

Approved - April 26, 2012

Guidelines for the Promotion of Lecturers

UT College of Engineering

A supplement to the

**Guidelines for the for Tenure and Promotion Review Process
UT College of Engineering**

I. Introduction

A. Purpose of document

1. To provide guidance about expected accomplishments for promotion of teaching faculty.
2. To provide guidance to the candidate during preparation of the Dossier.
3. To provide guidance to the department and College during the review process.

B. Guiding Principles

1. The guiding principles stated in the Guidelines for the Tenure and Promotion Review Process also apply to promotion of teaching faculty.
2. The process for promotion of Lecturers based in departments follows the path of review and recommendation by the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee to the head, review and recommendation by the department head to the dean, and review and recommendation by the dean to the provost.
3. The process for promotion of Lecturers based in programs under the oversight of the college (i.e., Engineering Fundamentals and Engineering Honors) follows the path of review and recommendation by the director of the respective college-based programs to the Associate Dean, review and recommendation by the Associate Dean to the dean, and review and recommendation by the dean to the provost.

II. Expectations for Promotion

A. University

1. Relevant guidance regarding the promotion process is provided in the Board of Trustees policies, the Faculty Handbook, and the Manual of Faculty Evaluation. The guidance in this document is subordinate to the above documents. However, the above documents do not specifically address promotion of teaching faculty; and the University has determined that this should be handled at the College level.

B. College

1. The general comments provided in the College of Engineering Guidelines for the Tenure and Promotion Review Process also apply to promotion of teaching faculty. However, many of the specific criteria noted for tenure-track faculty are not relevant to teaching faculty. Thus, the tables provided in that document have been modified herein to reflect only items relevant for teaching faculty
2. Each Department will develop teaching faculty promotion guidelines that are consistent with the Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Review Process. The major difference from the tenure and promotion guidelines is that teaching faculty will be evaluated only on teaching-related activities. Relevant evaluation criteria will include:
 - a) Teaching criteria
 - b) Scholarship criteria
 - c) Service criteria (especially those that are teaching related)
 - d) Awards and professional recognition

Approved - April 26, 2012

III. College of Engineering Supplement to the Dossier

A. Preparation of Dossier

1. The Dossier is to be prepared in accordance with the Board of Trustees policies governing tenure and promotion, and the requirements in the Faculty Handbook and the Manual for Faculty Evaluation. Care should be taken by the candidate, the department Tenure and Promotion Committee, and Department Head to assure adherence to these procedures.
2. In the event of conflicts, the above documents apply.
3. This document outlines additional items to be included in the College of Engineering Supplement to the Dossier. This supplement should be included as an appendix to the dossier.

B. Contents of the College of Engineering Supplement to the Dossier

1. The College Summary Form.
2. Checklist of Contents of the College of Engineering Supplement to the Dossier (Table T4). All information in the supplement must be included in the order given in Table T4.
3. Documentation addressing all “Essential” criteria (Table T1) that are not required to be included elsewhere in the Dossier.
4. Documentation addressing “Desirable” and “Beneficial” Criteria (Table T1) may be included.
5. The candidate’s three most significant contributions should be identified. A copy of these contributions should be included in the College Supplement to the Dossier.

Table T1. Evaluation Criteria and their Relative Importance
 E =Essential (must be reported in dossier) D= Desirable B = Beneficial

		Level I Evaluation*	Level II Evaluation*
Teaching			
T-1	Classroom: Evidence of Teaching Innovation (course content/ design/ breadth)	B	E
T-2	Classroom: SAIS student evaluations (reflected by "instructor effectiveness" score)	E	E
T-3	Classroom: Peer Teaching Evaluation	E	E
T-4	Classroom: Self-assessment teaching document	E	E
T-5	Mentoring: Lecturer and/or GTA mentoring	N/A	B
Research (particularly related to instructional responsibilities)			
R-1	Research-related activities (external funding, publications, presentations, other scholarly work such as textbooks)	B	B
Service			
Se-1	Internal service to department, college, and university.	B	B
Se-2	Instructional outreach activities (e.g., K-12 STEM-related instruction)	B	B
Se-3	Professional activities leading to national exposure, such as service as officer, organization of meetings/symposia/conferences, or participation on national/international boards or review panels.	B	D
Awards			
A-1	Teaching Awards	B	D
A-2	Service Awards	B	B

*Note: Level I Evaluation: Promotion to Senior Lecturer
 Level II Evaluation: Promotion to Distinguished Lecturer

Table T2. Rationale and Expected Documentation for each of the Table T1 Criterion (“Essential” criteria in bold)

Criteria		Rationale	Required Documentation
Teaching			
T-1	Classroom: Evidence of Teaching Innovation (course content /design/ breadth)	Teaching is the primary mission of the university and it is important to provide high quality instruction and current content	Syllabi of new, updated, relevant and revised courses, and innovative teaching methods
T-2	Classroom: SAIS Student evaluations (reflected by “instructor effectiveness” score)	Student feedback is an important aspect of teaching evaluation	SAIS scores from courses taught
T-3	Classroom: Peer Teaching Evaluation	Provide for comparison with departmental norms and expectations	Written report from peer evaluators including assessment of classroom observations
T-4	Classroom: Self-assessment teaching document	Provides teaching goals and methods of achieving them	Written report by the candidate
T-5	Mentoring: Lecturer and/or GTA mentoring	Growth of junior Lecturer is important	List of Lecturer mentoring achievements
Research			
R-1	Research-related activities (external funding, publications, presentations, other scholarly work such as textbooks)	Involvement in research activities help improve course content and/or instructional skills	List of research-related activities
Service			
Se-1	Internal service to department, college, and university.	Although university service is a requirement of all faculty members, this should not be a high priority for Tenure Track faculty.	List of university service activities, including dates of service, leadership roles, and if applicable, any significant accomplishments resulting from the activity.
Se-2	Instructional outreach activities (e.g., K-12 STEM-related instruction)	Important in preparing and transitioning students to engineering programs	List of outreach activities
Se-3	Professional activities leading to national exposure, such as service as officer, organization of meetings/symposia/conferences, or participation on national/international boards or review panels.	Professional service is an important responsibility and fosters professional growth.	List of professional service commitments, including dates of service, leadership/chair roles.
Awards			
A-1	Teaching Awards	Awards are a formal recognition of accomplishment from peers	List type of award, name, citation, date, awarding organization
A-2	Service Awards	Awards are a formal recognition of accomplishment from peers	List type of award, awarding organization name, citation, date

Table T3. Typical Examples of Expectations for the “Essential” Criteria

		Level I Evaluation*	Level II Evaluation*
Teaching			
T-1	Classroom: Evidence of Teaching Innovation (course content/ design/ breadth)	Syllabi of courses taught with contributions of the candidate documented.	Syllabi of new, updated, relevant and revised courses, and innovative teaching methods
T-2	Classroom: SAIS Student evaluations (reflected by “instructor effectiveness” score) http://web.utk.edu/~sais/results/	Achieved ratings comparable to College Mean by the end of the probationary period	Ratings comparable to College Mean
T-3	Classroom: Peer Teaching Evaluation	Evaluated as “effective “ teacher or has taken action to improve a less than effective rating	Ratings comparable to College Mean
T-4	Classroom: Self-assessment teaching document	Statement of teaching philosophy and goals	Documenting experience gained and the resulting improvements in teaching skills and perspective.

*Note:

Level I Evaluation: Promotion to Senior Lecturer

Level II Evaluation: Promotion to Distinguished Lecturer

Table T4. Checklist of Contents of the College of Engineering Supplement to the Dossier (“Essential” criteria in bold must be included)

		Documentation provided in Dossier (D) or Supplement (S)	If provided in Dossier, indicate Section
Teaching			
T-1	Classroom: Evidence of Teaching Innovation (course content/ design/ breadth)	__ D __ S	
T-2	Classroom: SAIS student evaluations (reflected by “instructor effectiveness” score)	__ D __ S	
T-3	Classroom: Peer Teaching Evaluation	__ D __ S	
T-4	Classroom: Self-assessment teaching document	__ D __ S	
T-5	Mentoring: Lecturer and/or GTA mentoring	__ D __ S	
Research			
R-1	Research-related activities (external funding, publications, presentations, other scholarly work such as textbooks).	__ D __ S	
Service			
Se-1	Internal service to department, college, and university.	__ D __ S	
Se-2	Instructional outreach activities (e.g., K-12 STEM-related instruction)	__ D __ S	
Se-3	Professional activities leading to national exposure, such as service as officer, organization of meetings/symposia/conferences, or participation on national/international boards or review panels.	__ D __ S	
Awards			
A-1	Teaching Awards	__ D __ S	
A-2	Service Awards	__ D __ S	