

## BYLAWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

### I. THE DEPARTMENT HEAD

The Department Head is a member of the faculty who has been given certain administrative responsibilities and the authority to carry them out in consultation with the faculty.

#### A. Definition of responsibilities:

1. The Head is responsible for care of the academic program through the following:
  - a. recruitment and development of the faculty, including recommendation for hiring, promotion and salary increases, assignment of courses, and assignment of office space;
  - b. development and review of the curriculum;
  - c. encouragement and support of faculty teaching and research;
  - d. encouragement and support of faculty in departmental and university service;
  - e. representation of the department in the college and university and in the community outside the university.
2. The Head is also responsible for support of the academic program through the following:
  - a. employment and supervision of clerical and supporting personnel;
  - b. management of departmental physical facilities and equipment;
  - c. preparation and defense of the departmental budget;
  - d. authorization of any expenditures from the departmental budget.

B. Appointment: The Head is appointed by the Chancellor upon recommendation of the Dean of the College and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs after the Dean has consulted the Department and heard its recommendations. The headship carries no tenure. It is renewed at the discretion of the Dean, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor, in consultation with the faculty. General procedures for selection of the Head are described in 1.4.4 of the Faculty Handbook. Both the professorial and non-professorial faculties vote as discrete groups for the Head. The results of each group's vote are made available to the Dean.

C. Review: Departmental faculty members provide annual objective and systematic evaluation of the Head to the Dean of the College, following procedures that are consistent with university policy.

### II. FACULTY

A. Definition of Faculty: The faculty consists of the professorial and non-professorial teaching staff. The non-professorial faculty consists of full-time and part-time Lecturers.

- B. The Faculty Voice in Administration: The most direct responsibility of both professorial and non-professorial faculty in departmental governance is to determine the shape of the academic programs. A less direct but no less important role of the faculty is to advise the departmental administrators concerning administration of departmental programs.

For the professorial faculty, these matters include:

1. Appointment and retention of faculty;
2. Promotion of faculty and awarding of tenure.

For both professorial and non-professorial faculty, these matters include:

3. Assessment of faculty performance;
4. Participation in long-range planning and determination of departmental, college, and university priorities;
5. Selection and retention of departmental, college, and university officers;
6. Adjudication of disagreements, grievances, or conflicts in faculty affairs.

Those eligible to vote on appointment, tenure, and promotion are specifically designated below, section V.

### III. ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

#### A. Department Administration

1. Associate Head
2. Director of Graduate Studies
3. Director of Undergraduate Studies
4. Director of Composition

#### B. Administrative Committee

1. Function: The Administrative Committee advises the Head. It helps formulate and implement departmental policy and personnel matters not delegated specifically to other committees or to the faculty at large. At the discretion of the Head, all members have access to the budget, personnel folders, and other departmental information.
2. Members
  - a. Appointed by the Head: Administrators of certain departmental programs, appointed by the Head in consultation with the faculty. The faculty will accept or reject the Head's nomination by a majority vote. With a change in headship, these positions are vacated.

Associate Head  
Director of Graduate Studies  
Director of Undergraduate Studies  
Director of Composition

- b. Elected by the faculty: Two will be drawn from the professorial faculty, with no more than one to be a full professor. One will be drawn from the full-time Lecturer faculty. The Lecturer representative will be elected by the lecturers. The two members drawn from the professorial staff will be elected by that staff. At least one and no more than one of those elected can be at the rank of Full Professor. All three members will serve for two-year terms. No member may be elected to successive two-year terms, although a member elected to a one-year term (as defined below) may be re-elected and serve a two-year term.

Election procedures: terms are to be staggered so that no more than two members are elected in a given year. If a position becomes vacant through resignation or promotion to another rank and only one other position is vacant, the replacement position shall be for two years. If, however, both of the other positions are up for election, the replacement position shall be for only one year. Faculty of all professorial ranks are eligible to vote for each professorial position. The first ballot for each position will list all those eligible to serve and ask the voters to vote for two; the next ballot will list the two (or more, if a tie) receiving the most votes and ask voters to choose one. If no one receives a majority, a further run-off will be held. Normally, the retiring member(s) of the committee will conduct the election.

- C. Other administrative positions, appointed by the Head as departmental need arises: for example, Director of ESL and Director of Creative Writing.
- D. The Graduate Committee shall consist of the Director of Graduate Studies; the Graduate Admissions and Placement Coordinator; one representative from the Graduate Students in English organization; one representative from Rhetoric Writing, and Linguistics; one representative from Creative Writing; and three representatives from Literature, Criticism, and Textual Studies. The three Literature members should represent the following fields: Medieval and Renaissance; eighteenth- and nineteenth-century studies; and twentieth- and twenty-first century studies. Additional persons may be appointed to the committee by the Head to expand representation. Such persons will serve for one year but may be reappointed at the Head's discretion.
- E. The Undergraduate Committee, normally consisting of the Director of Undergraduate Studies, the Assistant Director of Undergraduate Studies, and representatives of the professorial and non-professorial faculty.

- F. The Composition Committee, normally consisting of the Director of Composition, the Director of English as a Second Language, the Assistant Director of Composition, the Writing Center Director, and representatives from the professorial faculty, non-professorial faculty, and teaching graduate students
- G. Lecturer Committee, normally consisting of the Associate Head, the Director of Undergraduate Studies, the Director of Composition, and three members of the full-time Lecturer faculty.
- H. The Endowed Funds Committee (for the Hodges and Emperor Funds and other endowment income): this committee consists of all full professors and full professors emeriti.
- I. The Planning Committee, consisting of two representatives from the Literature professorial faculty; one representative from the Creative Writing professorial faculty; one representative from the Rhetoric, Writing, and Linguistics professorial faculty; one representative of the non-tenured professorial faculty; one representative of the tenured professorial faculty; and one representative of the full-time Lecturer faculty. Members of the Planning Committee are elected by those in the faculty ranks or areas they represent.
- J. Other committees, appointed by the Head or by other administrators.

#### IV. WRITING CENTER DIRECTOR

- A. Definition of Writing Center Director: The Writing Center Director is classified as a permanent position within the Department of English. A detailed position description is on file in the office of the Department Head.
- B. Writing Center Director's Voice in Departmental Administration: As with the professorial and non-professorial faculty, the most direct responsibility of the Writing Center Director in departmental governance is to determine the shape of the academic programs. A less direct but no less important role is to advise the departmental administrators concerning administration of departmental programs. These matters include:
  - 1. Participation in long-range planning and determination of departmental, college, and university priorities;
  - 2. Selection and retention of departmental, college, and university officers, including the Head.
- C. The Writing Center Director is considered a member of the Rhetoric, Writing, and Linguistics division. He or she may vote in the faculty meetings described in V.A.1 and V.C. [See sections below] but is specifically excluded from voting in the following situations:
  - 1. Matters that involve appointment, retention, promotion and tenure of professorial faculty;

2. Adjudication of disagreements, grievances, or conflicts in faculty affairs;
  3. If restricted from attending a meeting and/or voting by the Head or in response to a request of 20% of the professorial faculty (similar to the restriction specified in V.A.4.c).
- D. Performance Evaluation for the Writing Center Director: The Writing Center Director will undergo an annual performance review with the Department Head. During that meeting, the Director and the Head shall review progress toward goals outlined in the previous review and discuss new or revised goals for the year ahead. The Director's performance will be rated in accord with Human Resources policies, and the Head will provide a narrative summary of the evaluation.
- E. Should the department change the classification of this position to professorial faculty, the person hired under that capacity has the same rights as other professorial faculty. In that case the Department Head appoints the Director of the Writing Center, as provided for in III.C.

## V. ADJUNCT APPOINTMENTS FOR FACULTY IN OTHER DEPARTMENTS

The university allows departments to request adjunct faculty appointments for professorial faculty whose full-time appointment is in other departments. Adjunct faculty appointments may be recommended for faculty from other departments when doing so will provide a clear and documentable benefit to the department.

- A. Criteria: A faculty member from another department may be recommended for adjunct appointment at the assistant, associate, or full professor rank if the following criteria are met:
1. The individual so recommended has an area of specialization that overlaps significantly with the department's existing areas of specialization or complements one of these areas in ways deemed important by vote of the faculty;
  2. The individual has a record of, or strong potential for, participation with the department in terms of teaching and graduate supervision, either by teaching courses offered by or cross-listed with the English Department or by serving as a member of department dissertation committees.
- B. Duration: Adjunct faculty appointments will be for the duration of five years, with reconsideration of the appointment after this period.
- C. Rights: The faculty member who receives an adjunct appointment may be invited to attend department faculty meetings and to participate in other department activities such as curricular discussions as deemed appropriate by members of the faculty. Other rights and responsibilities of professorial faculty as outlined in these bylaws do not pertain to adjunct faculty.
- D. Procedures for approving adjunct professorial appointments:

1. Nominations may originate with the Head or any professorial faculty member.
2. A letter outlining the reasons for requesting this title will be submitted to the Administrative Committee along, along with the candidate's vita. This letter will discuss the candidate's potential contributions to the department and the proposed term of appointment. If recommended by the Administrative Committee, the professorial faculty will discuss and vote on the nomination.
3. Department recommendation to appoint at this rank will require a 2/3 affirmative vote from all professorial faculty present and voting yes or no by secret ballot.
4. Adjunct faculty appointment requires approval from the College and the Provost's Office, with a letter of appointment coming from the latter.

## VI. DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY MEETINGS

The department conducts several types of faculty meetings, each with specific procedures and voting policies. These meetings include: meetings initiated by faculty members; meetings called by the Head; meetings in which a majority vote is binding on the department; meetings in which the faculty vote is advisory to the Head; and meetings of special groups, divisions or programs within the department. These meetings will customarily be held on the campus of UT. The following outline distinguishes these meetings on the basis of whether the vote is advisory to the Head or binding on the department.

- A. Faculty meetings in which a majority vote is binding on the department. These meetings:
  1. address but are not restricted to the following: curriculum review and development; staffing prioritization; issues of long-range planning;
  2. may be called by the Head;
  3. may be called by petition of 20% of the professorial faculty;
  4. unless otherwise specified, are open to Lecturers and to elected graduate and undergraduate representatives.
    - a. In issues that address undergraduate curriculum at the 100 and 200 level, Lecturers are enfranchised proportionally according to a ratio of one representative to every four Lecturers.
    - b. Graduate and undergraduate representatives attend in a non-voting capacity.
    - c. A meeting may be restricted to professorial faculty by the Head or in response to a request of 20% of the professorial faculty.
  5. General procedures:
    - a. The Head should normally circulate the meeting time and agenda five days in advance of the meeting.

- b. Minutes are kept by the secretary to the Head and are available in the main office to all faculty members.
- B. Faculty meetings in which the faculty vote is advisory to the Head. These meetings:
  1. Concern appointment, promotion, and tenure of the professorial faculty.
  2. Are called by the Head.
  3. Are open to members of the professorial faculty. Additional restrictions are specified in sections 5c and 5d below.
  4. General procedures:
    - a. A positive recommendation requires that a simple majority of eligible voting faculty be in attendance and that they reach a 2/3 majority decision of those voting yes or no by secret ballot.
    - b. In the rare event that deliberations and voting are not completed by the scheduled end of the meeting, the faculty may elect to schedule a second meeting to reconsider and re-vote upon the issues as a group. Every effort will be made to conclude deliberation and voting in a single meeting.
    - c. The Head is specifically obliged in all tenure and promotion considerations to:
      - i. make sure that all relevant materials about candidates are available to the appropriate faculty in reasonable time for careful study and deliberation;
      - ii. call the appropriate faculty together as a group and to allow full discussion of the merits of the candidacy;
      - iii. receive from the appropriate faculty a collective recommendation;
      - iv. take note of any and all such recommendations, along with those given individually or privately, in his/her recommendation to the Dean.
    - d. All votes are advisory to the Head, with the expectation that the Head customarily follows the faculty's recommendations.

The Head is not obliged to follow the majority recommendations of the appropriate faculty, but in the event of disagreement, the Head must explain to the faculty frankly and openly the decision he/she has reached; and the Head, further, must give faculty members an opportunity to submit, along with his/her recommendation, a dissenting report if they so desire. In any event the appropriate faculty vote must be reported and explained to the Dean.
  5. Special procedures:

- a. Hiring priorities
    - i. The professorial faculty will decide by majority vote upon tenure-track or continuing full-time positions to be requested from the Dean.
    - ii. Searches for and evaluation of candidates will be conducted by select committees of those in relevant fields, assisted by the Administrative Committee.
  
  - b. Appointment
    - i. Appointment of specific persons to fill these positions is by a vote of the professorial faculty.
    - ii. If a choice is being made among two or more candidates, a simple majority will determine the candidate of choice, who must then receive a 2/3 majority decision of those voting yes or no by secret ballot.
    - iii. A majority vote constitutes a recommendation to the professors within and above the rank of the position being filled. These professors then vote to determine a 2/3 majority decision of those voting yes or no by secret ballot.
    - iv. If the candidate receiving the highest number of votes in the preference vote does not receive a 2/3 majority decision of those voting yes or no, the professors within and above the rank of the position being filled will vote on the candidate receiving the next higher number of votes. This process will continue until a candidate receives a 2/3 majority decision of those voting yes or no until the faculty votes (by simple majority) whether to suspend the search or invite additional candidates to campus.
    - v. In the rare event that no candidate receives a two-thirds vote, or if the deliberation and voting are not completed by the scheduled end of the meeting, the faculty may elect to schedule a second meeting to reconsider and re-vote upon the candidates as a group. Every effort will be made to conclude deliberation and voting in a single meeting.
    - vi. This vote is a recommendation to the Head.
  
  - c. Tenure: All tenured members of the department vote on tenure for non-tenured faculty members.
  
  - d. Promotion: Those faculty members within and above the rank for which the candidate has been proposed will vote on his or her promotion.
- C. Meetings of special groups, divisions or programs within the department. Membership in these groups, divisions, and programs will vary and may include professorial faculty, full and part-time Lecturers, and teaching assistants. Meetings



will be called by the individual(s) in charge of the group, division, and program or at the request of its members.

## VII. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION, RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE FOR TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY:

The following guidelines for appointment, performance evaluation, and promotion for tenured and tenure-track faculty are specific to the Department of English. They are designed to supplement the criteria and procedures for implementation of formal evaluations set down for the university in general in the Faculty Handbook (Chapter 3) and in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation. These guidelines should inform and be reflected in (A) annual reviews by the Head of individual faculty members and (B) intermittent reviews by the faculty, or by components thereof, and by the Head on specific, formally prescribed occasions when faculty are considered for the granting of tenure and/or promotion.

It is understood that appointment, evaluation, and promotion/tenure represent a continuous and linked process and that expectations must be clearly articulated to individual faculty members at every stage of this process. Faculty should be able to assume that discussions concerning performance evaluation, promotion, and tenure center on, and judgments follow from, performance in three areas—scholarship, research, or creative activity; teaching; and service—and are based on evidence made available before and during deliberations.

- A. Principles of evaluation: Evaluation is a cornerstone of the department's commitment to excellence, and it is important that the evaluation processes that the faculty undergoes be conducted with clearly articulated and consistently applied standards. In all acts of department evaluation the following general principles will be taken into account:
1. that in the area of research and creative activity a tenure-track or tenured faculty member, as evidence of an on-going research or creative agenda, should produce each year at least a scholarly article or the equivalent thereof;
  2. that it is the quality of publications that matters;
  3. that judgments, based as they are on the perceived value of the publications, may well be informed by such matters as length and place of publication (press, journal), readers' reports, reviews, number and nature of citations, and so on;
  4. that in recognition of the sometimes slow process of publication, a cumulative count over the last three consecutive years of evaluation will be used to evaluate the performance of faculty members;
  5. that the quantity of publications may vary in accordance with views as to the degree of difficulty of the project undertaken, some projects requiring more time and effort than others;
  6. that judgments as to the quality of teaching rely on several kinds of evidence, all or in part: on student evaluations, peer evaluations, syllabi, distribution of grades, quality of exams and other assignments, the development of and experimentation with courses, and on impressions otherwise received by faculty evaluators;

7. that the teaching that goes on other than in assigned courses counts as well-- for example, the direction of dissertations, of theses, graduate and undergraduate, and of independent studies;
8. that there are various kinds of service for which faculty should be rewarded: to the department, university, and the profession. Professional public outreach should also be recognized as fulfilling the faculty's service mission;
9. that participation in University initiatives in areas such as diversity are worthy of note;
10. that, because levels of achievement in each of the areas are apt to vary from year to year, the Head's written report will indicate the place of a particular year's evaluation within the overall pattern of an individual faculty member's performance;
11. and that the professorial faculty can exceed expectations overall, in most circumstances, given the following conditions: a national award or fellowship; a college or university award for scholarship/creative activity, teaching, or service; exceeding expectations in scholarship/creative activity and adequate performance in the other two areas.

B. Principles for evaluating digital scholarship and work in new media: The department recognizes the growing importance of digital scholarship and work in new media to its disciplines. In addition to the general principles of evaluation stated above, the department and the faculty member under evaluation will take joint responsibility for determining the criteria by which specific forms of digital scholarship will be evaluated. For tenure-track faculty who anticipate working in this format, special care will be taken to ensure that these criteria will be explained in writing well before the third-year review. Responsibility for assessing the contribution of digital scholarship is twofold. The department has a responsibility to educate itself about the digital work in question and to evaluate it accurately and fairly. At the same time, faculty members engaged in digital scholarship and work in new media have the responsibility to explain the nature of this work, its contribution to its field, and the contexts and venues in which it appears.

In general, scholarship and creative work presented exclusively in digital format (including but not limited to online journals or periodicals, blogs, or websites) will be evaluated using criteria similar to those applied to print publications: (1) the status of the digital venue (whether it is sponsored by a professional society, for instance) and (2) the nature and rigor of the review process that submissions undergo. Evaluation of this scholarship may also consider statistics on readership, such as the number of times an online publication has been accessed and scholarly citations.

The department also recognizes that new and emerging media play an increasing and often transformative role in teaching and service. Uses of technology in these areas include but are not limited to changes in course delivery, other pedagogical uses of new technology, online posting of lectures, the creation of online databases or other scholarly resources, and editing online publications. Every effort should be taken to ensure that these activities are recognized and credited in the appropriate areas, and care should also be taken to recognize those instances where work in new and

emerging media cross the boundaries traditionally separating teaching, scholarship, and service.

- C. Principles for evaluating collaborative scholarship: The department recognizes and affirms the value of collaboration in research, scholarship, and publication. It also acknowledges that in specific areas—rhetoric, composition, technical writing, and L2/ESL, for instance—collaborative scholarship is considered on a par with single-authored scholarship. In addition to the general principles outlined above for evaluating the publication as a whole, evaluation of collaborative scholarship will consider the nature and extent of the faculty member’s contribution. The department reserves the right to request confirmation of the faculty member’s contribution to collaborative scholarship. As part of this assessment, the department will consider whether the order of collaborators’ names is an indication of authorial priority. It is the responsibility of the evaluated faculty member to explain the nature of the collaboration in question and to clarify the conventions of authorial attribution particular to specific fields. This is particularly important in the case of retention and tenure/promotion reviews, since faculty members undergoing these reviews will be judged on their individual records as scholars and creative writers and on their success in meeting the criteria for promotion stated in VII.F.3.
- D. Probationary period for tenure-track faculty: A tenure-track faculty member must serve a probationary period prior to being considered for tenure. The appointment letter shall state the length of the faculty member's probationary period and the academic year in which he or she must be considered for tenure if he or she has met the minimum eligibility requirements for consideration.
- E. Department mentoring for tenure-track faculty: Mentoring is a crucial means by which the department's expectations are articulated to tenure-track faculty. Every tenure-track faculty member will be provided with a departmental faculty mentor, who will serve as a source of information about department and university policies and expectations as well as a guide to the profession in general. The mentor should have knowledge of the field in which the junior faculty member will be working. In some cases, where the junior faculty person has a wide range of interests, two mentors may be appointed.

The mentor acts as liaison between the probationary faculty member and the department. She or he advocates for the untenured faculty member, especially at the annual retention meetings. At the retention meetings, the mentor will report on the untenured faculty member’s accomplishments for the previous year and prospects for the coming year. As an advocate, it is the mentor’s responsibility to be well informed about all the mentee’s activities, having read the published work of the person she or he speaks for and whatever unpublished work that person has been willing to share; having observed teaching; and kept abreast of university and professional service commitments. The mentor makes an oral report of this information at the annual retention meetings and, finally, at the tenure meeting. She or he should also be ready to answer questions about the candidate’s work. At no point will the mentor be asked to provide an evaluation of the candidate’s work. Such judgments are the responsibility of the faculty and the Department Head, both of which are required to submit written evaluations each year.

If the working relationship between mentor and mentee is not satisfactory from either point of view, the junior faculty member will be assigned a new mentor.

- F. Annual retention review of tenure-track faculty: Every tenure-track faculty member will undergo an annual retention review each Fall Semester of their probationary period. The annual retention review process is designed to ensure that a tenure-track faculty member receives clear and timely feedback from the tenured faculty and Department Head about his or her progress as measured by the standards and criteria for rank as defined in department bylaws and the Faculty Handbook.

Procedure for retention review:

1. Each fall, the Department Head will request from each tenure-track faculty member a written summary of his or her accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service for the previous academic year in accordance with departmental bylaws. The Head will specify what additional information and materials, if any, should be included among the documents submitted for this review. The Department Head requests this summary on behalf of the tenured faculty at least two weeks before it is needed for the review.
2. The Department Head will schedule an annual retention meeting, in which tenured faculty will review the summary submitted by the faculty member and hear the report from the faculty member's mentor. The tenured faculty review culminates in a written statement that describes and discusses the faculty member's progress toward promotion and tenure in the context of his or her appointment and departmental bylaws. The writer of the statement will be appointed by the Department Head. In no circumstance shall the mentor be the reporter of the faculty review.
3. The tenured faculty will take a formal retention vote. The vote is advisory to the Head, who will take it into consideration when writing the recommendation for or against retention. The vote and the written narrative, attached to the Annual Recommendation on Retention form, will be shared with the faculty member and the Department Head.
4. The Department Head conducts an independent retention review based upon the faculty member's written summary, the written narrative and vote of the tenured faculty, and a scheduled meeting with the faculty member.
5. The Department Head makes an independent recommendation on retention and submits this recommendation on the Annual Recommendation on Retention form. The Department Head's report includes a written recommendation to the Dean as to retention or non-retention. The report will include a designation of whether the performance of the faculty member during the previous calendar year exceeds expectations for his or her rank, meets expectations for his or her rank, needs improvement for his or her rank, or is unsatisfactory for his or her rank.

6. The faculty member reviews and signs the Annual Recommendation on Retention form and each attached narrative and report. The faculty member's signature indicates that she or he has read the entire evaluation, but the signature does not necessarily imply agreement with its findings.
  7. The faculty member under review may submit a written response to the vote and narrative of the tenured faculty, to the report and recommendation of the Department Head, and/or to any dissenting statements. The faculty member shall be allowed two weeks from the date of receipt from the Head of the finalized Annual Recommendation for Retention and its complete set of attachments to submit any written response. If no response is received after two weeks of the date of receipt, the faculty member relinquishes the right to respond.
  8. The Department Head will forward to the Dean the finalized Annual Recommendation on Retention form, together with the Head's report and recommendation, the retention vote and the narrative of the tenured faculty, and all dissenting statements and responses.
- G. Annual evaluation of tenured and tenure-track faculty: Every tenure-track and tenured faculty member who is not on leave is reviewed annually by the Department Head. As the result of this review, the Head will indicate on the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report whether the performance of the faculty member during the previous calendar year exceeds expectations for his or her rank, meets expectations for his or her rank, needs improvement for his or her rank, or is unsatisfactory for his or her rank.
1. Procedure for evaluation:
    - a. During Spring Semester of each year, the Department Head will request from each tenure-track and tenured faculty member a written summary of work in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service, as well as a statement concerning specific plans and goals for the upcoming year. The written summary will be accompanied by relevant documentation of the faculty member's activities in the areas of scholarship and creative activity. The Head will specify what additional information and materials, if any, should be included among the documents submitted for this review.
    - b. The Department Head will schedule and hold an annual conference with each faculty member to discuss the previous year's goals and accomplishments and to formulate goals for the coming year.
    - c. The Department Head will document his or her evaluation of each faculty member on the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report. This report will include a narrative describing and discussing the performance of

the faculty member in the areas indicated above and outlining goals for the coming year. The Department Head will also designate on the evaluation report form whether the performance of the faculty member during the period under evaluation the performance of the faculty member during the previous calendar year exceeds expectations for his or her rank, meets expectations for his or her rank, needs improvement for his or her rank, or is unsatisfactory for his or her rank.

d. The Department Head will give the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report to the faculty member, who will review and sign it. At this time, the faculty member may prepare and submit to the Head a written response to the report. If no response is received by the Department Head after two weeks from the date of receipt, the faculty member relinquishes the right to respond. When the annual review is completed, the Head will forward the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report to the Dean, along with any written responses received from the faculty member.

2. Evaluation criteria: While rigorously objective standards for defining what is or is not acceptable performance and what meets or exceeds expectations for each area cannot be set down, the by-laws indicate what general guidelines will be applied in evaluating faculty members in the areas of research, teaching, and service (VI.A.1-11). The Head should also indicate what expectations apply to faculty members in fields where publications and other activities may be less amenable to traditional standards of academic measurement.

H. Tenure and/or promotion review:

1. Definition of tenure: As defined by the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, tenure is a principle that entitles a faculty member to continuation of his or her annual appointment until relinquishment or forfeiture of tenure or until termination of tenure for adequate causes, financial exigency, or academic program discontinuance. Tenure is granted on the basis of a demonstrated record of achievement and the promise of continued excellence. Although reviews are conducted at the department, college, and university levels, tenure at the University of Tennessee is acquired only by positive action of the Board of Trustees. Procedures for tenure and promotion review are the same.

2. Timetables for tenure and/or promotion review: Generally, assistant professors will be considered for promotion to the rank of associate professor at the same time as they are considered for tenure. Generally, associate professors must serve at least five years in rank before promotion to full professor.

3. Tenure and/or promotion materials: A candidate for tenure and/or promotion review will prepare and submit a dossier, *curriculum vitae*, and supporting

materials as evidence of his or her activities in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service. A detailed description of what should be included in the dossier can be found in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, Appendix B. In addition, the Department Head will provide the following attachments to the materials submitted by the faculty member:

- a. letters from external evaluators who have conducted an assessment based on the curriculum vitae and supporting materials such as sample publications. The Head's selection of external evaluators will be informed by discussion with faculty members familiar with the candidate's field of research/scholarship/creative activity;
  - b. previous evaluative reports such as the Annual Recommendation on Retention forms and Faculty Annual Evaluation Reports;
  - c. all statements, reports, summaries, recommendations generated by the departmental review committee and administrators involved in the review process.
4. Composition of departmental review committees: The departmental review committee is comprised of all faculty members eligible to discuss and make a recommendation on the candidate for review. Only tenured faculty members may make recommendations about candidates for tenure. Only faculty members of higher rank than the candidate may make recommendations about promotion.
5. Publication expectations for tenure and/or promotion: The Department normally expects that a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor will have published at least a book or, in the judgment of the evaluator(s), the equivalent thereof. A publication record from the time of tenure/promotion that demonstrates continuing professional accomplishment and ambition in terms of both quality and quantity is expected for promotion to full professor.
6. Departmental procedures for tenure and/or promotion review:
- a. No later than two weeks before the meeting at which a tenure and/or promotion case will be discussed the Department Head will make available to the review committee members all materials submitted by the candidate for tenure and/or promotion review as well as all letters from external reviewers.
  - b. In those cases where a junior faculty member is being considered for tenure and promotion to associate professor, the faculty mentor will summarize the candidate's activities in the realms of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity and service before the formal review discussion.

- c. In keeping with university policy, while the Department Head may attend the discussion of a tenure and/or promotion candidate, he or she shall not participate in the discussion except to clarify issues and assure that proper procedure is followed.
- d. The Department Head will select a representative of the faculty eligible to participate in the review discussion to serve as a recorder of this discussion. The recorder shall summarize the faculty discussion and present a written recommendation and vote to the Head. This recommendation must be available to the candidate and to the departmental faculty review committee so that they may (if they wish) prepare a dissenting statement. This recommendation, the vote, and any dissenting statement become part of the dossier.
- e. After conducting a separate review of the candidate's case for tenure and/or promotion, the Department Head will prepare a letter that provides an independent recommendation. This letter must be made available to the candidate and all voting faculty so that they may (if they wish) prepare a dissenting statement. This statement must be submitted no later than two weeks after receipt of the recommendation. The Head's letter, together with any dissenting statement, becomes part of the dossier.
- f. Any dissenting statements, which may be submitted by faculty members either individually or collectively, must become part of the dossier and must be available to the candidate and Department Head.

#### VIII. APPOINTMENT, EVALUATION, AND PROMOTION OF NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

- A. Appointment: Full-time and part-time lecturers will be interviewed by the Lecturer Hiring Committee and hired in one-year renewable positions with no term-limits. Full-time lecturers will typically have a terminal degree in an appropriate field; all lecturers must have at least a master's degree in an appropriate field. Lecturers are welcome to participate in departmental activities, with the understanding that teaching is their primary responsibility.
- B. Renewal of non-tenure-track faculty: Renewal of lecturer contracts will be based on departmental teaching needs and lecturer evaluations.
- C. Annual evaluation of Lecturer staff: Once a year, every lecturer will be evaluated by the Lecturers Committee. These evaluations will be based on teaching portfolios, including a current *curriculum vitae*; observation by a member of the professorial faculty; student evaluations; sample syllabi and course materials, and a statement of teaching philosophy. The Lecturers Committee is responsible for determining the weight given to these categories and for revising the evaluation criteria.
  - 1. Through their representation on the Lecturers Committee, Lecturers will have a role in any major revision of the criteria and procedures for evaluation.



2. Lecturers may present a formal response to the evaluation to the Lecturer Committee. This response will be included in the lecturer's portfolio.

D. Rank of Distinguished Lecturer.

1. Definition: a Distinguished Lecturer in the English Department has demonstrated excellence in teaching at the rank of full-time Lecturer.
2. Appointment: Distinguished Lecturers receive five-year renewable contracts.
3. A detailed description of the departmental criteria for selecting Distinguished Lecturer nominees is on file in the office of the Department Head.

IX. AMENDMENT

These bylaws may be amended at a meeting of the professorial faculty called especially for that purpose, provided that the proposed amendment has been circulated to all such staff at least two weeks before the meeting. Amendments to the bylaws must be approved by two-thirds of those voting yes or no by secret ballot. In addition, the total number of those voting on the amendment must constitute a majority of those eligible to vote.

Revisions to the bylaws of a more-than-occasional nature should be recommended by a committee appointed specifically for that purpose.

The department will keep a record of all bylaw revisions.

Passed 6 November 2013