

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

As of April 16, 2021

Approved by the faculty of the College of Social Work on August 13, 2015, April 27, 2016, April 11, 2017, November 17, 2017; updated through faculty vote on December 17, 2019; updated through faculty vote on May 11, 2020; updated through faculty vote on April 16, 2021

Policy and Procedures

- o Introduction
- o Organizational Structure
- o BSSW Program
- o MSSW Program
- o DSW Program
- o PhD Program
- o Policies Regarding Faculty
 - + Hiring & Screening
 - + Faculty Mentoring Program
 - + Workload
 - + Annual Performance Evaluation
 - + Criteria for Annual Performance Review for Tenure-Track Faculty
- o Search & Hiring of Clinical Faculty
 - + Annual Review of Clinical Faculty
- o Search & Hiring of Faculty of Practice
 - + Guidelines for Faculty of Practice Promotion
 - + Process for Promotion
 - + Contents of the Dossier
 - + Notification of Candidates during the Process and Candidates Rights to Respond
- o Materials to Submit to the Retention Review Committee
 - + Promotion and Tenure
 - + Tenure and Promotion Process
- o Criteria for Annual Performance and Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty
 - + Process for Promotion
 - + Contents of the Dossier
 - + Notification of Candidates during the Process and Candidates Rights to Respond
- o Guidelines for Faculty of Practice Promotion
 - + Process for Promotion
 - + Contents of the Dossier
 - + Notification of Candidates during the Process and Candidates Rights to Respond
- o Peer Teaching Evaluation Process
- o Policies Regarding Staff (refer to Staff Manual)

Students (refer to Hilltopics and the BSSW-, MSSW-, DSW- and PhD Student Manuals)
 ———+Standards of Professional Conduct

Introduction

This compilation of policies and procedures is a supplement to the Bylaws of the College of Social Work. Its purpose is to provide a ready reference for administrators, faculty, and staff in each of the campuses in regard to those policies and procedures that apply College-wide. The policies and procedures that follow are intended to conform to university policies and the *Faculty Handbook*. If there is variance, university policies and the *Faculty Handbook* take precedence.

Policies and procedures require periodic review and modification. The material is therefore organized to allow for additions and deletions as the College continues to grow, develop and change. Your comments and suggestions are very important in making this manual as useful as possible.

Organizational Structure

The College is a professional school responsible for contributing to both the development and transmission of knowledge about and for the practice of social work. The organizational structure of the College, as well as its policies and procedures, is intended to facilitate the achievement of its mission and goals by:

- Promoting a spirit of collegiality among the members of the faculty and administration;
- Promoting cooperation among the campuses and programs of the College;
- Articulating clearly the roles, responsibilities, and authority of administrators and faculty;
- Providing for the advice and counsel of the faculty in College governance as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*; and,
- Ensuring the authority and responsibility of the faculty in shaping academic programs, admissions criteria, degree requirements, and curriculum.

The executive structure of the College reflects both its goals and its statewide presence. Most committee structures are college wide with representatives from each campus:

- The Administrative committee is advisory to the dean;
- The Faculty Governance committee is advisory to the dean and faculty;
- The Retention, Promotion and Tenure committee is advisory to the dean and faculty;
- The Search and Screen committee is advisory to the dean and faculty; and
- The Committee for Equity and Inclusion is advisory to the dean and faculty.

Other committees within the College include:

- The BSSW-, MSSW-, DSW-, and PhD Program committees is advisory to the dean and faculty;

- Ad Hoc committees appointed by the dean or faculty committees for time-specific tasks.

BSSW Program-a description of the program mission and goals, admissions policy, application, advising, degree requirements, student organization (BSWO), academic and professional conduct, and grievance procedures are located on the CSW website.

MSSW Program-a description of the program mission and goals, admission policy, application, advising, degree requirements, student organization (MSWO), academic and professional conduct, and grievance procedures are located on the CSW website.

DSW Program-a description of the program mission and goals, admission policy, application, degree requirements, student organization (DSW Professional Alliance), academic and professional conduct, and grievance procedures is located on the CSW website.

PhD Program-a description of the program mission and goals, admission policy, application, degree requirements, academic and professional conduct, and grievance procedures is located on the CSW website.

Policies Regarding Faculty

Hiring & Screening

Search committees must follow University policies and procedures for conducting searches. Search Procedure Manuals, advertising and recruiting resources, and Search Procedure Forms may be obtained at the Office of Equity and Diversity website.

For full time tenure-track positions, a college wide search committee, nominated by the faculty and appointed by the dean, is responsible for advertising positions, reviewing applications, arranging campus visits, securing feedback from faculty, and making recommendations, with an analysis of the strengths and limitations of each candidate, to the dean. Appointment will be made by the dean, and subject to the approval of the chancellor.

Lecturers are selected by the appropriate program director in consultation with relevant faculty. Prospective lecturers must submit a current vita and transcripts to the appropriate program director prior to being hired. Continuation as a lecturer is contingent upon need and prior teaching performance as evidenced by student and/or peer evaluations.

Recruiting and Monitoring Lecturers – Procedures

1. BSSW-, MSSW-, DSW-, and PhD- program directors recruit lecturers. As part of this process BSSW-, MSSW-, DSW-, and PhD program directors ask faculty for recommendations for names of potential lecturers.
2. BSSW-, MSSW-, DSW- and PhD- program directors review potential lecturers'

- resumes and meet with potential lecturers, when possible, to determine their suitability
3. Lecturers are assigned a faculty mentor who is teaching or has taught the same course as the lecturer. Faculty mentors assist the lecturer with the development of course outline based on the course syllabus, which is reviewed by the Curriculum committee and voted on by the entire faculty, readings and assignments, make contact with the lecturer, at least once a semester (at mid-term), to discuss the progress of the course, and are available to provide course-related consultation to the lecturer through-out the semester.
 4. BSSW-, MSSW-, DSW-, and PhD- program directors observe the classroom teaching of all new lecturers
 5. BSSW-, MSSW-, DSW-, and PhD- program directors arrange for mid-term evaluations to be conducted for all new lecturers and, also, for returning lecturers, as needed, for the purpose of monitoring and enhancing the instructor's performance. This evaluation includes the administration of a mid-term evaluation instrument, common to all three campuses, to all students enrolled in these classes. This evaluation also includes judgments as to abiding by the rules for the construction of course syllabi and outlines, review of competencies, textbooks and assignments. BSSW-, MSSW-, DSW-, and PhD- program directors involve and ask the judgment of full time-teaching and resident faculty in these judgments. In addition, BSSW-, MSSW, DSW, and PhD- program directors meet with lecturers to discuss these mid-term evaluations shortly after the mid-term evaluations are conducted to allow sufficient time for the lecture to make any needed changes/improvements during the course term. If the results of the initial classroom observation and/or the student mid-term evaluations are negative, the BSSW-, MSSW-, DSW-, and PhD program directors conduct a second class room visit within several weeks of the evaluation meeting.
 6. BSSW-, MSSW-, DSW-, and PhD- program directors ensure that final course evaluations are sent to all BSSW-, MSSW-, DSW-, and PhD- program director along with the faculty, assess the quality of lecturer teaching. As part of this process BSSW-, MSSW-, DSW-, and PhD- program directors will share a summary of the course evaluations for new lecturers, and returning lecturers who received negative evaluations, with the faculty. The BSSW-, MSSW-, DSW-, and PhD- program directors will also share with the faculty any innovative technique/approaches that lecturers may be using in the classroom.
 7. Based upon this assessment the BSSW-, MSSW-, DSW-, and PhD- program directors, in consultation with full-time teaching and resident faculty, make a final decision concerning the re-hiring of the lecturer for future teaching needs.

Faculty Mentoring Program

The purpose of the CSW faculty-mentoring program is to provide ongoing guidance to tenure seeking faculty members as they prepare to meet College and University expectations in the areas of teaching, research and service during their probationary years leading up to promotion and tenure. While the nature of each mentoring relationship may vary, the following are some of the areas of guidance and support that may be offered by a mentor to his or her mentee:

- Reading and providing feedback on annual retention materials;
- Reading and providing feedback on manuscripts, presentations, and grant proposals;
- Providing methodological consultation to help plan for a research project; and
- Answering questions related to teaching.

The mentor-mentee relationship does not imply an expectation of an ongoing co-authoring relationship in terms of manuscripts submitted for publication. It is also important to note that mentors are not “advocates.” The role of mentor at the annual Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) committee meeting is to report on the overall progress of his/her mentee, rather than lobby on behalf of the mentee.

This mentoring program is facilitated by the RPT committee for tenure seeking faculty. Formal mentors should be chosen from among any tenured (non-administrative) faculty for several reasons. First, tenured faculty work within the same expectations of teaching, research and service as tenure seeking faculty. Second, it avoids the creation of a dual relationship that might result from a mentoring relationship where an administrator has authority over the mentee. Third, since only tenured (non-administrative) faculty attend the annual RPT committee meeting, any mentee who is mentored by an administrator or non-tenured faculty member will not have his/her mentor at that meeting to report on his/her overall progress. This is a significant disadvantage that should be avoided.

Formal mentors may be chosen from among the tenured faculty. A tenure seeking faculty member may choose a formal mentor for research and another informal mentor for teaching. While a tenure-seeking faculty member may ask for assistance or guidance from any tenured faculty member on any campus, there should be only one formal mentor.

Procedures for Selecting a Faculty Mentor

- 1) All tenure seeking faculty members are about the faculty mentoring program and the process for selecting a mentor;
- 2) Tenure seeking faculty are encouraged to investigate the research/teaching interests of potential mentors and to speak to potential mentors about their willingness to serve as a mentor;
- 3) Once a tenure seeking faculty member reaches an agreement with a tenured faculty member to enter into a formal mentor-mentee relationship, an e-mail memo is sent to the associate dean, with a copy sent to the dean.
- 4) This formal mentor-mentee relationship should be established within two months from the tenure seeking faculty member’s date of appointment;
- 5) A formal mentor-mentee relationship can be changed at the request of either party at any time during the academic year. The request for a change is made to the associate dean, along with specific documentation.

Faculty Mentoring Program

The purpose of the CSW faculty mentoring program is to provide ongoing guidance to tenure seeking faculty members and to tenured associate professors promoted to associate professor after August 1, 2016.

Tenure-Seeking Faculty

In the normal case, a faculty career begins with appointment as a tenure-track assistant professor for a period of up to six years, during which the faculty member is evaluated for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Faculty may apply to extend the tenure review period beyond six years for reasons related to the faculty member's care-giving responsibilities as described in Chapter 6.41 and the Knoxville Family Care Policy. Requests for extensions should be made prior to the final year of review (Faculty Handbook, Board of Trustees Policy, 2015, p. 15).

The purpose of the CSW faculty-mentoring program for tenure-seeking faculty is to provide ongoing guidance to tenure-seeking faculty members as they prepare to meet College and University expectations in the areas of teaching, research and service during their probationary years leading up to promotion and tenure. While the nature of each mentoring relationship may vary, the following are some of the areas of guidance and support that may be offered by a mentor to his or her mentee:

- Reading and providing feedback on annual retention materials;
- Reading and providing feedback on manuscripts, presentations, and grant proposals;
- Providing methodological consultation to help plan for a research project; and
- Answering questions related to teaching and service responsibilities.

The mentor-mentee relationship does not imply an expectation of an ongoing coauthoring relationship in terms of manuscripts submitted for publication. It is also important to note that mentors are not “advocates.” The role of mentor at the annual Retention, Promotion and Tenure and Promotion (RPT) committee meeting is to report on the overall progress of his/her mentee, rather than advocate for the mentee.

This mentoring program is facilitated by the RPT committee for tenure seeking faculty. Formal mentors should be chosen from among any non-administrative tenured faculty for several reasons. First, non-administrative tenured faculty work within the same expectations of teaching, research and service as tenure seeking faculty. Second, it avoids the creation of a dual relationship that might result from a mentoring relationship where an administrator has authority over the mentee. Third, since only non-administrative tenured faculty attend the annual RTP committee meeting, any mentee who is mentored by an administrator or non-tenured faculty member will not have his/her mentor at that meeting to report on his/her overall progress; this is a significant disadvantage that should be avoided.

Formal mentors may be chosen from among the non-administrative tenured faculty. A tenure seeking faculty member may choose a formal mentor for research and another

informal mentor for teaching. While a tenure seeking faculty member may ask for assistance or guidance from any tenured faculty member on any campus, there should be only one formal mentor.

Procedures for Selecting a Faculty Mentor

- 1) All tenure seeking faculty members should meet with the chair of the RPT committee as soon as possible after being appointed to the faculty to discuss the faculty mentoring program and the process for selecting a mentor;
- 2) Tenure seeking faculty are encouraged to consider the ability of potential mentors to provide guidance in moving toward tenure and promotion to associate professor (e.g., teaching interests and ability, publication rate, publication quality, journal quality, conference quality, citation index, how to promote oneself nationally) and to speak to potential mentors about their willingness to serve as a mentor;
- 3) Once a tenure seeking faculty member reaches an agreement with a tenured faculty member to enter into a formal mentor-mentee relationship, an e-mail memo is sent to the associate dean, with a copy sent to the dean.
- 4) This formal mentor-mentee relationship should be established within two months from the tenure seeking faculty member's date of appointment;
- 5) A formal mentor-mentee relationship can be changed at the request of either party at any time during the academic year. The request for a change is made to the associate dean in writing.

Tenured Associate Professors

Tenured associate professors may be promoted to full professor after at least five years at the rank of associate. All faculty members are expected to achieve a sufficient level of accomplishment in teaching, research / scholarship / creative activity, and service to merit promotion to full professor. Throughout this career path, all faculty members have annual reviews and appropriate reviews for promotion and tenure (Faculty Handbook, Board of Trustees Policy, 2015, p. 15)

The purpose of the CSW faculty-mentoring program for tenured associate professors is to provide ongoing guidance to tenured associate professors as they prepare to meet College and University expectations in the areas of teaching, research and service during the years leading up to promotion to full professor. While the nature of each mentoring relationship may vary, the following are some of the areas of guidance and support that may be offered by a mentor to his or her mentee:

- Reading and providing feedback on annual review materials;
- Providing methodological consultation to help plan for research projects; and
- Providing guidance about how best to achieve and maintain a nationally recognized program of research (e.g., publishing in top tier journals, presenting at high visibility national conferences, belonging to affinity groups such as SSWR and CSWE)

The mentor-mentee relationship does not imply an expectation of an ongoing co-authoring relationship in terms of manuscripts submitted for publication. It is also

important to note that mentors are not “advocates.” The role of mentor at the annual review of associate professors by full professors is to report on the overall progress of his/her mentee, rather than advocate for the mentee.

This mentoring program is facilitated by a subcommittee of the RPT made up of all tenured full professors who are not administrators. Formal mentors should be chosen from among non-administrative tenured full professors for several reasons. First, non-administrative tenured full professors work within the same expectations of teaching, research and service as tenured associate professors. Second, it avoids the creation of a dual relationship that might result from a mentoring relationship where an administrator has authority over the mentee. Third, since only non-administrative tenured full professors attend the RPT full professor subcommittee meeting, any mentee who is mentored by an administrator or tenured associate professor will not have his/her mentor at that meeting to report on his/her overall progress; this is a significant disadvantage that should be avoided.

Formal mentors may be chosen from among the non-administrative tenured full professor faculty. A newly tenured associate professor may choose a formal mentor for research and another informal mentor for teaching. While tenured associate professors may ask for assistance or guidance from any tenured full professor on any campus, there should be only one formal mentor.

Procedures for Selecting a Faculty Mentor

- 1) All associate professors should meet with the chair of the RPT committee as soon as possible after promotion to discuss the faculty mentoring program and the process for selecting a mentor;
- 2) Newly tenured associate professors are encouraged to consider the ability of potential mentors to provide guidance in moving toward promotion to full professor (e.g., publication rate, publication quality, journal quality, conference quality, citation index, how to promote oneself nationally) and to speak to potential mentors about their willingness to serve as a mentor;
- 3) Once a newly tenured associate professor reaches an agreement with a tenured faculty member to enter into a formal mentor-mentee relationship, an e-mail memo is sent to the associate dean, with a copy sent to the dean.
- 4) This formal mentor-mentee relationship should be established within two months from the date of appointment to associate professor with tenure;
- 5) A formal mentor-mentee relationship can be changed at the request of either party at any time during the academic year. The request for a change is made to the associate dean in writing.

Workload

I. Background

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville College of Social Work (UT-CSW) Faculty Governance Committee (FGC) undertook the task of drafting a written workload

distribution policy during the AY 2019-2020. As part of this process, committee members sought examples from aspirational and peer institutions, as well as feedback from the full faculty and administration. The goal is to produce a **consistent, equitable, flexible, and transparent** workload distribution policy that provides a standard for annual review of work performance for the entire faculty. The following policy proposal articulates a workload distribution for faculty and specifies activities and percentage of work time that counts towards annual workload.

II. Annual workload distribution

- i. Non-Tenure Track (NTT): The academic workload distribution policy for a twelve-month NTT faculty member is comprised of teaching and service activities. Scholarship can be included as part of NTT faculty workload annually through a negotiable agreement with administration.;
- ii. Tenured/Tenure Track (T/TT): Nine-month T/TT faculty workload is underpinned by scholarship, teaching, and service (see Section III for definition of workload components). Workload across scholarship, teaching, and service differs by faculty member rank and position, and T/TT faculty members may negotiate a differential workload annually.

Table 1 provides **baseline** expectations for work productivity based on rank, activity, and/or position. Annual performance is based on extent to which an individual faculty member fulfills and/or exceeds his or her annual workload distribution.

Table 1. Differential NTT and T/TT Faculty Baseline Workload Distributions

	Scholarship	Teaching	Service
NTT Faculty (12 mo)	0-10%	75%	15%-25%
TT Assistant Professor (9 mo)	55%	35%	10%
TT Associate Professor (9 mo)	50%	37.5%	12.5%
TT Professor (9 mo)	40%	40%	20%

Faculty members' workloads are based on percentages that are calculated according to either a 12-month or 9-month appointments. Percentages are, therefore, calculated by the number of months. For example, 20% of annual time for service equals 2.4 months for a NTT faculty member and 1.8 months for a T/TT faculty member.

III. Definition of work components

Scholarship, teaching, and service, and representative activities, are defined according to the University of Tennessee, Knoxville Faculty Handbook, as well as the College's discipline-specific expectations. The baseline weight for major activities is also provided. Table 3 provides examples of activities included under each component. The definitions given below and the activities listed in Table 3 are *not* intended, *in any way*, to be exhaustive; rather they provide a broad overview of activities that are counted towards each of the work components.

Faculty are encouraged to individualize their workloads based on their unique scholarly agendas, teaching strengths and resources, and opportunities for service. Moreover, as

faculty members innovate or pursue emerging opportunities, they may engage in new activities that are not reflected in this document. At the time of annual review, faculty members are encouraged to explain their work activities throughout the preceding year, and how unique work activities may fit into one of the below categories, as well as the significance/impact/weight of work activities.

In addition, the workload activities listed in Table 3 reflect formal activities. Many faculty members engage in informal activities in order to support the college, university, and discipline (e.g., visiting candidate transportation or meals, reviewing a doctoral student's paper for publication, etc.). Faculty members may explain these informal activities at the time of annual review to support their argument for potentially exceeding minimum expectations.

1) Scholarship: one (1) published journal article or submitted external funding application, representing **10%** of a faculty member's time.

Section 2.2.3 of the Faculty Handbook describes scholarship as making "intellectual and creative contributions through the scholarship of discovery and application, both within and across disciplines". The CSW recognizes that early and mid-career faculty should be highly engaged in scholarship as they work toward promotion. Therefore, scholarship loads are higher at these ranks, *in general*. While a refereed journal article, with the faculty member as a primary author, or an external funding proposal are common scholarly activities, the CSW values and recognizes a broad array of activities, including community-based and engaged scholarship with community-impact, as well, as interdisciplinary collaborations that result in new technologies or innovations within the discipline and practice. Examples of activities include, *but are not limited to*, securing funding, conducting original scholarship, disseminating scholarship, and engaging in community-based outreach and engagement, fostering interdisciplinary collaborations, and developing new technologies (e.g., software and hardware innovations).

2) Teaching: one (1), 3-credit-hour course, representing **7.5%** of a faculty member's time.

The CSW defines the standard teaching load for T/TT faculty members as **four (4), 3-hour courses per year**, or **30%** of a T/TT faculty member's time. This calculation stems from Section 3.7 of the Faculty Handbook, which defines a full-time teaching load for a T/TT faculty member as 12 credit hours *per semester* or four (4), 3-hour courses (including both face-to-face and online). T/TT faculty are nine-month employees across the fall and spring academic semesters, resulting in a standard teaching load of eight (8) courses per years. The teaching load is adjusted, however, to allow faculty to devote adequate time to scholarship (as emphasized in Section 2.2.1 of the Faculty Handbook).

The CSW further defines the standard teaching load for NTT faculty members as **ten (10), 3-hour courses per year**, or **75%** of an NTT faculty member's time.

Additional teaching activities, as defined by Section 2.2.2 of the Faculty Handbook, include, *but are not limited to*, student advising, serving on thesis, dissertation, and capstone committees, pedagogical innovation, and new course development.

3) Service: for example, serving on one college or university committee representing 2.5% of a faculty member's time.

Section 2.2.5 of the Faculty Handbook recognizes service as participation in college and university governance, disciplinary leadership, and community contributions. This may include, *but is not limited to*, serving on committees, editorial boards, and disciplinary and community organization boards.

Table 2. Work Component Anchor Activities, Weights, and Additional Activities

Research Anchor Activities	Weight
Active research management and implementation (data collection, IRB, etc.)	10-20%
Book author (first, co-author, editor)	10-15%
Funding application	5-15%
Refereed journal article (main contributing author)	10%
Grant-funded research administration (budgets, reporting, etc.)	5-10%
Refereed journal article (supporting/mentor author)	5-7%
Book chapter	5%
Scholarly conference presentation	2.5%
Additional Research Activities	
Community-engaged scholarship App or new technology design/creation Media dissemination of research (e.g., podcasts, op-eds, interviews) Political testimony regarding scholarship Program evaluations (with clear scholarly implications) Trainings based on translating evidence to practice Journal special issue editor	
Teaching Anchor Activities	Weight
One 3-hour course	7.5%
3 credit hours of field	7.5%
New course development	7.5%
Course revisions to new format (e.g., face-to-face to online) or significant revision	7.5%
Professional outreach for field	5-10%
Dissertation chair	5%

Capstone chair (per student)	3-5%
Comprehensive exam coordination and implementation	3-5%
Additional structured student advising/mentorship (e.g., dissertation/thesis committee member, group advising)	2.5-5%
Field supervision (per student)	2.5%
Additional Teaching Activities	
Course disability adaptation Service-learning Study abroad Establishing new field sites Maintaining current field sites Independent study supervision TA/GRA supervision Portfolio grading Professional development related to teaching or field pedagogy	
Service Anchor Activities	Weight
College, university, or community committee board chair	5-7.5%
College, university, or community committee board membership	2.5-5%
Additional Service Activities	
Additional community service (ad hoc event planning, etc.) Additional discipline-based service (ad hoc committee, event, etc.) Extracurricular student organization advising Faculty mentorship Textbook review University-based funding proposal review Certificate program chair Certificate committee member Community consultation/training on areas of expertise Reviewing conference abstracts Licensing board member	

Annual Performance Evaluation

The University of Tennessee requires annual performance evaluations of all faculty. The evaluation year is defined as the calendar rather than the academic year. Materials for review are to be submitted to the associate dean and evaluation conferences are to be scheduled during the spring semester. All evaluations are then submitted to the dean. Additional information may be found in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* at the Provost's website.

Materials for review may include the following required documents (Items 1 and 2) from the previous calendar year. Items 3–7 are optional.

1. A completed "Faculty Activity Form" with a brief statement describing goals for the next calendar year and a description of present and future research and

- professional agenda;
- 2. An updated vita;
- 3. Syllabi (including course outline, assignments, and bibliography) for courses taught;
- 4. All student evaluations for all courses taught during the academic year;
- 5. A copy of manuscripts submitted for publication;
- 6. A copy of all abstracts submitted for conference presentations;
- 7. A copy of all submitted grant proposals.

The dean is responsible for scheduling and conducting an evaluation session with faculty members. The dean will be responsible for faculty evaluations. The associate dean will be responsible for program director evaluations. The associate dean will ask program directors to submit written data (1-2 paragraphs or so) related to the faculty's member teaching and/or performance on committees in that program. The faculty member and dean will discuss and consider this information during the evaluation meeting. Faculty can review a copy of the dean's completed evaluation online.

If a faculty member disagrees with any part of the evaluation, she/he should first discuss it with the associate dean. If the situation is not resolved, the faculty member may communicate in writing the basis for the disagreement to the dean, with a copy of the statement to the associate dean.

Criteria for Annual Performance Review for Tenure-Track Faculty

A faculty member's performance **exceeds expectations for rank** based on the following criteria:

Research and scholarship, and national and international recognition as evidenced by for instance:

- 1. Publications in high quality journals;
- 2. Presentations at high visibility national or international social work conferences;
- 3. Congressional testimony; and,
- 4. Receipt of external funding.

Accomplished teaching evidenced by:

- 1. High level on all teaching evaluations; and,
- 2. Development of high-quality teaching materials incorporating information technology or other mutually recognized teaching innovations.

Service to the institution, community, state, or nation evidenced by:

- 1. High profile recognition of service; and,
- 2. Demonstrated impact of the service.

A faculty member's performance **meets expectations for rank** based on the following criteria:

Professors are expected to:

1. Be accomplished teachers;
2. Have achieved a nationally recognized scholarly or creative professional record;
3. Have participated significantly in the professional work of the discipline in ways other than teaching and research; and,
4. Have shown beyond doubt that they can work well 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;
3. Have a recognized scholarly or creative professional record for the year;
4. Have participated with promise in the professional work of the discipline in ways other than teaching and research; and,
5. Have demonstrated clearly that they can work well 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 and scholars, and to have begun a definite program of research or creative professional work; and,
3. Show evidence that they can work well with colleagues and students.

Criteria for **needs improvement for rank** are as follows:

Research and scholarship – Insufficient scholarly activity based on agreed upon faculty goals for the year.

Teaching – Teaching evaluations that, overall, are not at the level of “Good” on the UT teaching evaluation instruments; multiple items on teaching evaluations in the fair, poor, and very poor range.

Service – Insufficient service to the College, University, or community.

A faculty member’s **unsatisfactory performance for rank** is based on the following criteria:

Research and scholarship – An absence of research and scholarship;

Teaching – Overall poor teaching evaluations;

Service – A marked deficiency or absence of service to the College, University, or community.

1. Evaluations of teaching will occur prior to or at the time of the third-year review for tenure seeking faculty, in the fifth year prior to review for promotion and tenure, and

within one year of application for promotion to full professor. Assistant Professors in the first year of teaching should work with their faculty mentors to produce a statement of teaching philosophy and teaching goals. It is recommended that mentors review syllabi, Canvas sites, and other class materials at least once in the first year and then visit one class. This “pre-review” is for the purpose of assisting the Assistant Professor in developing his or her teaching skills and is not for the purpose of evaluation.

2. Responsibility for the organization and documentation of peer teaching evaluations will rest with the chair of the Retention Promotion and Tenure committee (RPT). The chair of the RPT committee will create a peer review team consisting of two tenured faculty members for each faculty member requiring peer teaching evaluation that year. The faculty member selects one member and the RPT chair, in consultation with the RPT committee, selects the other member. Preference will be given to selecting reviewers from the faculty member’s campus and area of teaching. The selection of peer review team will be completed by August 30 of the academic year in which the review will occur. (Assistant Professors will be reviewed by Associate or full Professors; faculty seeking promotion to Professor must be reviewed by peers of that rank.)

3. The faculty member will work with his or her peer review team to produce a self-assessment that includes teaching goals, methods for achieving these goals, and plans for achieving teaching excellence.

4. The faculty member and his/her peer review team should meet at least once to go over the faculty member’s syllabi, class materials, assignments, Canvas site, grade distributions, class evaluations, and any other supporting materials that either the peer review team or faculty member believes to be pertinent. In addition, at least one member of the peer review team must visit at least one of the faculty member’s classes.

5. By the end of the semester, the peer review team will produce a written report discussing the strengths and areas for improvement of teaching by the faculty member. The faculty member and the peer review team will keep a copy of the final report. The peer review team will send the RPT chair a copy of the final report.

Enhanced Retention Review of Tenure-Track Faculty

Schedule for retention reviews. Each tenure-track faculty member with a probationary period of three (3) or more years shall undergo an enhanced retention review in the academic year following the midpoint in his or her probationary period (typically, initiated at the start of the faculty member’s fourth year of employment).

It will be the faculty member’s responsibility to prepare and submit the required materials. All faculty members are notified of annual review and tenure guidelines at the time of initial employment. Faculty members will be notified again by the chair of the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Committee of the upcoming Enhanced Retention Review process in the year prior to and at the start of the academic year for the Enhanced Retention Review.

In the year in which an enhanced retention review occurs, the faculty member shall, with the guidance and counsel of the RPT chair, prepare and upload to Elements (for distribution to the tenured faculty) a single pdf file containing her or his cumulative performance, reflecting her or his degree of progress in satisfying the requirements for tenure in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service.

The file (which shall be prepared by the faculty member as a preliminary draft of the faculty member's file in support of a tenure dossier) shall contain:

1. The faculty member's Faculty Activity and Accomplishments Reports for each prior year submitted to the department head
2. Annual Retention Reports compiled during the faculty member's probationary period
3. Teaching materials, including:
 - a. Computer-tabulated teaching evaluations – The full summary page for each course in each semester prior to the Enhanced Retention Review year
 - b. All syllabi from previous academic year
 - c. A teaching statement prepared by the faculty member describing activities related to teaching, innovations, pedagogical training, accomplishments, awards, etc.
 - d. Peer Review of Teaching Evaluation Report (RPT Chair will be responsible for assisting the faculty member in completing this peer evaluation in advance of the Enhanced Retention Review year.)
4. Scholarship materials, including:
 - a. Copies of research and scholarship published or otherwise completed during the probationary period
 - b. A scholarship statement prepared by the faculty member describing research and scholarship activities in progress, specific accomplishments, and other activities
5. A service statement prepared by the faculty member describing his or her service to the department, college, university, and other relevant constituencies

Cumulative Review

Cumulative performance reviews for tenured faculty are triggered by unsatisfactory evaluations from annual reviews. Faculty members whose performance is found to be "unsatisfactory" in two out of five consecutive years or whose evaluations are any combination of "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory" in any three of five consecutive years undergo cumulative performance review. Procedures for cumulative reviews are provided in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* located on the Provost's website.

Retention Review

An annual retention review is required of all tenure-seeking faculty. This is a comprehensive assessment of the faculty member's progress toward tenure. In part, its purpose is to provide early feedback to tenure-seeking faculty in order to allow them to address any problems that may threaten their eventual promotion and tenure.

Material to be Submitted to the Retention Review Committee

At the time listed on the CSW College calendar, probationary faculty members are responsible for providing updated information and documentation of accomplishments to the associate dean. The period to be covered in the retention review is the previous calendar year. Material for review should include the following:

1. A syllabus (including course outline, assignments, and bibliography) for each course taught during the previous calendar year;
2. Complete reports of University-administered student evaluations for each course taught during the previous calendar year (other course evaluations may also be submitted);
3. A copy of research or scholarly work submitted for publication or conference presentation;
4. A brief statement (3-4 sentence paragraph) summarizing the focus of research activities;
5. A completed "Faculty Activity Form" covering the previous calendar year; and
6. An updated vita.

Procedure for the Retention Review Process

1. Each year, until the sixth year when application for tenure is submitted, probationary faculty will submit to the associate dean the materials listed above. (An exception to this procedure: in their first year of employment, new faculty need only submit an up-to-date vita.).
2. Copies of the tenured faculty's previous yearly review reports for all probationary faculty will be available for reference by the committee. These reports will be provided by the dean's office. The dean's office also will inform the tenured faculty of any non-standard agreements, such as early tenure consideration, made with each probationary faculty member at the time of appointment.
3. The tenured faculty of the college will meet by the last Friday in January to discuss these materials.
4. The tenured faculty will elect their chair as the first order of business at the RPT meeting. That chair will serve the RPT for the next year.
5. Each probationary faculty member's mentor will prepare and present a brief oral summary of the individual's activities and accomplishments for the previous year based on the material provided by the probationary faculty member. If the mentor cannot attend this meeting it is his or her responsibility to arrange, in consultation with the mentee, for another member of the committee to present the summary.
6. The tenured faculty considers all the materials and takes a vote on recommendation for continuation of each probationary faculty member. The recommendations are in the form of reports that are drafted by individual members with feedback and guidance from the full committee. The final product is the product of the entire committee.
7. No later than two weeks after the annual meeting of the committee, the committee chair submits the reports and the committee's vote to the associate dean who evaluates each probationary faculty member.

8. No later than four weeks after the annual meeting of the tenured faculty, each administrator meets with his or her probationary faculty members for the annual review. During the review, the faculty member is advised as to his/her progress in the areas of teaching, research, creative and/or scholarly achievements, and service. This is to include the recommendations from the tenured faculty committee. The administrator will at this time provide the probationary faculty member a copy of the tenured faculty's original assessment and recommendations for the probationary faculty member.

9. The associate dean prepares his or her evaluation, which should include guidance to the probationary faculty member on ways to improve performance, and a description of the probationary faculty member's strengths, weaknesses, and areas of concern. Additionally, the evaluation should record the general nature of the review and the date of transmission to the faculty member.

10. The associate dean completes the form "Annual Recommendation on Retention of Probationary Faculty", which records the faculty vote, the administrator's recommendation, and a copy of the evaluation. The form is signed by the associate dean and the faculty member who receives a copy of the form.

11. These materials are then forwarded to dean of the college for his or her recommendation by the second Friday in April.

12. The dean is responsible for reviewing the evaluation and submits his/her recommendation for retention or non-retention to the office of the Chancellor.

13. If the annual review of the probationary faculty member is for non-retention, consult the Faculty Evaluation Handbook regarding the time frames to be observed.

Promotion and Tenure

Membership of tenured faculty on the College Promotion and Tenure committee is consonant with University policy and is described in the Bylaws.

The review for tenure takes place in the time frame and year agreed upon at the time of the faculty member's employment. Under exceptional circumstances, faculty may make a request to the dean for early tenure review. While a request for early tenure review does not require approval of the tenured faculty of the campus, the candidate normally discusses an early review with his/her program director and reviews previous annual retention reviews and his/her progress in meeting recommendations contained in them before making a request to the dean. Should the review of the Promotion and Tenure committee for an early award of tenure be negative, the faculty member will automatically be reviewed in the time frame specified in his/her letter of appointment.

Tenure and Promotion Process

During the fall semester of their 6th year (unless an early tenure date is approved), the faculty member prepares a dossier of his/her accomplishments in accordance with the format in the UT Manual for Faculty Evaluation. The associate dean writes his or her summary and recommendation, which becomes part of the record. The dossier is then reviewed by all tenured faculty. The tenured faculty meets to vote on tenure and promotion by the last Friday in January. The dossier and all the reports are then reviewed by the dean of the college; who makes his/her recommendation to the Vice-Provost of Academic Affairs and Provost. After administrative review the final

recommendation goes to the UT Board of Trustees for final action.

Recommendation for Promotion: Consideration for promotion is separate and apart from consideration for the award of tenure. Normally, promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor is voted upon in the same meeting in which tenure is reviewed.

Search and Hiring of Clinical Faculty

The search for a candidate to fill an open clinical faculty position shall be undertaken by the Search and Screen committee. For the purpose of a clinical faculty search the dean shall appoint at least one Clinical Faculty, if available, as a member to the existing Search and Screen committee. The candidate will meet with faculty, the program director and will present a college-wide colloquium to demonstrate his/her teaching ability and knowledge. The faculty shall evaluate each candidate. Results of the faculty evaluation shall be made to the dean who will make the final hiring decision.

The primary criteria to be considered for the hiring of clinical faculty are:

- A PhD in Social Work or closely related field or a DSW.
- Multiple years of clinical experience.
- Demonstration of excellent abilities as an instructor, trainer, and/or public speaker.
- The ability to teach at the DSW level and demonstrated mastery to teach clinical course content.

Annual Review of Clinical Faculty

The performance of all non-tenure-track faculty members will be evaluated annually, with a written record of the evaluation maintained in departmental and human resources files. In the case of non-retention, every effort should be made to notify the faculty member as soon as possible.

Process of Evaluation

An annual evaluation of Clinical Faculty will be conducted by the dean. The clinical faculty shall submit a dossier containing information concerning the following:

A. Teaching Ability and Effectiveness

The material in this section should document clearly the candidate's teaching ability and effectiveness. This section contains the following statements and information arranged in the order given.

1. A statement by the candidate of his/her teaching philosophy and its implementation
2. A list of courses taught for each term or semester of instruction with enrollments in each course
 - a. A list of advising responsibilities for the period should be included.
3. A concise compilation of results of student evaluation or documented evaluation of candidate's programs, activities, and skills; and of the grade distributions for courses taught

4. A report from a peer evaluation of teaching and any other faculty input concerning the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, including any statements from colleagues who have visited the candidate's classroom for the purpose of evaluating his/her teaching, or who are in good position to evaluate fairly and effectively if available.
5. Internal letters about teaching effectiveness should be included in this section.
6. Other indicators of quality. The dossier may contain the following indicators of quality as appropriate:
 - a. Any statements from administrators which attest to the candidate's teaching and advising effectiveness;
 - b. Other documentation of evidence of teaching and advising effectiveness (e.g., performance of students any honors and awards received for teaching; any evidence of expertise or experience in international or intercultural activities).
 - c. Evidence of service to campus, college and community, if available
 - d. Publications and presentations at conferences, if available

*The above policy is taken from the UTK Clinical Faculty Promotion Guidelines. Sections specific to the College of Social Work have been added in accordance with the university guidelines.

Search and Hiring of Faculty of Practice

The search for a candidate to fill an open Faculty of Practice position shall be undertaken by the Search and Screen committee. For the purpose of a Faculty of Practice search the dean shall appoint at least one Faculty of Practice, if available, as a member to the existing Search and Screen committee. The candidate will meet with faculty, the associate dean and will present a college wide colloquium to demonstrate his/her teaching ability and knowledge. The faculty shall evaluate each candidate. Results of the faculty evaluation shall be made to the dean who will make the final hiring decision.

The primary criteria to be considered for the hiring of Faculty of Practice are:

- An MSSW or higher degree in the field of Social Work. Related fields may be considered with special approval from the dean.
- At least two years employed experience in the field of social work.
- Demonstration of excellent abilities as an instructor, trainer, and/or public speaker.
- The ability to demonstrate mastery of the topics in the courses the Instructor would be required to teach.

Annual Review of Faculty of Practice

The performance of all non-tenure-track faculty members will be evaluated annually,

with a written record of the evaluation maintained in departmental and human resources files. In the case of non-retention, every effort should be made to notify the faculty member as soon as possible.

Process of Evaluation

An annual evaluation of Faculty of Practice will be conducted by the dean. The Faculty of Practice shall submit a dossier containing information concerning the following:

B. Teaching Ability and Effectiveness

The material in this section should document clearly the candidate's teaching ability and effectiveness. This section contains the following statements and information arranged in the order given.

7. A statement by the candidate of his/her teaching philosophy and its implementation
8. A list of courses taught for each term or semester of instruction with enrollments in each course
 - a. honors courses should be identified separately
 - b. a list of advising responsibilities for the period should be included.
9. A concise compilation of results of student evaluation or documented evaluation of candidate's programs, activities, and skills; and of the grade distributions for courses taught
10. A report from a peer evaluation of teaching and any other faculty input concerning the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, including any statements from colleagues who have visited the candidate's classroom for the purpose of evaluating his/her teaching, or who are in good position to evaluate fairly and effectively if available
11. Internal letters about teaching effectiveness should be included in this section.
12. Other indicators of quality. The dossier may contain the following indicators of quality as appropriate:
 - a. any statements from administrators which attest to the candidate's teaching and advising effectiveness;
 - b. other documentation of evidence of teaching and advising effectiveness (e.g., performance of students any honors and awards received for teaching; any evidence of expertise or experience in international or intercultural activities).
 - c. Evidence of service to campus, college and community, if available
 - d. Publications and presentations at conferences, if available

*The above policy is taken from the UTK Faculty of Practice Promotion Guidelines. Sections specific to the College of Social Work have been added in accordance with the university guidelines.

Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty

a) Guidelines for Non-Tenure Track faculty promotion

This section describes the promotion process for non-tenure-track faculty employed by the College of Social Work as Faculty of Practice or Clinical Faculty on a full-time basis. This promotion process enables these faculty members to move forward to attain the ranks of Associate Faculty of Practice, Associate Clinical Faculty, Full Faculty of Practice or Full Clinical Faculty in accordance with the candidate's qualifications and accomplishments.

Following the guidelines proposed by the Faculty senate and passed by the UT Board of Trustees, these promotions will take place typically after a minimum of five years of service for promotion to Associate Professor of Practice and a minimum of three years for Full Professor of Practice. Only continuous full-time Faculty of Practice will be eligible for these promotions.

The promotion process is neither a requirement of continued employment nor is it an entitlement for years of service or meeting minimal standards. These promotions will be awarded based upon evidence of:

- 1) Exceptional merit (consistently exceeding performance expectations),
- 2) Continued professional development, and
- 3) Contribution to the college and beyond within the faculty member's assigned role.
- 4) Service to the institution, discipline and community

A Career Ladder for Faculty of Practice

Faculty of Practice and Clinical Faculty are hired principally to teach, so excellence in teaching and/or learning is required. Excellent teaching is exhibited in a variety of ways including engaging students in the learning process, incorporating collaborative and experiential learning experiences, the ability to facilitate student learning, course content and scope, rigor, test construction and depth of knowledge expected on examinations, and scope and quality of learning and evaluation activities.

Assistant Professor of Practice Rank

The initial hire for a Faculty of Practice position would typically be at the rank of Assistant Professor of Practice. A Faculty of Practice may stay at this level for an indefinite period of time on renewable, one-year contracts. The primary criterion to be considered for appointment at this rank is:

- An MSSW or higher degree in the field of Social Work. Related fields may be considered with special approval from the dean.
- At least two years employed experience in the field of social work
- Demonstration of excellent abilities as an instructor, trainer, and/or public speaker.
- The ability to demonstrate mastery of the topics in the courses the Assistant Professor of Practice would be required to teach.

Assistant Clinical Faculty

The initial hire for a clinical faculty position would typically be at the rank of Assistant Clinical Faculty. A clinical faculty may stay at this level for an indefinite period of time on renewable, one-year contracts. The primary criterion to be considered for appointment at this rank is:

- A PhD in Social Work or closely related field or a DSW.
- Multiple years of clinical experience.
- Demonstration of excellent abilities as a clinical instructor, and/or trainer.
- The ability to teach at both the MSSW or DSW levels and demonstrated mastery to teach clinical course content.

Associate Professor of Practice Rank

Typically, after a minimum of five years as an Assistant Faculty of Practice, exceptional faculty members would be eligible to be promoted to the position of Associate Professor of Practice. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor of Practice may be accompanied by a renewable contract of up to three years. The main criterion for promotion to Associate Professor of Practice would be:

- Demonstration of distinction in teaching of courses as evidenced by student evaluations, associate dean evaluations and peer evaluations, and by other relevant evidence.
- Exceptional merit (consistently exceeding performance expectations),
- Continued professional development,
- Contribution to the college and beyond within the faculty member's assigned role, and
- Service to the institution, discipline and community.

Associate Clinical Professor Rank

Individuals holding such positions have demonstrated clinical and teaching abilities consistent with those for appointment at the rank of Associate Clinical Professor.

Typically, after a minimum of five years as an Assistant Clinical Professor, exceptional faculty members would be eligible to be promoted to the position of Associate Clinical Professor. Promotion to the rank of Associate Clinical Professor may be accompanied by a renewable contract of up to three years.

The main criterion for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor would be:

- Demonstration of distinction in teaching of courses as evidenced by student evaluations, associate dean evaluations and peer evaluations, and by other relevant evidence.
- Exceptional merit (consistently exceeding performance expectations),
- Continued professional development,
- Contribution to the college, and beyond within the faculty member's assigned role, and
- Service to the institution, discipline and community.

Full Faculty of Practice Rank

Associate Professor of Practice who have demonstrated outstanding achievement in two or more of the areas and have demonstrated ongoing distinction in teaching since their promotion to Associate Professor of Practice

may be promoted to the position of Full Faculty of Practice. The time frame for this promotion would be flexible, but a three- to five-year term as an Associate Professor of Practice would typically be expected before initiating the promotion process. Promotion to the rank of Full Faculty of Practice may be accompanied by a renewable contract of up to five years.

Full Clinical Professor Rank

Associate Clinical Faculty who have demonstrated outstanding achievement in two or more of the areas and have demonstrated ongoing distinction in teaching since their promotion to Associate Clinical Professor may be promoted to the position of Full Clinical Professor. The time frame for this promotion would be flexible, but a three-to-five year term as an Associate Clinical Faculty would typically be expected before initiating the promotion process. Promotion to the rank of Full Clinical Professor may be accompanied by a renewable contract of up to five years.

Examples of evidence used to determine ongoing distinction may include:

- Professional development
- Exemplary teaching in face-to-face and/or online environments
- Exemplary development of new courses, instructional materials, and syllabi, and new/revised curricular development
- Mentoring and training others (e.g. faculty, doctoral students)
- Service to institution, discipline and /or community
- Conscientious and effective advising and/ or mentoring of students
- Awards or other recognition for teaching
- Conscientious and effective administration or service
- Scholarly or creative work in the scholarship of teaching as well as in the discipline
- Incorporating collaborative and experiential learning experiences, the ability to facilitate student learning, course content and scope, rigor, test construction and depth of depth of knowledge expected on examinations, and scope and quality of learning and evaluation activities.

b) Process for the promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty

The annual evaluation process will form the basis for the promotion process and will focus on the specific duties assigned to the faculty member. Non-tenure track faculty are hired principally to teach, and the annual evaluation and promotion processes must focus on establishing that the individual has an exceptional record of teaching based upon multiple sources. The faculty member's responsibilities and contributions will include service and may include research/creative work that should be evaluated where appropriate.

An adequate evaluation of a promotion candidate's qualifications and professional contributions requires the academic judgment of both the candidate's faculty colleagues and the associate dean.

College Level Review and Recommendation

- 1) The Faculty of Practice/Clinical Faculty and dean or designee should discuss promotion as part of the annual performance review, well in advance of the suggested dates for submission of the application of promotion in order to give the candidate sufficient time to gather the required materials and assemble the dossier.
- 2) The promotion process begins when a dossier is submitted for consideration for promotion to Associate or Full Professor of Practice/Clinical Faculty to the associate dean.
- 3) A Non-Tenure track faculty member's application for promotion will be considered by the Non-Tenure Track Faculty promotion committee at its annual meeting for promotion. Current NTT faculty at or above the position to which the applicant is seeking promotion shall be included as members of the NTT Faculty promotion committee for the purpose of the promotion consideration. The mentor of the NTT faculty member up for promotion shall present the NTT Faculty member going up for promotion to the NTT Faculty promotion committee. The NTT Faculty promotion committee shall review the NTT Faculty member's materials and record a vote in favor or against promotion by two-thirds vote. The vote of the departmentally designated faculty group is advisory to the dean.
- 4) The NTT faculty promotion committee chair will submit the committee's decisions regarding promotion to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, who will review and forward the recommendation to the dean;
- 5) After making an independent judgment on the promotion candidacy, the dean shall either:
 - 1) Forward a positive written recommendation to the Provost, OR
 - 2) Notify the candidate in writing that the college declines to recommend promotion
- 6) Any candidate not recommended for promotion by the college may appeal that decision to the Provost.

Campus Level Review and Final Promotion Decision.

- 1) The Provost reviews recommendations forwarded by the dean and serves as the final decision maker regarding promotion to Associate/Full Professor of Practice or Associate/Full Clinical Faculty.
- 2) The Provost notifies the successful and unsuccessful candidates in writing of his/her decision regarding promotion.
- 3) Any unsuccessful promotion candidate may appeal the Provost's negative decision to the Chancellor.

c) Contents of the Dossier

The candidate will work with their mentor to assemble a promotion dossier according to the guidelines outlined in section B of the University Faculty Handbook: <https://facultyhandbook.utk.edu/appendices-2/evaluation-and-promotion-of-non-tenure-track-faculty/>. Dossiers must be consistent with the requirements outlined in the handbook.

d) Notification of Candidates during the Process and Candidate rights to Respond

- Candidates will be notified upon completion of review at each level (college, provost).
- A candidate whose application for promotion is denied will be provided a written explanation of the grounds for the denial at the time of notification.
- Promotion applications that are not approved will not be forwarded to the next level of review unless the candidate writes a written appeal to the next level requesting further review within ten working days of the date of the written notification of a negative promotion decision.
- A candidate has a right to submit a written response to each level of review, whether the recommendation is positive or negative. The response must be delivered within ten working days of notification. The response will become part of the candidate's dossier and must be available to the departmentally designated review committee, the department head, the college review committee (if applicable), the dean, and the chief academic officer.
- Candidates not recommended for promotion must wait one academic year before resubmitting the application. Resubmission can occur only with the consent of the department head, which will consult with the departmentally designated review committee.
- **The promotion review will take place at the annual meeting of the Non-Tenure Track Promotion Committee. The above policy is taken from the UTK Faculty of Practice Promotion guidelines.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The purpose of this document is to facilitate the implementation of the peer teaching review policy developed by the faculty of the College of Social Work in consultation with the administration of the College. This process models itself on the Faculty Senate Resource Manual (2012) (formerly known as Best Practices, 2011) and which is now part of the UTK Manual for Faculty Evaluation. The UTK Manual for Faculty Evaluation states that, "Department bylaws should address the process of peer assessment of teaching" (p. 4).

Tenure-track faculty

Assistant professors in the first year of teaching should work with their faculty mentors to produce a statement of teaching philosophy and teaching goals. It is recommended that mentors review syllabi, Canvas sites, and other class materials at least once in the first year and then visit one class. This "pre-review" is for the purpose of assisting the Assistant Professor in developing his or her teaching skills and is not for the purpose of evaluation.

For tenure-seeking faculty peer evaluations of teaching will occur prior to the third-year review and in the fifth year prior to review for promotion and tenure.

Tenured faculty peer evaluation of teaching will occur within one year of application for promotion to full professor. The Peer Evaluation Teaching Guide (p. 2) recommends this review take place by the third year at the Associate rank and once every five years after that.

Non-tenure track faculty

For non-tenure seeking faculty peer evaluations of teaching will occur prior to the third-year review, and within one year of application for promotion to associate and promotion to full professor. Non-tenure track faculty must be reviewed every five years after the first initial review (Peer Evaluation of Teaching Guide, p. 2). Assistant non-tenure track professors in the first year of teaching should work with their Program Directors to produce a statement of teaching philosophy and teaching goals. It is recommended that program directors review syllabi, Canvas sites, and other class materials at least once in the first year and then visit one class. This “pre-review” is for the purpose of assisting the Assistant Professor in developing his or her teaching skills and is not for the purpose of evaluation.

Organizational Process

Responsibility for the organization and documentation of peer teaching evaluations will rest with the chair of the Retention Promotion and Tenure committee (RPT). The chair of the RPT committee will create a peer review team consisting of two tenured faculty members for each tenure-track faculty member requiring peer teaching evaluation that year. The chair of the RPT committee will create a peer review team consisting of two faculty members (either tenured or non-tenured) above the rank of the non-tenure track faculty member requiring peer teaching evaluation that year. If there is/are non-tenure track professor(s) above the rank of the NTT faculty member requiring a peer review of teaching, then at least one member of the review team should be a non-tenure track professor above the rank of the faculty under review. The faculty member selects one member and the RPT chair, in consultation with the RPT committee, selects the other member. Preference will be given to selecting reviewers from the faculty member’s campus, area of teaching and method of teaching (face-to-face or online). The selection of the peer review team will be completed by August 30 of the academic year in which the review will occur. (Assistant Professors will be reviewed by Associate or full Professors; faculty seeking promotion to Professor must be reviewed by peers of that rank).

Peer Review Teaching Process

a) Self-Assessment

Prior to the peer review process, the faculty member being reviewed should submit a “self-assessment of teaching” to the review team. Self-assessment allows faculty members to reflect on their teaching for their benefit and to facilitate dialogue about their teaching with others. The self-assessment should include the faculty member’s teaching philosophy, previous reviews, teaching goals and methods for

achieving these goals and for achieving teaching excellence. The self-assessment document may be supported by a teaching portfolio that illustrates implementations or successes of the philosophy, documents activities such as short courses that improved teaching skills, alternative teaching objectives and methods, or possibly other aspects or innovations of teaching. For tenure-track faculty, their mentor may offer advice in preparing the self-assessment document. For non-tenure track faculty, the program director may offer advice in preparing the self-assessment document (p.3).

b) Peer Assessment

The faculty member and his/her peer review team should meet at least once to review the faculty member's dossier, which should include the faculty member's self-assessment, course syllabi and course outlines for all courses taught, class materials, assignments, Canvas sites, grade distributions, instruments for evaluating student learning outcomes/competencies, class evaluations, and any other supporting materials that either the peer review team or faculty member believes to be pertinent. In addition, at least one member of the peer review team must visit at least one of the faculty member's classes.

c) Peer Review Feedback and Report

By the end of the semester, the peer review team will produce a written report providing specific feedback including but not necessarily limited to:

1. Whether the courses of the faculty member have appropriate content and offer students sufficient opportunity to acquire appropriate skills
2. Whether the grading system and review/assessment tools are consistent with course content /skill development and evaluation of the competencies
3. Examines the teaching methods of the faculty member for effectiveness
4. Recognizes the potential risks and benefits inherent in innovative teaching methods

This feedback should be based on (1) examination and discussion of materials for the course (e.g., handouts, tests, web pages, etc.); and (2) observation in the classroom or instructional setting for at least one course being taught during the semester of the peer assessment.

In addition to producing the report the peer review team will discuss the content with the faculty member being reviewed. This discussion may include the strengths and areas for improvement of teaching by the faculty member.

The faculty member and the peer review team will keep a copy of the final report. The peer review team will send the RPT chair a copy of the final report. The chair of the RPT committee then submits the dossier to the office of the dean.

Dossiers not containing evidence of self-assessment and peer evaluation in addition to student evaluations will not be considered for promotion and tenure according to University guidelines.

Research

The College-wide Departmental Review Committee (DRC) reviews and approves

research to be conducted under College auspices. The university's Institutional Review board also reviews and approves research. For information on compliance, rules and procedures, and appropriate forms, see the Office of Research website.

Faculty Development Leave

The University of Tennessee grants extended professional leave designed to reinvigorate and revitalize both the faculty and the institution.

The purposes for which professional leave may be granted include:

1. Research on significant problems and issues;
2. Important creative or descriptive work in any means of expression;
3. Post-doctoral study at another institution;
4. Other approved projects, including innovations in teaching and learning.

Eligible faculty are full-time tenured faculty with a minimum of six years full-time campus service since any previously granted professional leave (or six years at the time of an initial professional leave).

The entire policy and application procedures are available at Provost's website.

POLICIES REGARDING STAFF

College policies regarding staff can be found in the *Staff Manual*.

Evaluation

Staff is evaluated annually. The review period is defined as the calendar year rather than the academic year. Knoxville and Nashville staff members are evaluated by the administrative assistant in coordination with others.

Policies Regarding Students

The *BSSW Student Manual*, the *MSSW Student Manual*, *DSW*, and the *PhD Student Manual* contain policies for students. These manuals may be found on the College website.

The following policies are particularly important for faculty.

STANDARDS OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

CSW students are responsible for adhering to the University of Tennessee's Standards of Conduct, which are published in [Hilltopics](#), the University's student handbook. The Standards of Conduct include a prohibition on cheating, plagiarism, or any other act of academic dishonesty, including, but not limited to, an act in violation of the Honor Statement. A copy of the Honor Statement and a more detailed description of the

procedures that are followed in cases of alleged academic dishonesty also can be found in [Hilltopics](#).

The Office of Student Judicial Affairs is responsible for determining whether to initiate a disciplinary charge against a student for violating the Standards of Conduct. Potential penalties imposed through the Office of Student Judicial Affairs for violations of the Standards of Conduct include suspension and permanent dismissal from the University. In addition, the CSW may take independent action regarding the student's status in the CSW if the student's conduct violates the CSW's standards of professional conduct, as described below.

CSW STANDARDS of PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

Separate and distinct from the University of Tennessee's Standards of Conduct, and the CSW's standards for academic performance (which are contained elsewhere in this handbook and in the Graduate Catalog), there are certain cognitive, emotional and character requirements that students must possess that provide the CSW with reasonable assurance that students can complete the entire course of study and participate fully in all aspects of social work education and the professional practice of social work. Students in the CSW are expected to possess the following abilities and attributes at a level appropriate to their year in the program. They are expected to meet these standards in the classroom and in their practicum. Attention to these standards will be part of evaluations made by faculty responsible for evaluating applications for admission and faculty responsible for evaluating students' classroom and practicum performance.

- **Professional Behavior.** The social work student behaves professionally by knowing and practicing within the scope of social work, adhering to the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics and the Tennessee Board of Social Worker Standards of Conduct (1365-01-.10) as found in the Tennessee Board of Social Work Certification and Licensure General Rules and Regulations, <http://www.state.tn.us/sos/rules/1365/1365-01.20100729.pdf>
- **Interpersonal Skills.** The social work student communicates and interacts with other students, faculty, staff, clients and professionals in a professional manner, and demonstrates respect for and consideration of other students, faculty, staff, clients and professionals in spoken, written and electronic form. The social work student expresses her/his ideas and feelings clearly and demonstrates a willingness and ability to listen to others.
- **Self-awareness.** The social work student is willing to examine and change his/her behavior when it interferes with her/his working with clients and other professionals, and is able to work effectively with others in subordinate positions as well as with those in authority.

- **Professional Commitment.** The social work student has a strong commitment to the essential values of social work (the dignity and worth of every individual and her/his right to a just share of the society's resources). The social work student is knowledgeable about and adheres to the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics and the Rules of the Tennessee Board of Social Worker Certification.
- **Self-care.** The social work student recognizes the signs of stress, develops appropriate means of self-care, and seeks supportive resources if necessary.
- **Valuing Diversity.** The social work student appreciates the value of human diversity. Social work students do not impose their own personal, religious, sexual, and/or cultural values on other students, faculty, staff, clients or professionals. Social work students are willing to serve in an appropriate manner all persons in need of assistance, regardless of the person's age, class, race, religious affiliation (or lack of), gender, disability, sexual orientation and/or value system.

The following list provides examples, but is not exhaustive, of professional misconduct:

- Misuse, alteration or falsification of documents
- Unauthorized or improper use of university equipment, services and facilities
- Harassing, coercing and intimidating behavior
- Obstruction or disruption of teaching
- Criminal activity
- Failure to comply with an order from a legitimate university authority and failure to attend required meetings called by university faculty or administration such as academic committee meetings and field evaluation meetings
- Threatening behavior and verbal abuse
- Inappropriate relationships
- Inability to secure, sustain, or perform satisfactorily in a field placement
- Other behaviors determined to be unprofessional conduct towards colleagues, faculty, staff and/or clients

CSW Professional Standards Committee

Except for alleged academic dishonesty, which shall be addressed through the procedures set forth in [Hilltopics](#), the following procedures are used to address a faculty member's concern that a social work student has failed to meet or maintain the CSW's professional standards:

1. The faculty member/major professor should discuss the concern(s) with the student and seek agreement with the student on the question of the student's failure to meet or maintain professional standards. If a plan of

remediation is recommended by the faculty member and agreed upon by the student, the faculty member should document the plan of remediation. The documentation should include a description of the student's conduct, the plan of remediation, and an indication that the student has agreed to the plan of remediation. Copies should be provided to the student, the student's record the student's major professor, and program director.

2. If the faculty member believes dismissal from the CSW is appropriate, or the faculty member believes that the student should be given an opportunity to remedy his/her failure to meet or maintain a standard but the faculty member and the student cannot agree on a plan for remediation, the faculty member shall notify the student's program director. The program director shall call a meeting with the faculty and student involved in an attempt to resolve the matter. If the matter cannot be resolved, the program director, in consultation with the associate dean, shall convene a hearing of the Professional Standards committee as soon as practicable.
3. A Professional Standards committee will be constituted each year. The associate dean will select a faculty chairperson and 3 faculty members from the full-time faculty to serve on this committee. The term of office is one year and can be renewed. The Professional Standards committee meets on an as needed basis. Faculty members of the Professional Standards committee having direct prior involvement with a case shall recuse themselves. In such a circumstance, the associate dean will appoint an alternative faculty for consideration of that case.
4. The student shall be provided with written notice (e-mail is sufficient) of the time and place of the hearing of the committee at least 48 hours in advance of the hearing.
5. The faculty member's prior written documentation of the student's conduct and proposed plan for remediation will be submitted along with any other germane supporting documents. Prior to the hearing, the student may also submit written materials to the committee. Copies of materials submitted to the committee must be provided to the opposing party.
6. At the hearing, the committee will hear orderly presentations from the student and the faculty member(s) who raised the concern(s). Each party will be allowed to present witnesses in support of her/his position, ask questions to opposing witnesses, and rebut the presentation of the opposing party. However, a hearing of the committee is not a legal proceeding and legal representation of the parties is not permitted in the hearing.

7. The committee will deliberate in private and make a decision on the appropriate course of action, which may include, but is not limited to: no action against a student; placement of a student on probationary status; changing the student's field placement; putting the student on a leave of absence; or dismissing the student from the CSW.

A student may appeal the decision of the committee by sending a written appeal to the associate dean within 14 days, who then shall make a decision on the student's appeal and communicate that decision to the student in writing. A student may appeal a decision of the associate dean to the dean of the CSW by sending a written appeal to the dean within 14 days of receiving the appeal of the associate dean, who then shall make a decision on the student's appeal and communicate that decision to the student in writing. To appeal the decision of the dean of the College of Social Work, a student shall file a written appeal in accordance with the Graduate Council Appeal Procedure. The [Graduate Council](#) considers student appeals only after they have been duly processed through the College of Social Work. A complete statement of the Graduate Council Appeal Procedure is available from the UT-Knoxville Graduate School, <http://gradschool.utk.edu>

APPENDICES

- Appendix A: Evaluation of Director of Field and International Education
Annual Clinical/Practice Faculty Performance Evaluation
Annual Field Coordinator/Practice Faculty Performance Evaluation
- Appendix B: Tenure Career Statement
- Appendix C: Annual Performance Evaluation Criteria for Tenure-Track Faculty

Director of Field & International Education YEAR to YEAR
This is an evaluation of XXXX

Director of Field and International Education: _____

Date of Review: _____

Reviewer: _____

Circle One*

5-Outstanding (Excellent): Far exceeds expectations

4-More Than Expected (Very Good): Exceeds expectations

3-Expected (Good): Meets expectations

2-Less Than Expected (Fair): Falls short of meeting expectations

1-Unsatisfactory (Poor): Falls far short of meeting expectations

1. Provides oversight and leadership for the Field Education Program (*leads field faculty in analysis and development of field education policies, procedures, and written materials; actively promotes integration of field and academic curricula; represents field education on the Administrative committee; assures compliance with CSWE standards and CSW and University policies and procedures; provides oversight of technology used in field, including the online database, forms, training platform, and website resources*)

1 2 3 4 5

2. Leadership in continuous upgrading of the Field Education Program (*provides vision in identifying areas for growth and improvement, establishing priorities for action, and promoting enhancement of field curricula and resources for BSSW and MSSW programs*)

1 2 3 4 5

3. Supervision of Field Coordinators (*meets regularly with field coordinators to evaluate progress toward program and individual goals; provides guidance and feedback to improve field coordinator performance in work responsibilities; assists field coordinators in establishing professional development goals and identifying training and mentoring resources*)

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

4. Provides leadership in development of partnerships to support field education. *(provides oversight of development and utilization of Field Advisory Boards for each program; promotes development of field placement sites across the state, nationally, and internationally)*

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

5. Provides Consultation on Field Issues *(assists field coordinators in solving field problems and concerns; consults with faculty, CSW administration, and agency personnel to identify and resolve concerns related to field)*

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

6. Provides oversight and leadership for international education at the CSW *(Develops partnerships for international study and placement; works with faculty and international partners to develop faculty exchange opportunities; works with faculty and the CIE to develop faculty-led programs; coordinates and manages itineraries for international visitors to the College; manages process for international scholars visiting the College; identifies opportunities to provide students with experiences with international populations.)*

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

7. Ensures that study and placement abroad experiences enhance CSW curricula *(Communicates with international faculty and NGOs to develop plans for student educational experiences; ensures that universities and organizations can provide academic coursework or placement experiences that fulfill CSW curriculum requirements and comply with CSWE accreditation standards; collaborates with CSW faculty, CIE staff, and international partners to develop individual and group study and placement experiences that enhance students' educational experience.)*

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

8. Coordinates Study or Placement Abroad Experience for Students *(meets with students from all CSW programs to explore options for study or placement abroad; consults with students' advisors on curriculum requirements; works with the CIE staff to enroll students in study abroad opportunities; manages the Rukeyser scholarship application process; provides field instruction for international placements)*

as needed; maintains contact with students while abroad to provide support and assist with problem-solving.)

9. Service to the College and University
(provides additional services according to program need and assignment including service on CSW or University committees, and collegial support and assistance)

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

Additional Activities*

10. Activities to maintain and enhance skill and knowledge

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

11. Service to the Community

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

12. Presentations at agencies, local, regional, and national conferences

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

* Scores of > 3 or <3 require comments in evaluative section

QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

This year's strengths:

Areas That Need Improvement:

GOALS for COMING YEAR

Director of Field and International Education

Associate Dean

Annual Clinical/Practice Faculty Performance Evaluation 20XX

Faculty Member: _____

Date of Review: _____

Associate Dean/Director: _____

Circle One*

5-Outstanding (Excellent): Far exceeds expectations

4-More Than Expected (Very Good): Exceeds expectations

3-Expected (Good): Meets expectations

2-Less Than Expected (Fair): Falls short of meeting expectations ²

1-Unsatisfactory (Poor): Falls far short of meeting expectations

1. Appropriate coverage of subject matter (*Course outline is clearly linked to course competencies and content as listed in course syllabus*)

1 2 3 4 5

2. Student evaluation of teaching effectiveness

1 2 3 4 5

3. Peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness (face-to-face courses)

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

4. Peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness (Online courses)

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

Circle One*

0) Needs Improvement

1) Meets Expectations

5. Instructor's evaluation of student performance (*Needs Improvement: Consistent assignment of very high or low grades or consistent student complaints*)

0) Needs Improvement 1) Meets Expectations

6. Student Advising (*Needs Improvement: Frequent student complaints of inability to reach advisor or receive relevant advice/information from advisor*)
- 0) Needs Improvement 1) Meets Expectations
7. Timeliness of response to student emails & phone calls (*Needs Improvement: Frequent student complaints about lack of response or timely response*)
- 0) Needs Improvement 1) Meets Expectations
9. Appropriateness of interactions with students (*Needs Improvement: Has not maintained professional boundaries with students; frequent complaints concerning disrespectful interactions with students*)
- 0) Needs Improvement 1) Meets Expectations
10. Timeliness of submission of teaching related materials and products (e.g. syllabi, grades) (*Needs Improvement: Frequently misses deadlines*)
- 0) Needs Improvement 1) Meets Expectations

Additional Activities*

11.	Activities to maintain and enhance skill and knowledge						
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
12.	Institutional Service						
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
13.	Research and Scholarship						
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	

* Scores of > 3 or <3 on items 1-4 and 11-13 and on rating of needs improvement on items 5-10 require comments in evaluative section

QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

This year's strengths:

Areas That Need Improvement:

Annual Field Coordinator/Practice Faculty Performance Evaluation

20XX

Field Coordinator:

Date of Review:

Director:

Circle One*

5-Outstanding (Excellent): Far exceeds expectations

4-More Than Expected (Very Good): Exceeds expectations

3-Expected (Good): Meets expectations

2-Less Than Expected (Fair): Falls short of meeting expectations

1-Unsatisfactory (Poor): Falls far short of meeting expectations

1.Development of Field Placement Sites (*actively engages in identifying a variety of prospective placement sites according to student interest and need, communicates effectively with agency personnel, assures that all new placement sites meet CSW and CSWE standards, assures that an MOA is signed and the agency is entered in the CSW database*) **1 2 3 4 5**

2.Recruitment and Development of Field Instructors (*identifies prospective field instructors through outreach and networking, assures that field instructors meet CSW and CSWE standards, provides field instructor orientation and training, actively promotes development of field instructor knowledge and skills*) **1 2 3 4 5**

3.Management of Placement Planning Process (*uses a consistent placement planning process according to course level and informs students of the requirements and timelines, provides information and advising to students regarding prospective placements through a variety of methods, e.g., interviews, email, placement fairs, etc., coordinates the interview process with students and field instructors, approves final placement decisions*) **1 2 3 4 5 N/A**

- **Coordination of Field Liaison Services** (*recruits and recommends hiring of liaisons as needed, orients and supervises liaisons assigned to her/his program, assigns liaisons to students and establishes timelines for visits and reporting*) **1 2 3 4 5 N/A**

- **Problem-solving of Field Issues** (*assists students, field liaisons and field instructors in solving field problems and concerns, reassigns students as needed, consults with*

faculty and academic committees regarding student concerns, needs, and problems)
2 3 4 5 N/A

- Coordination and Instruction of Field Seminars (*coordinates and serves as instructor for field seminars, covers required and appropriate content according to course level, uses a variety of instructional methods and modalities*)

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

- Participation in continuous upgrading of the Field Education Program (*participates with other field staff in analysis and development of field education policies, procedures, and written materials, engages as an active field team member in problem-solving and process improvement*) **1 2 3 4 5 N/A**

- Service to the College and University (*provides additional services according to program need and assignment which may include student academic advising, instruction of academic courses, service on CSW or University committees, and collegial support and assistance*) **1 2 3 4 5 N/A**

Additional Activities*

9. Activities to maintain and enhance skill and knowledge **1 2 3 4 5 N/A**

10. Service to the Community **1 2 3 4 5 N/A**

11. Presentations at agencies and/or local, regional, and national conferences

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

* Scores of > 3 or <3 require comments in evaluative section

QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

This year's strengths:

Areas That Need Improvement:

GOALS for COMING YEAR

Field Coordinator Signature Date

Annual Performance Evaluation for Director of Field & International Education 20XX

Director of Field and International Education: _____

Date of Review: _____

Reviewer: _____

Circle One*

5-Outstanding (Excellent): Far exceeds expectations

4-More Than Expected (Very Good): Exceeds expectations

3-Expected (Good): Meets expectations

2-Less Than Expected (Fair): Falls short of meeting expectations

1-Unsatisfactory (Poor): Falls far short of meeting expectations

1. Provides oversight and leadership for the Field Education Program (*leads field faculty in analysis and development of field education policies, procedures, and written materials; actively promotes integration of field and academic curricula; represents field education on the Administrative Committee; assures compliance with CSWE standards and CSW and University policies and procedures; provides oversight of technology used in field, including the online database, forms, training platform, and website resources*)

1 2 3 4 5

2. Leadership in continuous upgrading of the Field Education Program (*provides vision in identifying areas for growth and improvement, establishing priorities for action, and promoting enhancement of field curricula and resources for BSSW and MSSW programs*)

1 2 3 4 5

3. Supervision of Field Coordinators (*meets regularly with field coordinators to evaluate progress toward program and individual goals; provides guidance and feedback to improve field coordinator performance in work responsibilities; assists field coordinators in establishing professional development goals and identifying training and mentoring resources*)

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

4. Provides leadership in development of partnerships to support field education.
(provides oversight of development and utilization of Field Advisory Boards for each program; promotes development of field placement sites across the state, nationally, and internationally)

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

5. Provides Consultation on Field Issues
(assists field coordinators in solving field problems and concerns; consults with faculty, CSW administration, and agency personnel to identify and resolve concerns related to field)

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

6. Provides oversight and leadership for international education at the CSW
(Develops partnerships for international study and placement; works with faculty and international partners to develop faculty exchange opportunities; works with faculty and the CIE to develop faculty-led programs; coordinates and manages itineraries for international visitors to the College; manages process for international scholars visiting the College; identifies opportunities to provide students with experiences with international populations.)

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

7. Ensures that study and placement abroad experiences enhance CSW curricula
(Communicates with international faculty and NGOs to develop plans for student educational experiences; ensures that universities and organizations can provide academic coursework or placement experiences that fulfill CSW curriculum requirements and comply with CSWE accreditation standards; collaborates with CSW faculty, CIE staff, and international partners to develop individual and group study and placement experiences that enhance students' educational experience.)

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

8. Coordinates Study or Placement Abroad Experience for Students
(meets with students from all CSW programs to explore options for study or placement abroad; consults with students' advisors on curriculum requirements; works with the

CIE staff to enroll students in study abroad opportunities; manages the Rukeyser scholarship application process; provides field instruction for international placements as needed; maintains contact with students while abroad to provide support and assist with problem-solving.)

9. Service to the College and University
(provides additional services according to program need and assignment including service on CSW or University committees, and collegial support and assistance)

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

Additional Activities*

10. Activities to maintain and enhance skill and knowledge

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

11. Service to the Community

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

12. Presentations at agencies, local, regional, and national conferences

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

* Scores of > 3 or <3 require comments in evaluative section

QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

This year's strengths:

Areas That Need Improvement:

GOALS for COMING YEAR

Director of Field and International Education

Associate Dean

APPENDIX B

TENURE CAREER STATEMENT

The process of being reviewed for tenure gives faculty the opportunity to present to their colleagues a comprehensive picture of their career development to date as well as their plans and aspirations for their academic future. While teaching, scholarship and service are viewed frequently as discrete elements, there are substantive threads which join the activities together into an integrated whole. In many instances, these connectors are not readily apparent. In this statement, faculty are asked to describe the development of their professional career and the interconnecting dimensions of their work. The following should be used as a guideline for organizing your material.

1. INTRODUCTION

Describe the conceptual framework which you have developed that integrates your teaching, research and scholarship and service activities and how it fits with the mission of the College.

- a) the context and focus of your scholarship and teaching
- b) the principles that guide and integrate your work
- c) the direction of your future work

2. RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

Describe the development and product(s) of your past and present scholarship and research activity.

- a) major interest(s) and how it (they) evolved
- b) your major contributions to knowledge (identify 3-5 of your most significant pieces of work)
- c) presentations at regional, national and international conferences
- d) role of collaborating colleagues in your work
- e) funding sources, if any for your research
- f) future plans

3. TEACHING AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Describe the range and content areas of your past and present teaching and courses you would like to teach in the future.

- a) teaching philosophy and its effectiveness
- b) teaching goals, methods and style
- c) courses developed and/or revised
- d) participation in curriculum development
- e) contributions to fieldwork and agency consultation
- f) academic student advising

4. SERVICE TO THE PROFESSION, COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY

Describe the nature of your service in each of these areas and the contributions you have made.

- a) advising
- b) participation on local and College committees
- c) unreimbursed community service

- d) membership on editorial boards of professional journals
- e) leadership positions (elected or appointed) on local, state, and national organizations and associations
- f) local speaking engagements

5. PLEASE DESCRIBE OTHER ACTIVITIES AND CONTRIBUTIONS THAT ARE RELEVANT TO YOUR WORK AND CAREER.

APPENDIX C

Annual Performance Evaluation Criteria for Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenure earning faculty: 55% (research); 35% (teaching); 10% (service)

Tenured faculty: 50% (research); 30% (teaching); 20% (service)

Factors considered for research, teaching, and service.

Teaching:

- Student course evaluations
- Peer teaching evaluations
- Informal peer teaching reviews/feedback (e.g., for tenured faculty who are not yet up for promotion, hence may not have formal teaching reviews at this time)
- BSSW, MSSW, DSW, Ph.D. student advising
- New course development, also consideration of whether online or face-to-face
- Independent studies
- Size of courses taught
- Supervision of graduate teaching assistants
- Supervision of graduate research assistants
- Development of new teaching materials and techniques
- Ph.D. dissertation committees (chair or member)
- DSW capstone I and II committees (chair or member)
- Supervision of MSSW theses
- Supervision of BSSW honors students research projects
- Conference presentations on pedagogy
- Peer-reviewed publications on teaching
- Activities to increase teaching excellence
- Teaching awards
- Training and professional workshops
- Sponsored training grants (e.g., seeking, acquiring, managing)
- Development of training proposals relevant to instruction
- Syllabi and curricular review
- Workshops and other educational opportunities for students
- Assist students with grant submission/funding

Research/Scholarship

- Externally sponsored research grants submitted (e.g., number, funding agency, amount)
- Externally sponsored research grants funded (e.g., number, funding agency, amount)
- Internally sponsored research grants submitted (e.g., number, amount)
- Internally sponsored research grants funded (e.g., number, amount)

- Number of peer-reviewed journal publications (including “in press”)
- Quality of publications
- Rationale for journal selected
- Quality of journals published in (e.g., rank, impact factor, other relevant background information)
- Authorship (e.g., order, number of authors)
- Peer-reviewed presentations at national/international conferences.
- Invited presentations at national/international conferences
- Books (authored, edited)
- Book chapters
- Impact of publications (e.g., citation index)
- Activities to increase research capacity (grant trainings, ORE workshops)
- Research that engages faculty in advancing knowledge through the pursuit of their scholarly interests while simultaneously addressing specified community problems and issues, thereby benefiting the scholar, the discipline, the university, and society

Service:

- Member/Chair College committee(s)
- Member/Chair University committee(s)
- Community service (e.g., board membership)
- Professional service (e.g., editing or reviewing for journals, external reviews for tenure/promotion)
- Faculty mentoring
- Serving as faculty advisor for student organizations (e.g., BSWO, MSWO, MSWSN, Phi Alpha)
- Service that engages professional skills of faculty to benefit external communities and extends the intellectual resources of the university to seek solutions to problems

