

Remaining Portion of the Manual for Faculty Evaluation

**The University of Tennessee, Knoxville
2019**



**Office of the Provost
and
Senior Vice Chancellor**

Table of Contents

Manual for Faculty Evaluation

Part VI – Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Teaching Faculty	
A. Lecturer Promotion Process	1
Appendix A - Forms.....	5
Faculty External Compensation and Consulting Annual Report Form.....	6
Form A – Consulting Engagement Report	7
Appendix B – Promotion & Tenure Dossier Forms & Examples	8
Summary Sheet Form: Recommendations for Promotion and/or Tenure.....	9
Educational History and Employment History Example	10
Certification of Competence to Communicate in English Form	11
SAIS Teaching Evaluation Summary Table Example	12
TN Voice Teaching Evaluation Summary Table Example	13
Candidate Signature Statement Form	14
Letter to External Evaluators Example	15
Log of External Letters of Assessment Example	16
Method of Selection of External Evaluators Example.....	17
Qualifications of External Evaluators.....	18
Master Checklist for Tenure Review	19

Please note that Part VI is currently undergoing revision.

PART VI: PROMOTION OF NON-TENURE TRACK TEACHING FACULTY

A. LECTURER PROMOTION PROCESS

A lecturer is eligible for promotion to senior lecturer typically after a minimum of five years of regular (full-time) service at the rank of lecturer. A senior lecturer is eligible for promotion to distinguished lecturer typically after three to five years of regular (full-time) service at the rank of senior lecturer.

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

2. Criteria for Promotion to Lecturer Ranks. The principal criterion for promotion is excellence in teaching; however, research and/or service may be considered when recommending a lecturer for promotion. Even in cases where there is evidence of excellence in research and / or service, excellence in teaching will remain the principal criterion for evaluation of instructional faculty.

a. **Promotion to Senior Lecturer:** After serving at the rank of lecturer, typically for a minimum of five years, a lecturer who has satisfied the following criteria may apply for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer:

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

- ii. Professional development, as evidenced by appropriate activities in support of the expected instructional practices listed in Section VI.A.1., above;
- iii. Evidence notable contributions to the university’s instructional mission, within the faculty member’s assigned role.

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

- i. Evidence of consistent excellence in teaching, typically of undergraduate courses, as documented by student evaluations, peer evaluations, annual supervisor / departmental evaluations;
- ii. Continuing professional development, including some or all of the following activities: attendance at campus, regional, national, or international meetings directed at improving instruction; development of new courses and / or revision of existing courses; incorporation of innovative course materials or instructional techniques; scholarly or creative work in the scholarship of teaching as well as in the discipline; awards or other recognition for teaching;
- iii. Evidence of outstanding contributions to the university’s instructional mission, within the faculty member’s assigned role.
- iv. Evidence of institutional or disciplinary service, within the faculty member’s assigned role, such as advising and mentoring undergraduate students, supervising GTAs, course coordination, or other forms of institutional service, such as serving on committees

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

a. **Departmental Level Review and Recommendation.** The faculty member and department head or designee should discuss promotion as part of the annual performance review, well in advance of the suggested dates for submission of the application for promotion in order to give the candidate sufficient time to gather the required materials and assemble the dossier.

- i. The promotion process begins when a dossier is submitted for consideration for promotion to senior or distinguished lecturer. According

to the *Faculty Handbook*, “A departmentally designated group of faculty will review and evaluate appointments to the rank of senior [and distinguished] lecturer, in accordance with departmental and college bylaws” (4.2.1.). Typically, all tenure-track and tenured faculty members are eligible to be members of this group, as are non-tenure-track instructional faculty who hold higher rank than the candidate, unless otherwise specified by college or departmental bylaws. They shall review the candidacy and record a vote in favor or against promotion by majority vote (unless some other voting mechanism is established by college or departmental bylaws). The vote of the departmentally designated faculty group is advisory to the department head or his/her designee.

ii. After making an independent judgment on the promotion candidacy, the department head shall either insert a positive written recommendation in the dossier and advance it to the next level of review or, notify the candidate in writing that the department declines to recommend promotion.

iii. Candidates not recommended for promotion by their departments may appeal that decision to the next level. If a candidate chooses not to appeal, the application is considered to be withdrawn and the promotion process ends. (See Section VI.A.5. below.)

b. **College Level Review and Recommendation.** The dean may establish a college-wide committee for review and recommendation regarding promotion of non-tenure-track faculty. The recommendation of any college-wide committee shall be advisory to the dean. After making an independent judgment on the promotion candidacy, the dean shall either insert a positive written recommendation in the dossier and advance it to the next level of review or, notify the candidate in writing that the college declines to recommend promotion. Candidates not recommended for promotion by their colleges may appeal that decision to the chief academic officer. If a candidate chooses not to appeal, the application is considered to be withdrawn and the promotion process ends. (See Section VI.A.5. below.)

c. **Campus Level Review and Final Promotion Decision.** The chief academic officer reviews recommendations forwarded by the dean and serves as the final decision maker regarding promotion to senior/distinguished lecturer. The chief academic officer will notify successful and unsuccessful candidates in writing of his/her decision regarding promotion. Candidates not recommended for promotion by the chief academic officer may appeal to the Chancellor.

4. **Contents of the Dossier.** A cover sheet that records the decisions at the various levels of review must accompany the dossier. Candidates for promotion must provide a complete *curriculum vitae* and assemble a dossier in advance of the process. The candidate will work with the department head or designee to assemble a promotion dossier according to the guidelines listed below. This dossier must describe the responsibilities assigned to the lecturer/senior lecturer and must include an appropriate

subset of the following materials. The dossier, excluding the cover sheet and the candidate's *curriculum vitae*, should not exceed 50 pages.

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

- i. A complete *curriculum vitae**
- ii. Statement of teaching philosophy and professional goals*
- iii. A summary of student evaluations and grade distributions (listed in chronological order, earliest to most recent) consisting of a table of responses to the first four questions from the SAIS from all classes taught during the five years prior to the date of the application for promotion and a table of final grade distributions from all classes taught during the five years prior to the date of the application for promotion.*
- iv. Evidence of teaching excellence such as:
 - Narrative comments from student evaluations (**Note:** If a candidate submits narrative comments, all comments received during the review period shall be provided to the department head or designee, who will make a selection that includes both “best liked” and “least liked” qualities. The selection should be broadly representative of the entire body of student comments.);
 - a list of honors and awards for teaching, advising, and mentoring; a representative syllabus, ideally from the most recent instances of the candidate's most frequently taught courses;
 - evidence of course or curricular development; evidence of pedagogical innovation;
 - an account of supervision of undergraduate research;
 - a description of mentoring or coordinating GTAs for large-enrolling, multi-section classes;
 - a description of participation in teaching workshops or pedagogical training.
- v. Evidence of excellence in contributing to the university's instructional mission such as:
 - administrative responsibilities within the program or unit;
 - program or course-coordination across multiple sections;
 - support for extra-curricular student organizations and activities;
 - participation in the unit's governance activities and committees;

- professional outreach activities in the campus, community, or discipline;
- other evidence of professional excellence.

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

- i. Description of the candidate's responsibilities,*
- ii. Copies of annual evaluations during the review period (since the last promotion or for the last five years, as applicable),*
- iii. Copies of at least two separate peer/faculty evaluations of instruction during the review period for promotion to senior lecturer. For promotion to distinguished lecturer, one peer/faculty evaluation performed after promotion to senior lecturer is required,*
- iv. Any other annual evaluations.

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

- a. Candidates will be notified upon completion of review at each level (department, college, campus).
- b. A candidate whose application for promotion is denied will be provided a written explanation of the grounds for the denial at the time of notification.
- c. A promotion application that is not approved will not be forwarded to the next level of review unless the candidate submits a written appeal to the next level within ten working days of the date of the written notification of a negative promotion decision. The appeal must make an explicit request for further review of the application and give reasons for that request.
- d. A candidate has a right to submit a written response to each level of review, whether the recommendation is positive or negative. The candidate must submit any response within ten working days of notification. The response will be inserted in the dossier.
- e. Candidates not recommended for promotion must wait one academic year before re-applying.

APPENDIX A:

**FACULTY EXTERNAL COMPENSATION AND CONSULTING
ANNUAL REPORT FORM**

FORM A – CONSULTING ENGAGEMENT REPORT

Form A – Consulting Engagement Report

The information below is supplied to the extent available and to the extent the information below can be provided consistent with professional and contractual obligations of confidentiality.

1. Names and addresses of firms, agencies or individuals: _____

2. Nature of work: _____

3. Basis for engaging in consulting, if applicable (discuss remuneration, value to UT, professional enhancement):

4. Period of activity: _____ through _____
Date Date

5. Equity ownership involved? _____ If so, the amount and type of equity interest owned:

APPENDIX B:

SAMPLE FORMS, LETTERS, AND TABLES TO BE INCLUDED IN THE TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION DOSSIER

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)

Educational History and Employment History Example

Candidate Name: Jane/John Doe

Educational History (List most recent degree first)

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Program or Degree</u>	<u>Dates in Program</u>	<u>Degree</u>
University of California, Berkeley	Ph.D. History	1980 – 1985	Ph.D.
University of Michigan	B.A. History	1976 – 1980	B.A.

Employment History (List current appointment first)

<u>Ranks Held</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>Effective Date of Rank</u>
Associate Professor	University of Tennessee	History	1994- present
Assistant Professor	University of Tennessee	History	1987 - 1994
Lecturer	University of Arizona	History	1985 - 1987

Certification of Competence to Communicate in English

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE, ENGLISH COMPETENCY FORM

I have sufficient evidence to affirm that _____,

who has been recommended to a teaching position in the Department/Unit of

at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, is competent in communicating in the English
Language.

Department/Unit Head

Date

SAIS TEACHING EVALUATION SUMMARY¹

Example

SEM/YEAR	COURSE	# STUDENTS	RANKING				
			COURSE OVERALL	COURSE CONTENT	INSTRUCTOR CONTRIBUTION	TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS	# ADVISEES
FALL/07	SSE 419(4)	12	4.4	4.1	4.6	3.7	15 UG 5 G
	ED 401(3)	57	4.4	4.1	4.6	4.9	
	ED 401(3)	53	3.2	4.4	4.1	3.9	
	SSE 593(3)	2					
SPRING/08	ED 401(3)	59	4.4	4.1	3.4	3.7	15 UG 4 G
	ED 401(3)	42	3.2	4.1	4.6	4.9	
	SSE 422(3)	6	4.4	4.4	4.1	3.9	
	SSE 523(3)	3					
	SSE 593(3)	1					
FALL/08	ED 401(3)	46	4.4	4.1	4.2	3.7	15 UG 4 G
	SSE 419(4)	7	3.2	4.4	4.5	4.9	
SPRING/09	ED 401(3)	50	4.5	4.6	3.2	3.7	25 UG 5 G
	ED 401(3)	50	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.9	
	SSE 416(3)	9	4.3	3.1	3.1	3.9	
	SSE 523(3)	2					
FALL/10	FYS 101(2)	18	3.2	4.5	4.6	3.7	25 UG 5 G
	SSE 419(4)	10	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.9	
	ED 401(3)	26	4.2	4.3	3.1	3.9	
	ED 574(2)	1					
	ED 575(4)	1					
	SSE 500(3)	1					

¹ Range 5-0: 5=excellent, 0=very poor

TN VOICE TEACHING EVALUATION SUMMARY¹

Example

Details														
Term	Year	Subject Code	Course #	Section #	# of Students	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	# Advisees
Fall	2016	SSE	419	4	12	4.4	4.2	4.3	1.2	3.9	2.1	3.7	1.5	15UG
		ED	401	3	57	4.4	4.1	4.2	3.5	4.2	3.7	4.2	2.5	5G
		ED	401	3	53	3.2	4.2	4.1	2.7	4.2	3.5	4.1	4.5	
		SSE	593	3	2	N/A								

Candidate Signature Statement

I hereby attest that I have examined for accuracy the factual and informational parts of my dossier (excluding the external letters of assessment).

Candidate Signature

Date

Letter to External Evaluators for Tenure and/or Promotion Decisions

This letter may be adapted for tenure or promotion decisions as appropriate.

EXAMPLE

Dear _____:

Dr. _____, (rank), is being considered for tenure and promotion to associate professor this year at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. I would very much appreciate your assessment of Dr. _____'s professional performance.

University policy mandates that I seek evaluations of a candidate from professionals who are qualified to judge the candidate's research/creative achievement, scholarly qualities, career development, and contributions to the discipline. Of particular value would be a frank appraisal of: (1) his/her research abilities and creative achievements, including papers given at scholarly meetings; (2) the quality of his/her publications or other creative work; (3) his/her reputation or standing in the field; (4) his/her potential for further growth and achievement; (5) and whether he/she would be ranked among the most capable and promising scholars in his/her area. It would also be particularly helpful to us in our deliberations if you could rate Dr. _____'s contributions in comparison with others you have known at the same stage of professional development. A copy of his/her *curriculum vitae* and a sample of pertinent publications, and the departmental and collegiate statements of criteria and expectations for tenure and/or promotion are included. Please also describe the nature of your association with Dr. _____.

We are aware of the imposition that this inquiry provides; however, we assure you that guidance from scholars like you is vital to our decision-making process. An early report would be most appreciated as we do hope to have all letters in the file by November 1, _____. You should be aware that the State of Tennessee has a Freedom of Information Law, and therefore, we are unable to guarantee that the candidate will not request to see your letter. However, your letter is not provided to the candidate unless the candidate specifically requests it in writing. Thank you for your assistance in this matter which is of such great importance to us.

Sincerely,

**Log of External Letters of Assessment
Example**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Request</u>	<u>Date of Receipt</u>	<u>Date of Entry into Dossier</u>
Professor Rosemarie Tong Davidson College	phone 7/23/99 letter 8/1/99	9/15/99	9/20/99
Professor Howard Brody Michigan State University	phone 7/23/99 letter 8/5/99	9/20/99	9/22/99
Professor Mary Mahowald University of Chicago	email 8/2/99 letter 8/5/99	9/30/99	10/1/99
Professor James F. Childress University of Virginia	phone 9/15/99 letter 9/20/99	9/27/99	10/2/99
Professor Thomas Akerman University of Kentucky	email 8/5/99 letter 8/10/99 email 9/1/99	not received	

Method of Selection of External Evaluators

Example

The department solicited evaluations of Professor Hindle's scholarship from five scholars in the field of biomedical ethics. All of these scholars are highly respected in Professor Hindle's area of specialization and have published numerous books and journal articles in the area. They were asked to evaluate several of Professor Hindle's journal articles and his recent monograph. Four of the five scholars responded. They are Professor Rosemarie Tong (Davidson College), Professor Howard Brody (Michigan State University), Professor Mary Mahowald (University of Chicago) and Professor James F. Childress (University of Virginia).

Two of the scholars who responded (Tong and Brody) were selected from a list compiled by the department head in consultation with departmental faculty. The other two responses were from scholars selected from a list of possible reviewers provided by the candidate.

Qualifications of External Evaluators

Example

Rosemarie Tong, Ph.D., is Professor in Medical Humanities and Philosophy at Davidson College, and has been Visiting Professor in 1993 at Lafayette College. She is the author of ten books in feminist bioethics, and has published over sixty articles in refereed journals. She has reviewed numerous books for a variety of journals, and is the editor of Rowan & Littlefield's New Feminist Perspectives series, which includes thirteen renowned volumes in contemporary feminist ethics, epistemology and bioethics. She is the series editor of Point/Counterpoint volumes of Political Correctness, Assisted Suicide, and Gun Control. She is on the editorial boards of seven major journals, and has consulted for hospitals, State Departments of Human Resources, and the National Research Council.

Howard Brody, M.D., Ph.D., is Professor of Family Practice and Philosophy, and Director of the Center for Ethics and Humanities in the Life Sciences at Michigan State University. He is a board certified family practice M.D. as well as a Professor of Philosophy. He is the author of four books, twenty-four book chapters, and has published over forty-five articles in national and international refereed journals. He is one of the patriarchs of medical ethics in the U.S.

Mary Mahowald, Ph.D., is Professor in the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology at the University of Chicago and is also Assistant Director of the MacLean Center for Clinical Medical Ethics at the University of Chicago. She is the author of two books and the editor of three more. She is also the author of two textbooks and over seventy-five articles in excellent refereed journals. She is one of the most highly respected ethicists of her generation.

James F. Childress, Ph.D., is Professor in the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Virginia. He is the author of numerous books and articles in biomedical ethics. Dr. Childress is one of the lions of the field, and one of the most visible and public of all philosophically-trained medical ethicists in the country.

MASTER CHECKLIST FOR TENURE REVIEW

	SUBMISSION RESPONSIBILITY		SUBMISSION REVIEW			
	CANDIDATE	ADMIN	DEPT FACULTY REVIEW	OUTSIDE EVALUATOR	COLLEGE REVIEW	CAO REVIEW
MASTER CHECKLIST OF TENURE REVIEW ITEMS						
CURRICULUM VITAE	X		YES	YES	YES	YES
ANNUAL REVIEWS		X	YES	NO	YES	YES
TEACHING						
CANDIDATE'S STATEMENT	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
LIST OF COURSES	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
STUDENT EVALUATIONS	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
PEER REVIEW		X	YES	NO	YES	YES
FACULTY/OTHER INPUT	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
HONORS AWARD	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
STUDENT SUPERVISION AND COMMITTEE WORK	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
SELECTED WORK RELATED TO TEACHING: SYLLABI, COURSE MATERIALS, STUDENT WORK,	OPTIONAL		OPTIONAL	NO	OPTIONAL- MAY REQUEST	NO
RESEARCH, CREATIVE WORK, SCHOLARSHIP						
CANDIDATE STATEMENT	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
ALL FACTUAL INFORMATION	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
ADDITION OF FACTUAL INFO	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
SELECTED PUBLICATIONS, VIDEOS, RECORDINGS, AND OTHER EXAMPLES OF RESEARCH AND CREATIVE WORK	X		YES	RECOMMENDED- SELECT ITEMS DETERMINED BY CANDIDATE	YES	NO
SERVICE						
UNIVERSITY SERVICE RECORD	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
PUBLIC SERVICE RECORD	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
PROFESSIONAL SERVICE RECORD	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
EVALUATIVE STATEMENTS FROM APPROPRIATE INDIVIDUALS	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
OTHER INPUT						
EXTERNAL LETTERS		X	YES	NO	YES	YES
LOG OF EXTERNAL LETTERS		X	YES	NO	YES	YES
SELECTION OF REVIEWERS		X	YES	NO	YES	YES

QUALIFICATIONS OF REVIEWERS		X	YES	NO	YES	YES
STATEMENTS OF EVALUATION						
DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE		X	YES	NO	YES	YES
DEPARTMENT HEAD		X	YES	NO	YES	YES
COLLEGE COMMITTEE		X	NO	NO	-	YES
DEAN		X	NO	NO	NO	YES
PROVOST		X	NO	NO	NO	-
CHANCELLOR		X	NO	NO	NO	-