views of chief academic officers and faculty senates of the respective campuses." The first meeting of the Steering Committee will be on April 9. That evening, Dr. Rich Rhoda, Executive Director of THEC, will speak to Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS) and TUFS will have an opportunity to learn about the plan and provide initial feedback.

On April 9-11, TUFS will hold its annual meeting at MTSU. John Nolt, current President of TUFS, and the UTK Faculty Senate President will attend. The meeting will focus on the Complete College Tennessee Act of 2010.



## Summary of Resolutions from the Faculty Affairs Committee

### **Resolution 1: 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 2: Definition of Non-Tenure Track Teaching Faculty Ranks of Senior Lecturer**

Purpose: As recommended in the NNTF best practices report, 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 lecturer to lecturer and distinguished lecturer.

### **Resolution 3: Terms of Appointment for Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

Purpose: 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 29, 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 Statements 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 29, 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 these two paragraphs. Typically, 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 letters of appointment.

In unusual circumstances, the department head, with the prior permission of the dean and the chief academic officer, may recommend to the Office of the Chancellor or Vice President initial appointment at a rank of senior lecturer or

distinguished lecturer. In such cases, initial appointment may be for a period of up to three years for a senior lecturer or up to five years for a distinguished lecturer.

- 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 29, 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 “Distinguished 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.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE  
KNOXVILLE

**FACULTY SENATE AGENDA  
MARCH 29, 2010, 3:30 P.M.  
UNIVERSITY CENTER  
SHILOH ROOM  
President's Office: 607 Dougherty Engineering Building  
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-2210 (865) 974-8376**