

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND POLICY STUDIES

Adopted: May 8, 2008

Appendix A, Adopted: August 18, 2008

DEPARTMENTAL BYLAWS

The Bylaws of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies (ELPS) are organized by topics related to Department Mission and Programs; Organization and Governance; Faculty Rights and Responsibilities; Faculty Appointment and Evaluation; Non-Tenure Track Faculty Appointment and Evaluation; Faculty Benefits, Leaves of Absence and Emeritus/Emerita Status; and Compensation for Outside Activities.

Any bylaw of the Department may be modified by simple majority vote of the faculty of the department, with exceptions as follow. For sections reflecting tenure and promotion as well as evaluation of tenured faculty, and approval to direct dissertations and teach 600 level courses, only tenured faculty senior to the faculty member under consideration may vote or, in the case of full professors, other full professors who are also tenured. For all other sections, non-tenured faculty may vote. Decisions to modify a bylaw must take place at a departmental faculty meeting.

ARTICLE ONE – DEPARTMENT MISSION AND PROGRAMS

1.1 Vision: The Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies seeks to excel in preparing effective leaders for schools and colleges, researchers and policy scholars in state, regional, and national agencies involved in the study of major educational policy issues, educational leaders for active participation in policy dialogue affecting the purpose and performance of schools and colleges, and future educational leadership faculty in institutions of higher education.

1.2 Values: The effectiveness of leaders at any level and in any setting turns on competence and conscience. Technical knowledge and skill are placed in action at the service of core values, which are premier design instruments for organizational cultures and climates. Honoring these core values promotes leadership effectiveness. Neglecting these values takes clients and organizations in harm's way and diminishes the promise and performance of those who give voice and meaning to educational organizations. The core values which are embedded in all components of the work of the Educational leadership and Policy Studies Department include:

Civility - Affirming the power of human dignity and diversity

Candor - Respecting the power of public forum and the role of dissent and debate

Courage - Acting on conviction and linking belief to action

Responsibility - Accepting care for one's actions and decisions

Compassion - Caring for person and principle and hold high expectations

Community - Respecting diversity while developing and agenda of common caring

Persistence - Accenting long range goals and staying the course in face of hardship

Service - Placing the welfare and promise of others before self

Excellence - Calling individuals and organizations to high standards of performance

Justice - Insuring equity in opportunity and recognition

1.3 Mission: The mission of the ELPS Department is to prepare entry and executive level administrators for schools and colleges, faculty in colleges and universities, and policy scholars to serve in state, regional and national policy agencies associated with educational and human service enterprise. The graduate programs of the department are designed to enrich knowledge, skills, and values requisite to effective leadership and to effective teaching and research in educational settings.

The Department views leaders as stewards and servants of organizations; designers of the social and cultural climate in which they work; teachers who facilitate and encourage human growth and development; change agents who continually examine the purpose and performance of their organizations, and conceptual provocateurs who challenge ideas and assumptions on which policy and practice are build.

1.4 Organization and Programs. The Department offers two program tracks, one centering on leadership in school settings and one centering on leadership in college, university and policy organization settings. The department offers these programs:

Educational Administration

PreK-12 Licensure Certificate in Educational Administration

Master of Science in Educational Administration

Education Specialist in Educational Administration

Doctor of Philosophy in Education with a concentration in Educational Administration

Higher Education Administration

Master of Science in College Student Personnel

Doctor of Philosophy in Higher Education Administration

ARTICLE TWO – EFFECTIVE DEPARTMENT GOVERNANCE

2.1 Shared Governance. The Department operates in the spirit of shared governance, building upon principles contained in the Faculty Handbook (see Section 1.5). The effective articulation of the responsibilities of the Department Head and the responsibilities of the faculty are enhanced when the values previously articulated are honored (candor, civility, etc.).

2.2 Decision-making. Decision making by Department members occurs through consensus when possible and by voting if necessary. When consensus is not possible, *Robert's Rules of Order* will guide the decision and deliberation process. When voting is necessary, decisions are made by a simple majority vote of those present. The Department may not conduct business or make decisions without a quorum present. Any member of the department may call for a vote. A member of the department who cannot attend may send a written proxy vote. The decision to vote and type of vote will be determined by those eligible to vote. In some instances (especially those reflecting policy laid out in the *Faculty Handbook*, e.g., promotion and tenure of faculty members and evaluation of tenured faculty) only tenured faculty may make decisions regarding those at a lower rank

2.3 Departmental Meetings. The Department holds at least two meetings during the academic year (i.e., fall and spring semesters). Other meetings take place as needed and or called by the Department Head or a majority petition of the faculty. The agenda for each Department meeting will be initially framed by the Department Head after requesting agenda items from the faculty. The faculty approves the agenda for each meeting. Revisions to the agenda may be made by consensus or majority vote.

2.4 Administrative Structure. The Department is a unit of the College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences. An Academic Dean serves as the chief academic officer of the College. The Department Head is defined in the *Faculty Handbook* as a member of the faculty who is assigned the special duty of administering the Department (Excerpt from *Faculty Handbook*, Section 1.4.2).

Program Area Coordinators (PACs) provide overall management of a particular program area including student recruitment, admissions process, curriculum, scheduling, communication with other faculty in their area, and oversight of any graduate assistants assigned to their programs. The PAC is the primary representative of a program area in the Department to the Department Head. The Department Head selects each PAC after consultation with other faculty in the program. Selection is based on the individual's willingness to serve, knowledge of the program area, and professional affiliation. Program Area Coordinators may receive one course release per year and a minimum of ten hours a week support from a Graduate Assistant.

2.5 Department Head Responsibilities. The *Faculty Handbook* describes the following responsibilities of the Department Head as follows:

1. providing leadership for the departmental academic program in relation to the comprehensive academic program of the university
 - a. recruiting faculty and staff
 - b. working with faculty to plan, execute, and review curriculum

- c. encouraging and supporting faculty teaching, research and creative activity, and public service
 - d. counseling and advising students majoring in the discipline
 - e. representing the Department to the public, the other faculty and administration, colleagues at other universities and institutions, and the constituency supporting the university
2. providing leadership for the infrastructure necessary for support of the academic programs through
- a. employment and supervision of clerical and supporting personnel
 - b. management of departmental physical facilities and planning for space and equipment needs
 - c. resource enhancement
 - d. preparation, presentation, and management of the departmental budget
 - e. authorization of all expenditures from the department budget
3. planning annual performance and review faculty and staff (Excerpt from the *Faculty Handbook*, section 1.4.2).

2.6 Selection, Evaluation and Reappointment of the Department Head. The *Faculty Handbook* provides specific policy and procedures for faculty involvement in the selection of the Department Head. (see section 1.4.)

Reappointment is based upon annual objective and systematic evaluation provided by the department's faculty members to the Dean as well as a five-year review based upon the annual evaluations. (see the *Faculty Handbook*, section 1.4.6, *Reappointment of Department Heads* for a description of the five-year review and faculty involvement in the reappointment decision).

Annual evaluation of the Department Head involves faculty completing an evaluation form received from the Dean each spring term. Faculty members may sign the evaluation forms or choose to remain anonymous. The Dean may elect to meet with the Department faculty to seek evaluative feedback beyond the survey instrument and to share his or her evaluative perception.

2.7 Department Committees. The work of the Department will generally be conducted as a Committee of the Whole. That is, the entire faculty will be involved in deliberation on any and all matters affecting the life of the Department, with the exception of

decisions related to tenure and promotion to be later specified. There may be special occasions where ad hoc committees may be formed by the Department to meet special or time limited responsibilities. Appointment of such ad hoc committees will be at the joint discretion and approval of the Department Head and the faculty. In matters that affect program areas, work will be conducted by program faculty under the direction of the Program Area Coordinator.

ARTICLE THREE - FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

3.1 Public Forum. The Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies operates with a “sunshine” intent on all matters of program and budget. That is, all matters related to program and finance in the Department are to be available for review by the faculty in formal meetings of the department.

3.2 Curricular and Program Decisions. An important faculty responsibility involves curricular and programmatic decisions. Faculty members in each program area will develop proposals for curricular and programmatic changes according to college and university guidelines. The written proposals will be presented at a meeting of all departmental faculty members where a consensus approval or vote will be taken. If approved or after revisions agreed to at this meeting, the proposal goes forward to the appropriate college and university committees for their review.

3.3 Budget and Finance. Budget amounts and priorities proposed will be reviewed by the Department Head and faculty. Priorities for requesting funds and expending funds would be shared by the Department Head and faculty. In those cases where there is a difference of opinion between the Department Head and the faculty, the administrative role and responsibility of the head will be properly acknowledged. If the dissent is serious enough to warrant pursuit, the faculty may file such dissent with the Dean.

3.4 Faculty Responsibilities and Workload. It is expected that faculty teaching at the graduate level will be active in research and in directing student theses and/or dissertations. Ordinarily, faculty involved with doctoral instruction and supervision of dissertations would teach two three-hour course--with grants, publications, and enrollments in thesis and dissertation sections reflecting the equivalent of two other three hour instructional loads.

At the discretion of the Department Head, variations from the 12 credit hour load per semester may also be granted for significant involvement in departmental, college, institutional, public, and professional service. At the discretion of the Department Head and with full knowledge of the department faculty, some reallocation of teaching responsibility may be warranted to encourage and ensure scholarship engagement of tenure-track faculty.

Equity in faculty responsibility and workload is encouraged via the filing of annual goals as outlined in Section 4.3. The “Plan of Work” for each faculty member, when approved by the Department Head, constitutes a point of consent on the “mix” of faculty

responsibility, as previously discussed, and also serves as the basis for annual performance evaluation as detailed in that section.

3. 5. *Faculty Rights of Appeal.* Section Five of the *University Faculty Handbook* furnishes general guidance on both policy and procedure for faculty rights of appeal on any decision that affects the faculty member's welfare. These appeal procedures are designed to ensure fair, impartial, and expedited resolution of any problem that may arise related to a faculty member's conditions of employment. In addition, these department bylaws describe certain appeals processes within the department.

ARTICLE FOUR - APPOINTMENT, EVALUATION, PROMOTION, TENURE, AND ANNUAL REVIEW FOR ALL TENURE-TRACK AND TENURED FACULTY

4.1 *Appointment of New Faculty to Tenure-track Positions.* Program faculty nominate a chair for the search and potential search committee members from which the Department Head selects a search committee in consultation with the tenured and tenure-track faculty. The Department Head and faculty will ensure appropriate search committee representation in accordance with departmental bylaws and university search procedures.

The chair of the search committee ensures that all processes and university policy are followed in announcing and conducting the search. The search committee reviews and evaluates the applicant pool and identifies candidates to be considered for interviews.

The tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Department will be given opportunity to review candidate files for those invited for interviews and to participate in candidate reviews and attend candidate presentation sessions. The search committee will evaluate the candidates and make a recommendation to the Department Head. The faculty of the Department will be given a chance to review the recommendation of the search committee and hear the Department Head's response. The Department Head will then recommend a candidate to the Dean. If the Department Head's recommendation diverges from that of the faculty, the Department Head must explain his/her reasons in detail to the faculty, who have the right to meet with the Dean.

4.2 *Designation of Faculty Line.* The Department Head facilitates a discussion with faculty in a departmental meeting regarding priorities for filling new faculty lines when and if they are available and/or anticipated. Programs requesting new or replacement lines present a report at the meeting that includes relevant information. Justification for faculty lines will include a rationale for enhancing or maintaining the program; and the report should include background data on relevant factors such as enrollments, majors, credit hour production, degree production, and other related data.

While the Department Head is responsible for making the designation decision, it is expected that his/her decision will take into consideration the faculty's assessment of faculty need priorities. The Department Head also holds informal discussions in

departmental meetings with faculty concerning requests and possible opportunities for additional lines.

4.3. Annual Performance Reviews for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty. The Department Head will share with the faculty all processes and criteria to be used in the annual evaluation of the faculty (See Attachment A for the Faculty Evaluation Rubric).

Tenure-Track Faculty

Annual performance reviews for tenure-track faculty take place in the fall semester and are based on accomplishments during the academic year. Materials presented for review by the tenure-track faculty members should cover the period from the previous August up through and including summer. Materials presented for review are submitted to the Department head no later than October 31st and contain:

- a. a summary of the faculty member's accomplishments of goals from the previous year;
- b. a Teaching Philosophy and record of teaching accomplishments during the year, including syllabi, teaching evaluations, and other documents related to the quality of teaching;
- c. a statement describing and explaining one's research program and a bibliographic record of all scholarly work accomplished during the review period, including publications, presentations, report writing and grant work, and other related/creative efforts;
- d. a record of service-related activities for the review period, including University, community, and professional service;
- e. a cumulative vita;
- f. professional development goals for the upcoming year; and
- g. teaching, scholarship, and service goals for the upcoming year.

Tenured faculty from the Department will individually review the portfolios of all tenure-track faculty members and meet prior to the close of the fall semester for this review. The tenure-track faculty member's mentor will prepare a one or two page summary of performance highlights based on the portfolio and provide both an oral and written report to the faculty. The Department Head will appoint a member of the Department faculty—other than the mentor—to write a letter summarizing the discussion of the tenure-track faculty member's performance strengths and weaknesses/concerns. This summary will be shared with the tenured faculty for possible revision/editing and finally forwarded to the Department Head. A vote must be taken on retention or non-retention. This formal vote will be included in the Department head's letter of recommendation to the Dean. The Department Head will meet with each tenure-track faculty member to review his/her performance, to share the result of the retention vote, and to share the letter written by the faculty.

Tenured Faculty

Tenured faculty will submit an Annual Performance Portfolio to the Department Head. The Department Head will share with the faculty all processes and criteria to be used in his/her annual evaluation of the faculty. This portfolio will cover the calendar year (i.e.,

January through December) and will describe goals and accomplishments in each of three areas: Teaching (including advising), Research (including scholarly outreach), and Service. These portfolios are due to the Department Head by February 1st. Individual evaluation conferences will be conducted in February and March. The annual performance portfolio should contain:

- a. a summary of the faculty member's accomplishments of goals from the previous year;
- b. a record of teaching accomplishments during the year, including syllabi, teaching evaluations, and other documents related to the quality of teaching;
- c. A bibliographic record of all scholarly work accomplished during the review period, including publications, presentations, report writing and grant work, and other related/creative efforts;
- d. a record of service-related activities for the review period, including University, community, and professional service;
- e. a cumulative vita;
- f. professional development goals for the upcoming year; and
- g. teaching, scholarship, and service goals for the upcoming year.

The Department Head will review the portfolio and write an evaluative summary that includes separate ratings for each area (i.e., teaching, research, and service) and an overall rating of the faculty member's performance as exceeds expectations for rank, meets expectations for rank, needs improvement for rank, or unsatisfactory performance for rank. This document must be signed by the faculty member to acknowledge receipt (not agreement) and by the Department Head.

Sometime in the spring semester (during April/May) performance portfolios of both tenure-track and tenured faculty will be available for review by colleagues and the Department will dedicate a faculty meeting to sharing the accomplishments of faculty and the Department for the previous academic year.

If a faculty member believes that he/she has been evaluated unfairly by the Department Head, he/she may ask the Department Head to reconsider his/her evaluation. Within one week of having met with the faculty member on appeal, the Department Head must notify in writing the faculty member of his/her response to the request for reconsideration.

If the Department Head decides not to change his/her evaluation, the faculty member can either accept the Department Head's evaluation or ask for a review by the entire department faculty. If unsatisfied with the decision following this joint review, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean. The Dean will have access to the Department Head's review and recommendation, the review and recommendation of the entire department faculty, and the appeal justification of the faculty member.

Any member of the department faculty believing that the principle of equity in responsibility and workload is not being honored may place this concern before the Department Head, first informally and in writing, if desired. Any equity issue not explained or resolved to the satisfaction of any faculty member may be placed on the

departmental meeting agenda for review and discussion by the entire faculty, who share with the Department Head community responsibility for equity in faculty responsibility and workload. The hope is that any perceived equity issue can be resolved informally but that, if necessary, the candor of public dialogue among faculty colleagues will promote both equity and accountability to one another.

These guidelines on faculty workload should understandably be considered in all evaluations related to faculty productivity and performance as outlined in other sections of these bylaws.

4.4 Criteria for Promotion. The *University Faculty Handbook* carries the following criteria for promotion to the various ranks:

All who are appointed as tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to contribute to the missions of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and public service. While the general scope of performance at a particular rank is consistent across the University, the particular requirements of the varying ranks are a function of the discipline and are typically defined by the faculty of the department in which an appointment resides. The exact apportionment of effort in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service is a function of the skills of the faculty member and the needs of the department and university. All and tenure-track faculty, however, are expected to pursue and maintain excellence in research/scholarship/creative activity.

In addition to the expectations listed for each rank below, the University requires the Head to determine and attest that each person appointed to the faculty is competent in written and spoken English.

Professors are expected to:

1. hold the doctorate or other terminal degree of the discipline, or present equivalent training and experience appropriate to the particular appointment;
2. be accomplished teachers; based on evidence such as student evaluations, peer observations, and materials submitted by the faculty member in support of accomplished teaching
3. have achieved and to maintain a nationally recognized record in disciplinary research/scholarship/creative activity; based on evidence of a recognizable, sustained, and substantial scholarship agenda, including peer reviewed articles in prominent journals, publication of books and book chapters, invitations to make scholarly presentations, editing and editorial board service, invitations to review thesis and dissertations and/or serve as an external reviewer for faculty at other universities nationally or internationally, external reviewer opinions of national and/or international recognition;
4. have achieved and to maintain a record of significant institutional, disciplinary, and/or professional service; based on evidence of leadership roles in the college, university, and professional associations

5. serve as mentors to junior colleagues; based on evidence of having effectively served as a mentor to one or more junior faculty members
6. have normally served as an associate professor for at least five years; and
7. have shown beyond a doubt that they work well with colleagues and students in performing their university responsibilities; such as evidence of effective committee work with colleagues and students.

Associate Professors are expected to:

1. hold the doctorate or other terminal degree of the discipline, or to present equivalent training and experience as appropriate to the particular appointment;
2. be good teachers; based on evidence of student evaluations, peer observations, and materials submitted by the faculty member in support of good teaching;
3. have achieved and to maintain a recognized record in disciplinary research/scholarship/creative activity; based on evidence of a recognizable and sustained scholarship agenda;
4. have achieved and to maintain a record of institutional, disciplinary, and/or professional service; based on evidence of committee and task force work in the department, college, and/or university, and/or professional associations
5. have normally served as an assistant professor for at least five years; and
6. have demonstrated that they work well with colleagues and students in performing their university responsibilities, such as evidence of effective committee work with colleagues and students.

Assistant Professors are expected to:

1. hold the doctorate or other terminal degree of the discipline, or to present equivalent training and experience as appropriate to the particular appointment;
2. show promise as teachers; based on materials submitted by the faculty member in support of promise as a teacher;
3. show promise of developing a program in disciplinary research/scholarship/creative activity that is gaining external recognition; based on evidence of the ability to conduct research and produce scholarly products and a recognizable scholarship agenda;
4. have a developing record of institutional, disciplinary, and/or professional service; based on evidence of service on one or more departmental, college, and/or university committees or task forces, and/or professional associations; and
5. have demonstrated that they work well with colleagues and students in performing their university responsibilities, such as evidence of effective committee work with colleagues and students.

4.5. Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion Review. The departmental review of faculty members for tenure and/or promotion shall occur according to university policy as described in the *Faculty Handbook* and the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* (2005).

The Departmental Review Committee shall be composed as follows:

- i. When conducting the initial departmental review, only tenured faculty members make recommendations about candidates for tenure.
- ii. When conducting the initial departmental review, only faculty members of higher rank than the candidate make recommendations about promotion. (Manual for Faculty Evaluation, III. C. 2. b., p. 14)

The Departmental Review Committee reviews the dossier of the candidate prior to the review meeting. At the review meeting, the candidate's designated mentor presents an oral report on the candidate's credentials and performance, with a one page written document accompanying (with headings Teaching, Research, and Service). The review committee shall discuss the candidate and submit a confidential vote to a committee member(s) other than the mentor who shall count the votes and inform the committee of the results.

The Department Head shall attend the meeting of the review committee but refrains from participating in the discussion other than to clarify issues and assure that proper procedure is followed.

For each faculty member under review, a representative of the departmental review committee other than the faculty members serving as mentors will be chosen at the discretion of the Head to summarize faculty discussion about candidates and present written recommendations and votes on tenure, promotion, and retention to the faculty for review within three working days. The mentor then has two working days to review the letter before it is sent to faculty for final review. The letter is then forwarded to the Head and the candidate. The summary becomes part of the candidate's dossier and goes forward with all materials for review by the college tenure and promotion committee and then for review at the university level.

The Department Head conducts an independent review of the candidate's case for promotion and/or tenure (*Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, III. C. f., p. 15) The Department Head shall, within five working days, share with the candidate and the review committee a letter reporting this independent review. (Note: The manual contains further details about the Department Head's review).

Faculty members may individually and collectively submit dissenting statements to the faculty recommendation or to the department head's recommendation (*Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, III. C. g., p. 15) (Note: The manual contains further details about dissenting reports).

The faculty member may prepare a written response to the recommendation and vote of the faculty and/or to the department head's recommendation (*Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, III. C. h., p. 15). (Note: The manual contains further details about the right of the faculty member to respond).

4.6 Development of Tenure Track Faculty. The Department should provide the time, resources, and guidance to help tenure-track faculty develop recognizable, sustained, and

substantial research programs. This should include a mentor who accepts responsibility for meeting regularly (i.e., at least twice per semester) with the tenure track faculty member and for helping him/her understand how to be successful within the culture of the department, college, and university. The department should set a high priority for providing resources to all faculty members for participation in professional development activities as listed in the *Faculty Handbook* excerpt above, and including travel money for participation in conferences.

4.7 Approval to Direct Dissertations and Teach 600 Level Courses. The faculty member seeking approval to direct and/or teach 600 level courses presents materials according to college and university guidelines to his/her appointed mentor. The mentor presents written copies of these materials in a departmental meeting. The departmental faculty members review the materials and vote. Materials then go forward to the appropriate college and/or university committees.

4.8 Annual Salary Recommendation and Adjustments. For annual salary raises, the Department Head shall make recommendations to the Dean. Raise recommendations may include any university level authorization for across the board salary increases, salary increases based on merit/performance, and salary increases based on equity considerations: (1) who should receive a merit raise, and (2) the size of each merit raise.

These sources of information shall be used by the Department Head in making his/her recommendations to the Dean for merit raises:

- *. The Annual Performance Review documents submitted by faculty members to the Department Head for all years since the last merit raise opportunity
- *. The Department Head's direct contact with and observation of each faculty member in professional settings
- *. Unsolicited oral and written reports, both formal and informal, presented by constituents to the Department Head (i.e., constituents include faculty members, staff, students, alumni, members of other departments, administrators, and individuals who supervise our students).

Matters of salary are considered a public record and candor is encouraged between the Department Head and the faculty member, and with members of the department faculty on all matters related to salary increases.

Any faculty member who believes that he/she has been treated unfairly by the Department Head should follow the formal grievance procedures outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*. He or she may also exercise informal appeal before department colleagues in a meeting of the department faculty.

ARTICLE FIVE. APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATION FOR NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

5.1 Appointment of Faculty to Non-Tenure-track Positions. Each year the Department Head will work with the department faculty to review applications and select people to fill any non-tenure-track positions, as well as to evaluate performance and make decisions about continuation.

The following ranks or titles may be assigned to non-tenure-track teaching faculty: instructor, lecturer, distinguished lecturer, adjunct faculty, and visiting faculty (*Faculty Handbook*, section 4.1.1).

The following ranks or titles may be assigned to non-tenure-track research faculty: research assistant professor, research associate professor, research professor, adjunct research faculty, and visiting research faculty (Excerpt from *Faculty Handbook*, section 4.1.2).

The following ranks or titles may be assigned to non-tenure-track clinical faculty: clinical instructor, clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, clinical professor, visiting clinical faculty, and adjunct clinical faculty (Excerpt from *Faculty Handbook*, section 4.1.3).

5.2 Criteria for Appointment to Faculty Rank. Non-tenure-track members of the faculty are employed for assignments specific to departmental need.

Normally they are not expected to do 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. Their conditions of employment are governed by the terms of their appointment letters (Excerpt from *Faculty Handbook*, section 4.2.1).

Section 4.2 of the *Faculty Handbook* provides specific information regarding the qualifications of

- (a) Instructor, (b) Lecturer, and (c) Distinguished Lecturer.
- (b) Research Assistant Professor, (b) Research Associate Professor, and (c) Research Professor.
- (c) Clinical Instructor, (b) Clinical Assistant Professor, (c) Clinical Associate Professor, and (d) Clinical Professor.

5.3 Adjunct Faculty. Individuals who provide uncompensated or part-time compensated service to the instructional and/or research programs of the university may be given

adjunct faculty appointments. As with all other non-tenure-track faculty appointments, the Office of the Chancellor or Vice President will issue letters of appointment to adjunct faculty members. Staff exempt employees with appropriate expertise who, on occasion, provide instruction or participate in research may be given adjunct faculty appointments in a department other than that in which their budget line resides. Professional credentials and/or the terminal degree required for appointment to professorial ranks are required for adjunct faculty appointments.

Adjunct faculty may serve on graduate committees, serve as program directors, supervise clinical experiences, or assume other responsibilities as are consistent with university, college, and departmental policies. Adjunct faculty appointments may be made at the rank of adjunct professor, adjunct associate professor, adjunct assistant professor, or adjunct lecturer. Tenured and tenure-track faculty will evaluate the recommended rank in accordance with departmental and college bylaws (Excerpt from *Faculty Handbook*, section 4.2.4).

5.4 Visiting Faculty. Visiting faculty carry out instructional and/or research responsibilities within an academic department. Professional credentials and/or the terminal degree required for the university's professorial ranks are also required for appointments as visiting faculty. Normally, the rank of appointment will be the professorial rank that the individual holds at his or her home institution; however, the standards of scholarship for holding visiting faculty rank will be the same as required for the university's own faculty. Visiting faculty members do not participate in the governance of the department and are not subject to annual performance reviews. Normally, a visiting appointment is for 12 months (Excerpt from *Faculty Handbook*, section 4.2.5).

5.5 Appointment and Evaluation. Non-tenure-track faculty salaries are established by the terms of appointment, within University guidelines. Individual qualifications and faculty performance are reflected through salary structure. The annual performance of all non-tenure-track faculty members is evaluated using the same process as with tenure-track faculty, but focused only on relevant areas (i.e., typically teaching and service) According to Chapter 4 of the *Faculty Handbook*, Research and clinical faculty are subject to annual performance reviews appropriate to the positions and as outlined in departmental and college bylaws (Excerpt from *Faculty Handbook*, section 4.3). The length of a research faculty appointment is contingent upon the availability of designated funding. Appeal procedures for non-tenure-track faculty are described in chapter 5 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

ARTICLE SIX—BENEFITS, LEAVES OF ABSENCE, AND EMERITUS/EMERITA STATUS

6.1 Leaves of Absence. Leaves of absence, extended periods of time spent away from campus for professional growth or personal reasons are an important aspect of faculty development. Leaves of absence must be requested in writing by the faculty member and specifically approved by the department head, dean or director and the chief academic

officer, and where appropriate, the State of Tennessee. Leaves of absence are normally granted for not more than 24 months and are normally without university compensation (Excerpt from *Faculty Handbook*, section 6.1). The University grants leave with and without pay to full time faculty on regular appointment for a variety of reasons: Personal and Service Leave, Sick Leave, Funeral Leave, Family and Medical Leave, Military Leave, and Court Leave.

6.2 Vacations and Annual Leave. The university recognizes the importance of rest and recreation and encourages faculty vacations. Faculty members must arrange the length and timing of vacation periods with the Department Head/Dean, and must provide information on how they may be contacted during periods of absence. Refer to the annual leave policy in the *UTK Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual* (Excerpt from *Faculty Handbook*, section 6.5.1).

1. Faculty [and Professional Staff] members employed on twelve-month appointments. Faculty [and professional staff] members employed on regular full-time twelve-month appointments earn annual leave at the rate of two (2) working days per month [twenty-four (24) working days of annual leave per year]. A maximum of forty-two (42) days of accumulated annual leave may be carried forward from one calendar year to the next. At the end of a calendar year, annual leave days in excess of forty-two (42) will be credited to sick leave. Faculty members [and professional staff] on regular part-time twelve-month appointments receive a prorated amount of annual leave based on the percentage of full-time employment (Excerpt from *Faculty Handbook*, section 6.5.1).
2. Faculty Employed on Academic Year Appointments. Faculty members employed on regular full-time academic year appointments do not accrue annual leave. However, nine-month faculty members are not required to be on campus during any semester for which they have no University assignments. Such periods begin when all reports have been made following the preceding semester's commencement, and extend to a reasonable period prior to the beginning of the semester following the semester without assigned duties. A reasonable period must include sufficient time to participate in scheduled faculty meetings, perform committee work, advise, and other activity necessary for the satisfactory resumption of the work of the department in that semester (Excerpt from *Faculty Handbook*, section 6.4.3).

6.3 Emeritus/Emerita Designation. Upon retirement of a faculty member, that faculty member may petition the Department Head and Faculty for "Emeritus/Emerita" designation. The faculty of the department will consider the length and quality of service of the candidate. Emeritus/Emerita designation should be based on: (a) a sustained record of devotion and service to the Department, the College, the University, and the profession; (b) a distinguished record of scholarship and service that advanced the reputation of the Department, the College, the University, and the profession; (c) a clear record of professional recognition nationally and internationally; and (d) distinguished

and caring record of teaching and service to students. Upon recommendation by the Department Head and faculty, such recommendation will be forwarded to the Dean and further review/action will occur as specified in the Faculty Handbook.

6.4 Educational Leave and Semester Banking. In approved circumstances, faculty may plan for leave by teaching overload courses without pay and engaging in course banking (building the equivalent of a teaching load with overload courses). All plans for course banking or requests for educational leave should be made in writing to the department head. This proposal should describe the following (1) the dates of the requested leave, (2) the activities planned and how they contribute to the faculty member's scholarship, the program, and the department, (3) the plans for covering normal activities of the person requesting leave (i.e., student advising, courses normally taught), and (4) a brief report of the last leave taken and results of scholarly activities during that leave. The Department Head and faculty determine if others will be able to maintain activities necessary while the member is on leave. A report is made at a departmental meeting and consensus of agreement for the leave sought from department members present, prior to granting the leave (See *Faculty Handbook* Section 6.3.1 for information on criteria for faculty development leave).

ARTICLE SEVEN – COMPENSATED OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES/CONSULTING

Chapter Seven of the *University Faculty Handbook* details general guidelines concerning the relationship between the primary responsibilities of a faculty member to the university and the application of academic expertise and experience in compensated and consulting activities beyond those primary responsibilities.

Consistent with *University Faculty Handbook* guidelines, the value of compensated outside activities and consulting is recognized for their value (1) in strengthening academic expertise; (2) in enriching performance in the primary faculty responsibilities of teaching, research, and service; and (3) enriching faculty, department/program, and university reputation.

Annual reviews of faculty performance in the Department will center primarily on performance evidence related to faculty goals and the three primary areas of faculty responsibility in teaching, research, and service. Faculty members, however, may offer addendum evidence from compensated outside and consulting activity as this evidence may speak to faculty reputation and performance.

Faculty members should inform the Department Head if planning compensated outside activities/consulting that may be ongoing or extended in nature. The faculty member and the Department Head should be in agreement that such activities are beneficial to the professional development and reputation of the faculty member and the department, and that a faculty member's obligation to teaching responsibilities and other primary duties will not be negatively affected by compensated outside and consulting activities.

The *University Faculty Handbook* specifies those actions and/or sanctions that a Department Head may employ if a faculty member appears to be neglecting primary responsibilities due to compensated outside activities and consulting. These may include restrictions on such activities and possible negative influence on decisions related to salary, promotion, and tenure.

In summary, the department bylaws encourage and support faculty participation in compensated outside activities and consulting for the reasons cited in the *University Faculty Handbook* and those benefits cited in the opening of this Section 7. The By-Laws, however, do not encourage commitments to compensated outside and consulting activities that interfere with or distract from performance of the primary responsibilities of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service.

Appendix A Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

The chart below details annual expectations of faculty members according to rank and level of performance. Annual evaluation is based on the overall performance of each faculty member, reflecting their work accomplished in teaching/advising, scholarship/creativity, and service. The following rubric is intended to be a general and flexible guideline for faculty evaluations.

Assistant Professor

Teaching/Advising	
Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
<p>Good teaching as evidenced by, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Development of well organized, comprehensive syllabi for all assigned courses <input type="checkbox"/> Consistently average ratings on student evaluations across a majority of classes <input type="checkbox"/> Available to advise students <input type="checkbox"/> Participation in curriculum development at the programs- or department level <input type="checkbox"/> Service on masters committees 	<p>Excellent teaching as evidenced by, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Adoption of innovative instructional strategies <input type="checkbox"/> Development of a “new” course(s) that adds to the strength of our programs in educational leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Consistently above average ratings on student evaluations across a majority of classes <input type="checkbox"/> Coordinates student advising <input type="checkbox"/> Directs curriculum development and/or implementation design, such as curriculum audits at the program or department level <input type="checkbox"/> Other documentation of quality teaching as available or evidence of student outcomes (e.g., student presentations or publications that emanate from teaching activities) <input type="checkbox"/> Service on masters and/or doctoral committees
Scholarship/Creativity	
<p>Contributions to the professional literature as evidenced by, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Contributes to the development of internal or external research grants <input type="checkbox"/> Author of at least 2 peer-reviewed publications (with or without collaborators) or equivalent (e.g., completion of book chapter, chapter in research handbook, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> At least 2 local, state, regional, or 	<p>Exceptional contributions to the professional literature as evidenced by, for example :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Initiates the application for internal or external research grants <input type="checkbox"/> 3 or more peer-reviewed publications (with or without collaborators) or equivalent (e.g., completion of book chapter, chapter in research handbook, etc.), at least one of which is a primary

national presentations	authorship <input type="checkbox"/> At least 2 local, state, regional, or national presentations
Service	
A record of service as evidenced by, for example: <input type="checkbox"/> Involvement in department, college, university, OR community service <input type="checkbox"/> Service to at least 1 state, regional, or national organization or professional associations	Substantial service involvement as evidenced by, for example: <input type="checkbox"/> Leadership in department, college, and university work <input type="checkbox"/> A combination of leadership on or service to at least 2 state, regional, or national organizations or professional associations

Associate Professor

Teaching/Advising	
Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
<p>Good teaching as evidenced by, for example :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Development of well organized comprehensive syllabi for all assigned courses ❑ Consistently average or higher student evaluations across a majority of classes ❑ Available to advise students ❑ Service on masters and/or doctoral committees ❑ Involvement in curriculum development or revision 	<p>Excellent teaching as evidenced by, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Innovative teaching as evidenced by: adoption of innovative instructional strategies ❑ Consistently above average ratings on student evaluations across a majority of classes ❑ Coordinates student advising ❑ Chair on masters and/or doctoral committees ❑ Leadership in curriculum development or revision
Scholarship/Creativity	
<p>Contributions to the professional literature as evidenced by, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Management of at least 1 secured external research grant award ❑ 2 or more scholarly peer-reviewed publications (with or without collaborators) ❑ At least 2 local, state, regional, or national presentations 	<p>Exceptional contributions to the professional literature as evidenced by, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Securing of substantial external research grants ❑ 3 or more scholarly, peer-reviewed publications in top-tier journals or equivalent (e.g., completion of book with major publisher, chapter in research handbook) ❑ At least 2 local, state, regional, or national presentations
Service	
<p>A record of service as evidenced by, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Participation and leadership in department, college, and/or university work ❑ Professionally relevant community service ❑ Service on to 1-2 state, regional, or national committees associated with professional organizations ❑ Participation in committees and other service work at the department, college, and/or university level 	<p>Substantial service involvement as evidenced by, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Extensive involvement and leadership in national/international professional organizations ❑ Leadership in community projects relevant to the profession ❑ Leadership in regional or national professional organizations ❑ Leadership in department, college, and/or university committee or service work

Full Professor

Teaching/Advising	
Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
<p>Good teaching as evidenced by, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Development of well organized comprehensive syllabi for all assigned courses ❑ Consistently average ratings on student evaluations across a majority of classes ❑ Available to advise students ❑ Service on masters and/or doctoral committees ❑ Involvement in curriculum development or revision. 	<p>Excellent teaching as evidenced by, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Innovative teaching as evidenced by: adoption of innovative instructional strategies ❑ Consistently above average ratings on student evaluations across a majority of classes ❑ Coordinates student advising ❑ Chair masters and/or doctoral committees ❑ Leadership in curriculum development or revision.
Scholarship/Creativity	
<p>Contributions to the national professional literature as evidenced by, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Management of at least 1 secured external research grant award ❑ 2 or more scholarly peer-reviewed publications (with or without collaborators) ❑ At least 2 local, state, regional, or national presentations 	<p>Exceptional contributions to the national professional literature as evidenced by, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Securing of substantial external research grants ❑ 3 or more scholarly, peer-reviewed publications in top-tier journals or equivalent (e.g., completion of book with major publisher, chapter in research handbook) ❑ At least 2 local, state, regional, or national presentations
Service	
<p>A record of service as evidenced by, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Participation and leadership in department, college, and/or university work ❑ Professionally relevant community service ❑ Service on to 1-2 state, regional, or national committees associated with professional organizations ❑ Participation in committees and other service work at the department, college, or university level 	<p>Substantial service involvement as evidenced by, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Extensive involvement and leadership in national/international professional organizations ❑ Leadership in community projects relevant to the profession ❑ Leadership in regional or national professional organizations ❑ Leadership in department, college, and/or university committee or service work ❑ Principal investigator and/or project director of external funding