

BYLAWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILD AND FAMILY STUDIES

Table of Contents

I. THE FACULTY

- 1.1 Composition of Faculty
- 1.2 Voting Faculty
- 1.3 Faculty Selection
- 1.4 Evaluation Process
- 1.5 Approval for 600-Level Courses and Direction of Dissertation

II. THE STUDENTS

- 2.1 Student Constituency

III. DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATION

- 3.1 Department Head
- 3.2 Department Faculty Meetings as a Committee of the Whole
- 3.3 Department Committees
- 3.4 Teaching
- 3.5 Advising
- 3.6 Mentoring
- 3.7 Early Learning Center for Research and Practice (ELC)
- 3.8 Administration of External Projects

IV. GRIEVANCE AND HEARING PROCEDURES

V. BYLAW CHANGES

- 5.1 Annual Review and Revision of CFS Bylaws
- 5.2 Amendments to CFS Bylaws

APPENDIX STATEMENT OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

Revised April, 2013

BYLAWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILD AND FAMILY STUDIES

I. THE FACULTY

1.1 Composition of Faculty

- 1.1.1** Tenured and tenure-track faculty may hold the rank of Assistant Professor or above.
- 1.1.2** Non-tenure-track teaching faculty are governed by the terms of their appointment letters. The ranks of non-tenure-track teaching faculty include Lecturer, Instructor, Distinguished Lecturer, Adjunct Faculty, and Visiting Faculty.
- 1.1.3** Non-tenure-track research faculty are governed by the terms of their appointment letters. The ranks of non-tenure-track research faculty include Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor, Adjunct Research Faculty, and Visiting Research Faculty.
- 1.1.4** Non-tenure-track clinical faculty are governed by the terms of their appointment letters. The ranks of non-tenure-track clinical faculty include Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor, Adjunct Clinical Faculty, and Visiting Clinical Faculty.

1.2 Voting Faculty

- 1.2.1** The voting faculty for department business will consist of all tenured and tenure-track faculty.
- 1.2.2** A quorum of one more than half the number of voting department members (including Department Head) will be necessary to conduct departmental business.

1.3 Faculty Selection

- 1.3.1** The department will follow CEHHS procedures for college-level review of position openings.
- 1.3.2** The department will follow the hiring procedures outlined by the Office of Equity and Diversity.
- 1.3.3** The search process will include evaluative input from the faculty.
- 1.3.4** Search Committee members will keep the faculty informed about the search process through regular reports at faculty meetings.
- 1.3.5** After the interviewing process of all candidates is completed, faculty will submit candidate evaluation forms to the Search Committee Chair.
- 1.3.6** The Search Committee will meet to review candidate evaluation forms. Any tenured or tenure-track faculty member may attend this meeting and present her/his perspective in person.
- 1.3.7** The Search Committee will make a recommendation to the Department Head regarding extending an offer to a candidate.
- 1.3.8** Non-tenure-track faculty will be appointed by the CFS Department Head in consultation with faculty and after reviewing vitae of qualified candidates.

1.4 Evaluation Process

1.4.1 Annual Evaluation of Faculty

1.4.1.1 The annual evaluation by the CFS Department Head for each faculty member should be guided by the adopted expectations for CFS faculty performance in teaching, research, and service, as indicated in the *Statement of CFS Faculty Performance Expectations* (see Appendix), the *UTK Faculty Handbook*, and the *UTK Manual for Faculty Evaluation*.

1.4.1.2 Evaluation materials will be submitted online each year by tenure-track and tenured faculty members. The Department Head will annually evaluate each faculty member's performance in teaching, research, and service over the previous three academic years (the "Evaluation Period") and submit an online Faculty Annual Review Form. Each faculty member will be asked to electronically sign his/her individual Faculty Annual Review Form.

1.4.1.3 The Department Head writes and submits a Progress and Performance Narrative for tenured faculty at least once every three years.

1.4.1.4 Probationary faculty members undergo an annual review as well as an annual retention review (described below). The results of the Retention Review Form shall be recorded on the faculty Annual Review Form.

1.4.1.5 Evaluation conferences with each tenured or tenure-track faculty member will be conducted annually by the Department Head.

1.4.1.6 In the case of a faculty member not meeting departmental expectations in one or more areas, the report will include detailed information regarding expectations for the subsequent year.

1.4.2 Retention Reviews

1.4.2.1 As specified in the *UTK Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, there will be a retention review of each probationary faculty member conducted every year leading up to the year of tenure consideration by the Department Head in consultation with tenured faculty.

1.4.2.2 Each faculty member with a probationary period of 4 or more years shall undergo an enhanced retention review in the academic year following the midpoint in his or her probationary period (typically, the faculty member's fourth year of employment)

1.4.2.3 In the year of the enhanced retention review, faculty members will submit for consideration enhanced materials, as outlined in the *UTK Manual for Faculty Evaluation*.

1.4.2.4 Tenured faculty members will review the materials submitted by each probationary faculty member, prepare a written narrative, and take a formal retention vote, all as specified by the *UTK Faculty Evaluation Manual*.

1.4.2.5 The Department Head conducts an independent retention review and submits a Retention Review Form as specified by the *UTK Faculty Evaluation Manual*.

1.4.3 Promotion and Tenure of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

1.4.3.1 Promotion and tenure processes for faculty follow guidelines stated in *UTK Faculty Handbook* and in the *UTK Manual for Faculty Evaluation*.

1.4.4 Cumulative Reviews of Tenured Faculty

Cumulative review of all tenured faculty will be conducted when triggered by the conditions specified in, and according to the guidelines stated in, the *UTK Faculty Handbook* and in the *UTK Manual for Faculty Evaluation*.

1.4.5 Teaching Evaluations

1.4.5.1 Periodic in-depth teaching evaluations will be conducted of tenured and tenure-track faculty by a committee consisting of two faculty members from Child and Family Studies and one faculty member from outside of the department. At least two such peer evaluations of teaching will be conducted for every probationary faculty member. It is recommended that two peer evaluations of teaching are conducted at the Associate level prior to promotion consideration.

1.5 Approval for 600-Level Courses and Direction of Dissertations

1.5.1 Approval to Teach 600-Level Courses

Faculty members may be approved to teach 600-level courses by the Department Head. Typically, the faculty member would have previously taught one or more 500-level courses in the department.

1.5.2 Initial and Continuing Approval to Direct Doctoral Dissertation Research

1.5.2.1 Tenure-track but untenured faculty members are eligible to direct dissertations subject to (a) departmental approval as indicated by a vote of the tenured faculty, (b) a letter of support from the Department Head, (c) recommendation by the Graduate School Credentials Committee, and (d) approval by the Graduate School. Specific procedures and required materials are specified in the bylaws of the Credentials Committee of the Graduate School. The letter of support and the results of the vote should be forwarded to the Credentials Committee, which will make a recommendation to the Graduate Council. Based on the recommendation of the Department Head, the Credentials Committee may recommend approval for an unspecified number of students prior to the review for tenure or may limit approval to a specified dissertation project.

1.5.2.2 When a faculty member is awarded tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, approval to direct dissertations will automatically be granted for a period of 10 years and will be reviewed every 10 years thereafter, for so long as approval is sought.

1.5.2.3 Application for continuing approval following promotion to professor should be submitted to the Credentials Committee in the year prior to expiration. The Credentials Committee bylaws specify procedures for application.

1.5.3 Initial and Continuing Approval to Direct Master's Thesis Research

All tenured and tenure-track faculty can chair and serve on MS committees as long as they meet the criteria of the UT Graduate School. Non-tenure-track faculty may serve on MS committees as long as they meet the criteria of the Graduate School. Non-tenure-track faculty may chair MS committees only with the approval of the Department Head.

II. THE STUDENTS

2.1 Student Constituency of the Department

For the purpose of selecting student representatives from the college to university committees, from the department to college committees, and from the department to department committees, the student constituency shall be all students who have declared with the Registrar a major or a

major preference (e.g., “CFS Interest” students) in an academic program administered in the department.

III. DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATION

3.1 Department Head

3.1.1 The Department Head is a member of the faculty who has been assigned the special duty of administering the department with guidance from a variety of official documents such as Departmental Bylaws and the *University Faculty Handbook*.

3.1.2 As stated in the Faculty Handbook (section 1.4.2), the Head’s responsibilities include:

1. Providing leadership for the departmental academic program in relation to the comprehensive academic program of the university.
 - a. recruiting faculty and staff.
 - b. Working with faculty to plan, execute, and review curriculum.
 - c. encouraging and supporting faculty teaching, research and creative activity, and public service.
 - d. counseling and advising students majoring in the discipline.
 - e. representing the department to the public, the other faculty and administration, colleagues at other universities and institutions, and the constituency supporting the university.
2. Providing leadership for the infrastructure necessary for support of the academic programs through
 - a. employment and supervision of clerical and supporting personnel.
 - b. management of departmental physical facilities and planning for space and equipment needs.
 - c. resource enhancement.
 - d. preparation, presentation, and management of the departmental budget.
 - e. authorization of all expenditures from the department budget.
3. Planning and conducting annual performance reviews of faculty and staff.

3.1.3 Department Head shall seek recommendations from faculty in setting priorities for budgetary, personnel, and physical facility allocations that enhance and support academic programs offered by departments. The Department Head is authorized to make the final decisions within the department.

3.1.4 Decisions related to these responsibilities shall be reported to the faculty at faculty meetings.

3.1.5 Should the Department Head be temporarily unable to meet these designated responsibilities, the Department Head (or the Dean of the College in the event that it is not appropriate or possible for the Department Head to do so) shall appoint an Acting Department Head of the department for a specified period of time.

3.1.6 The performance of the Department Head shall be subject to annual review by tenured and tenure-track faculty and by the CEHHS Dean.

3.1.7 The voting faculty of the department shall review the performance of the Department Head annually through evaluation of her/his execution of assigned duties on a form provided by the Dean. The review forms should be returned directly to the Dean, who shares a summary of the results privately with the Department Head.

3.2 Department Faculty as a Committee of the Whole

3.2.1 Tenured and tenure-track faculty of the department as well as the ELC Director will meet at a regular time each month during the academic year. Others may be invited or in some cases required to attend. Additional meetings may be called by the Department Head as deemed

necessary. A 120 minute period of time during which no classes are scheduled will generally be used for faculty meetings.

3.2.2 The Department Head, or her/his designee, shall attend and chair all department faculty meetings.

3.2.3 Faculty, students, and staff should submit items to the Department Head for the agenda no later than 4 business days prior to the upcoming meeting.

3.2.4 The conduct of Department Faculty Meetings shall be governed by *Robert's Rules of Order*.

3.2.5 Although consensus is the preferred method of reaching decisions for departmental issues, all motions will be carried by a simple majority of those regular faculty voting.

3.2.6 In the event of a tie vote on curriculum issues, the Department Head's vote shall carry the issue. In all other instances, as specified in the *UTK Faculty Handbook*, faculty votes are advisory to the Department Head.

3.2.7 The faculty may ask the Department Head to obtain votes from members not present. No proxy votes will be allowed.

3.2.8 The request of any faculty member for a secret ballot vote on any voted issue will be honored.

3.2.9 Minutes of each department meeting will be prepared by the Department Head or an individual designated by the Department Head and distributed to all faculty at least one week prior to the subsequent faculty meeting. Minutes will be kept on file on the departmental shared drive for review.

3.3 Department Committees

3.3.1 Promotion and Tenure Committee

3.3.1.1 The Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of all tenured faculty in CFS.

3.3.1.2 The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee is elected by committee members for a 2-year term.

3.3.1.3 The committee reviews all applications for promotion and tenure, including annual retention reviews of probationary tenure-track faculty.

3.3.1.4 The committee reviews all tenure-track but non-tenured faculty who are nominated for approval to direct doctoral dissertation research, making recommendations to the Department Head.

3.3.1.5 The committee conveys the outcomes of reviews to the Department Head.

3.3.2 Graduate Committee

3.3.2.1 The Graduate Committee consists of a minimum of three faculty members, two of whom must be tenured and approved to direct doctoral dissertation research. It is preferred that at least one faculty member has an Early Childhood Education focus and familiarity with teacher licensing standards and practices. If no member of the Graduate Committee is familiar with teaching licensing standards, the Director of Graduate Studies will solicit a recommendation from the Teacher Licensure Committee regarding changes in any policy or procedure that impacts the ECE licensure programs.

3.3.2.2 Members of the Graduate Committee are appointed by the Department Head.

3.3.2.3 The Chair of the Graduate Committee is also the Director of Graduate Studies and is appointed by the Department Head for a term of 3 years. **The Department Head may extend this term with approval (majority vote by secret ballot) of the faculty.**

3.3.2.4 The Director of Graduate Studies will receive one 3-hour credit course release per academic year.

3.3.2.5 The Director of Graduate Studies serves as a member of the CEHHS Graduate Committee.

3.3.2.6 The committee makes application materials of potential graduate students available to faculty, and makes admission recommendations to the Department Head.

3.3.2.7 The committee makes recommendations to the Department Head regarding graduate assistantship assignments, using input from the larger faculty.

3.3.2.8 The committee develops and implements a graduate student recruitment plan.

3.3.2.9 The committee, with tenured and tenure-track CFS faculty, conducts annual reviews of continuing graduate students.

3.3.2.10 The committee recommends all graduate-level course changes, changes in graduate program requirements, or other curricular matters brought to the committee's attention by faculty members or the Department Head.

3.3.2.11 The committee oversees progression to candidacy standards and all other matters pertaining to graduate curriculum issues.

3.3.2.12 The committee evaluates requests to modify "core" program requirements of Ph.D. students and Community Outreach MS students on a case-by-case basis, making recommendations to the Department Head.

3.3.2.13 The committee reviews and nominates graduate students for awards.

3.3.2.14 The committee reviews web material related to the graduate programs annually, suggesting revisions to the Department Head.

3.3.3 Undergraduate Committee

3.3.3.1 The Undergraduate Committee consists of a minimum of three faculty members, two of whom must be tenured. At least one faculty member must have an Early Childhood Education focus and familiarity with teacher licensing standards and practices.

3.3.3.2 Members of the Undergraduate Committee are appointed by the Department Head.

3.3.3.3 The chair of the Undergraduate Committee is also the Director of Undergraduate Studies and is appointed by the Department Head for a term of 3 years. **The Department Head may extend this term with approval (majority vote by secret ballot) of the faculty.**

3.3.3.4 The Director of Undergraduate Studies will receive one 3-hour credit course release per academic year.

3.3.3.5 The Director of Undergraduate Studies serves as a member of the CEHHS Undergraduate Committee.

3.3.3.6 The committee makes recommendations on all undergraduate level course changes, changes in undergraduate program requirements, or other curricular matters brought to the committee's attention by the faculty members or the Department Head.

3.3.3.7 The committee oversees progression standards and all other matters pertaining to undergraduate curriculum issues.

3.3.3.8 The committee reviews and nominates undergraduate students for awards.

3.3.3.9 The committee is responsible for facilitating the administration of the undergraduate exam in the major and preparing necessary progress reports.

3.3.3.10 Requests to waive program requirements on a case-by-case basis are under the purview of the student's faculty advisor who makes recommendations to the Department Head.

3.3.3.11 The committee reviews web material related to the undergraduate program annually, suggesting revisions to the Department Head.

3.3.4 Departmental Review Committee of the IRB (Human Subjects)

3.3.4.1 The Departmental Review Committee of the IRB is comprised of a chair and at least one additional member and one alternate appointed by the Department Head.

3.3.4.2 The committee reviews all research applications involving human participants initiated by faculty, staff and students. Reviews of individual applications should be completed within 10 working days of receipt by the committee.

3.3.5 Teacher Licensure Committee

3.3.5.1 The Teacher Licensure Committee (TLC) is comprised of a chair and at least two additional members appointed by the Department Head.

3.3.5.2 Members of the TLC are appointed by the Department Head.

3.3.5.3 The chair of the TLC is appointed by the Department Head for a term of 3 years. The Department Head may extend this term with approval (majority vote by secret ballot) of the faculty.

3.3.5.4 The Chair of the TLC will receive one 3-hour credit course release per academic year.

3.3.5.5 The TLC makes recommendations on course changes, changes in undergraduate program requirements, or other curricular matters affecting teacher licensure programs brought to the committee's attention by the faculty members or the Department Head.

3.3.5.6 The TLC oversees progression within the teacher licensure programs and all other matters pertaining to teacher licensure curriculum issues.

3.3.5.7 The TLC evaluates requests to modify "core" program requirements of Teacher Licensure MS students on a case-by-case basis, making recommendations to the Department Head.

3.3.5.8 The TLC reviews and nominates undergraduate teacher licensure students for awards.

3.3.6 Ad Hoc Committees

Various ad hoc committees, including but not limited to Search and Strategic Planning Committees will be appointed by the Department Head for specific projects and a limited, identified term. Each Ad-Hoc committee will be chaired by a faculty member appointed by the Department Head.

3.4 Teaching

3.4.1 Teaching assignments are made by the Department Head.

3.4.2 A standard teaching load consists of two courses in Fall semester and two courses in Spring semester unless a course release has been negotiated with the Department Head.

3.4.3 At the Department Head's discretion, a tenured faculty member may be assigned a teaching load of up to six courses per academic year (e.g., three courses in the fall and three courses in the Spring) if it is determined that a differential load is warranted due to reduced productivity in other areas.

3.5 Advising

3.5.1 Departmental faculty are assigned to the role of Undergraduate Advisors by the Department Head. Undergraduate advisees are assigned to Undergraduate Advisors by the Department Head or his/her designee.

3.5.2 Consulting services regarding program of study issues are provided to undergraduate students by the CFS Advising Center; however, the faculty advisor is ultimately responsible for advising designated advisees.

3.5.3 The Director of Graduate Studies, or a faculty member appointed by the Director or the Department Head (often the faculty member supervising the student's assistantship), initially advises all graduate students. When a graduate student selects a Committee Chair (typically in the first year), that faculty member becomes the graduate student's advisor.

3.6 Mentoring

3.6.1 Mentors are tenured faculty appointed by the Department Head to mentor tenure-track faculty. The Department Head will consult with new probationary faculty member during his/her first semester of employment to identify a suitable mentor. A tenured faculty member may mentor more than one person if agreed upon by the tenured faculty member and the Department Head. The Department Head may not mentor a faculty member in his/her department.

3.6.2 The mentor and mentee should meet during the first semester of the mentee's appointment and prepare a written, individual **5 year** mentoring plan that must be submitted to the Department Head for approval. The faculty mentor and mentee are responsible for designing a plan that is consistent with the *Statement of CFS Faculty Performance Expectations* and the *UTK Faculty Handbook*.

3.7 Early Learning Center for Research and Practice (ELC)

The Director of the ELC (who functions as the CEO of the ELC) is appointed by the Department Head. The Director of the ELC reports to the Department Head on a bi-weekly basis.

3.8 Administration of External Projects

Principal investigators of externally-funded projects report to the Department Head. All budgetary matters related to externally-funded projects must be approved by the Department Head.

IV. GRIEVANCE AND HEARING PROCEDURES

4.1 Procedures for resolving faculty grievances are outlined in the *UTK Faculty Handbook* and the CEHHS Bylaws.

4.2 In cases of student grievances, such as grade appeals, the Department Head may form an ad hoc committee **of CFS and potentially other CEHHS** faculty to review the appeal. The ad hoc committee will review the student's appeal statement and obtain a written response to the appeal from the instructor. The student will be given an opportunity to review the instructor's written response and to submit a written response to the committee. The ad hoc committee may choose to meet with the student or the instructor to clarify the written appeal and responses. The ad hoc committee will review the appeal and responses and make a recommendation to the Department

Head. The Department Head will make the decision regarding whether to accept or deny the grade appeal.

V. BYLAW CHANGES

5.1 Annual Review and Revision of CFS Bylaws

These Bylaws shall be reviewed bi-annually by the Department Head or a committee of faculty appointed by the Department Head and, if necessary, revised. Final approval of any proposed changes will be determined by a two-thirds majority vote of the tenured or tenure-track faculty.

5.2 Amendments to CFS Bylaws

5.2.1 Proposed amendments to one or more Bylaws may be forwarded by any department member to the Department Head. Proposed changes shall be distributed to the voting faculty of the department at least one week prior to the faculty meeting at which the proposed changes are to be discussed.

5.2.2 Amendments shall be adopted by a two-thirds majority of votes. The vote will be conducted at the department faculty meeting following the meeting at which the amendment was introduced and discussed.

Appendix

Statement of Faculty Performance Expectations

**The Department of Child and Family Studies
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville**

Approved by the CFS faculty September, 2007
Revised April, 2013

All CFS Faculty are expected to be engaged in teaching, research, and service activities. Moreover, there should be visible theoretical and conceptual linkages between the knowledge that is generated by a faculty person's research and what is taught by the person in courses and presented to the community through service efforts. This *Statement of Performance Expectations* represents an effort to work toward this aim by specifying what we expect of ourselves in the areas of research, teaching, and service.

In preparing this *Statement of Expectations*, we recognize that there is no perfect formula for judging faculty performance. What we are seeking is a departmental climate that supports flexibility and diversity in faculty effort without sacrificing adherence to clear standards of excellence. Achieving this balance is not an easy task, but we believe it is possible to encourage high levels of diverse performance and still adhere to a set of performance expectations that is in part quantifiable but also clarified when bolstered by written descriptions of mediating factors and illustrative examples of individual performance. Such a structure should help each of us meet or exceed the standards that we have set for ourselves. It is through the integration of quantitative and qualitative methods of measurement, therefore, that we hope to create and describe a set of expectations that will truly reflect our commitment to excellence and also our willingness to make public what we expect of ourselves.

Research Accomplishments

Meets Expectations

All tenured and tenure-leading faculty members are expected to be involved in an active research program that includes students and leads to publications in peer-reviewed journals that reach a national and/or international audience. Each faculty member should pursue one or more lines of research consistent with the themes of the department's mission and eventually produce a body of work for which the faculty person becomes a recognized scholar and expert. To achieve this recognition, it usually is necessary that the faculty person be the lead author on a significant number of publications, publish most of the articles in respected journals, seek and hopefully secure internal and/or external funds to support graduate students and research activities, and present important findings to regional, national, and/or international conferences. The type of funds (e.g., research, training, service) does not determine the extent of performance excellence. Rather, it is outcomes such as publications, program impact on the community, grants, and contributions to thesis and dissertation research that are some of the critical measures of successful accomplishments. Additionally, we specifically believe that serving on and directing student committees, and especially directing doctoral committees, represents both teaching and research effort. While there is some flexibility in terms of effort allocation for tenured faculty, serving on these committees does not substitute for a base level of published scholarly activity.

Within this framework, each tenure-leading member is expected to demonstrate yearly progress toward a record of scholarship that: (a) reflects a focused area of research, (b) includes a body of research articles to which the faculty member made most of the important conceptual and methodological contributions, and (c) has undergone peer-review in respected journals, (d) reflects a clear continuity of effort over time.

By *focused area of research*, we mean a body of work that reflects the department's mission themes and is generally recognized by other scholars as a legitimate and important area of investigation. Regarding *contribution to a scholarly product*, it should be clear that the faculty member was primarily responsible for conceptualizing and undertaking most of the work. Such work should include, but not necessarily be limited to, peer-reviewed journal articles, grant applications, and conference paper presentations. It also might include other examples of scholarly work, such as book chapters. First authorship is perhaps the best indicator of one's contribution to scholarship and certainly a tenure-leading faculty member needs to be the first author on several scholarly products, particularly journal articles and grants. However, we recognize that there are other means of demonstrating one's contribution to a scholarly product, and we also acknowledge that serving in a secondary authorship also role warrants recognition. In cases of multiple authorships where a faculty member is not the first author and it cannot be determined by reading the article, grant, chapter, or paper what the faculty member's contribution was, it then becomes the responsibility of the faculty member to present information (e.g., letters or emails from first authors) that makes his or her contribution clear.

The faculty also value accomplishments that support scholarly productivity and offer opportunities for students to engage in research. For example, the establishment of a laboratory or center that brings positive attention to the department and serves as a means for faculty-student collaborative research efforts can be one means of highlighting one's research focus. However, even in these kinds of situations the dissemination of scholarly products and attainment of funding support still would be the most important measures of meeting performance expectations.

Peer-review of journal articles is a process well known to all of us and needs no clarification, but faculty can disagree on what constitutes a highly regarded journal. For our purposes, we agree that faculty members who are familiar with the field and have published research in representative journals are well suited to judge the quality of individual journals. We also recognize there are other means of assessing a journal's status in the field, for example, by noting the acceptance rate of articles submitted and/or the number of times articles that appear in the journal are cited by other researchers. Open access journals and standard print journals are equally valued; the quality of the journal and its scholarly reputation are the keys to assessing its merits, not the mode of publication.

Continuity of effort can be demonstrated in a variety of ways, for example, by noting over the course of a specified period of time the number of articles published in peer-reviewed journals, the number of internal and/or external grant applications submitted, and the number of papers presented at national and/or international conferences. However, the number of publications, paper presentations, or grant applications undoubtedly will vary from one faculty member to another and from one year to another year for the same faculty member - - often for very good reasons. A new faculty member may need time to establish a community network of agencies to support her or his research, or a senior faculty member may decide to explore a new field of interest. Certain types of research also take more time to complete, may be more difficult to publish, or do not have the kind of funding appeal that characterize other areas of research in CFS. In all of these cases, it would not be reasonable to expect a faculty member to publish research articles, present papers, or prepare grant applications at the same rate she or he might do

otherwise. What is critical even under these circumstances, however, is that continuity of scholarly effort should be evident. Some examples of meaningful evidence are documented meetings with agency directors, submissions of IRB applications, applications for professional development awards and professional leave proposals, and drafts of articles and grant applications in various stages of completion.

CFS faculty agree that it is difficult to specify a minimum number of scholarly products that is required for promotion and tenure, or even to meet the minimum expectations for yearly performance reviews. However, we also agree that a faculty member's record should reflect steady, consistent effort and that neither quality nor clarity of focus can be judged in the absence of a minimum quantity of scholarly products, particularly journal articles. A record sufficient to achieve promotion and tenure would be difficult to establish if a faculty member had not produced a body of research that received national and/or international recognition for its contribution through publication in peer-reviewed, respected journals and did not include an affirmative effort to seek internal and/or external funds to support research.

It also is important to recognize that scholarly accomplishments achieved prior to a faculty member's appointment in the department are valued and will be given consideration when a faculty member is ready to seek promotion and tenure. These accomplishments, however, cannot replace scholarly activity at UT. Continuity of effort will be examined very carefully. Scholarly productivity might temporarily slow when a faculty member transitions from another institution of higher education or research agency to the department, but if it does, the reasons should be clear and so should the resumption of the same or improved pattern of productivity well before a decision is made to seek promotion and tenure. Thus, the important measure in this kind of case is not the number of years that a faculty member has been in the field since she or he received the Ph.D. degree. Rather, it is a series of measures that include a strong demonstration of a clear research focus, recognition by peers of one's unique contribution to the field, and continuity of scholarly productivity across institutions.

Final determination of what is expected for the individual faculty person, regardless of rank, rests with the department head (in the case of tenure-leading faculty, members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee also will communicate expectations through yearly retention reviews) and should be negotiated with the faculty person during yearly evaluation meetings when individual goals are established. This process allows for some flexibility in terms of potentially reallocating effort across fields (teaching, research, service) for tenured faculty. This annual evaluation meeting also provides an opportunity for tenure-leading faculty to determine if they are doing enough, but not too much, serving on and chairing of student committees relative to other scholarly pursuits. Student committee work is recognized and valued but does not substitute for scholarly productivity at the pre-tenure level.

Tenured faculty should serve as role models for tenure-leading faculty and continue to receive national and/or international recognition for their work by consistently achieving the same set of scholarly accomplishments and continuing to demonstrate a continuity of effort. Members of the CFS faculty who pursue and achieve these aims, regardless of rank, are meeting the department's standards for minimum performance expectations.

Exceeds Expectations

Any faculty member can exceed expectations by meeting all of the previously stated standards in addition to accomplishing some combination of the following: publishing several articles per year in peer-reviewed journals; submitting multiple grant proposals over the three year evaluation period or receiving funding for the year; directing several graduate students; or engaging in activities that bring unusual national and/or international recognition to the individual, the department, and the university. Outcomes such as publications, grant applications, and conference presentations that are co-authored with students also would be viewed as indications of faculty exceeding expectations. Collaborations with all students are viewed favorably, but preference is given to work with UT students over work with non-UT students.

Teaching Expectations

All tenure-leading and tenured faculty members are expected to demonstrate good instructional skills in the classroom. Quality instruction involves regular assessment in a variety of ways, including student feedback and peer review. Each faculty person is expected to strive for excellence and to serve as a model and mentor (whenever possible) for graduate students. At a minimum, course content should be current, relevant, and appropriate for the level of instruction. Students usually should be evaluated several times using multiple methods over the duration of a course. The expectation is that a faculty person consistently seeks methods to improve individual courses, both in terms of content and process. Tenured faculty members are expected to take leadership roles in curriculum development and instructional innovations. They should do so in ways that can be documented and replicated so that students and colleagues may benefit by following the examples of exemplary teachers.

Meets Expectations

Each faculty person is expected to teach two CFS courses per semester, usually one at the undergraduate level and one at the graduate level, and usually totaling 6 credits. However, there can be exceptions to this general guideline. For example, the need to offer certain required courses on a regular basis might require that a faculty member teach two courses at the undergraduate level for a semester or more. Also, a faculty member could be assigned other responsibilities by the department head and released from teaching a course, or, if she or he is a new faculty member, the teaching load would be lighter during the first academic year. Another exception could be an increase in one's teaching load to three courses per semester. Only a tenured faculty member would be asked to take on this kind of load, however, and the circumstances that might warrant such a load would have to be made clear to the faculty member and implemented only with the approval of the department head and dean. A faculty member also may "buy out" a course by using released time secured with grant funds or by "banking" credit hours and, in effect, teaching an overload for one or more semesters to earn a lighter course load later on. Only tenured faculty are eligible for banking arrangements and any change to their standard load of two courses per semester can be done only with the prior approval of the department head. Ideally, modifications in teaching loads should be approved well in advance of the implemented change.

Quality instruction is difficult to measure. Certainly it includes instruction based on current theory and research. Faculty, therefore, are expected to revise and update course content at least every 3 years. Multiple and contemporary methods of instruction that include, but are not limited to, the use of video and computer applications are strongly encouraged. The university requires faculty to use the SAIS system to evaluate all courses. Every faculty person, therefore, must be evaluated by students and maintain, on average, minimum SAIS scores of 3.0. Acceptable reasons for not achieving this minimum for a particular course or courses might include preparation of a new course, a major revision to a previously taught course, or an unusual set of circumstances such as extremely heavy work load that temporally affects an individual's instructional performance. Student ratings, therefore, must be judged in the context of several factors and should never be the sole indicator of the individual's instructional performance. Indeed, given the abundance of research that raises serious questions about the reliability and validity of student evaluations, as well as the effect such evaluations often have on grade inflation, we believe we are ethically bound to place emphasis also on other performance measures such as those identified above. Regardless, it remains the individual's responsibility to document new efforts to improve instruction and to keep the department head and other faculty informed. In this way, more informed judgments can be made about the quality of CFS instruction and each faculty person's contribution to overall teaching performance. Tenure-leading faculty also must have their teaching skills evaluated by a committee of three tenured faculty members twice prior to tenure consideration. This process will be implemented according to guidelines set forth in the *Faculty Evaluation Manual*. Similarly, two additional peer evaluations of teaching should occur after tenure but prior to consideration for promotion to Full Professor. Additional peer evaluations may be recommended by the department head in individual cases and include tenured faculty as well as tenure-leading faculty.

Exceeds Expectations

The number of courses that an individual faculty person teaches per semester does not have to change for faculty members to exceed expectations in this area (usually, the same requirements for teaching load, research, and community service will apply). SAIS ratings usually should be above 4.0 on average for each course, but this is not required for a faculty member to exceed expectations in this area. Also, it would be desirable but not essential for peers to evaluate course content and process before the level of instruction is considered "exceptional." What is most important is a demonstration that the faculty member made an unusual effort to enhance her or his teaching skills and very likely had an extraordinary impact on student interest and learning. Certainly, written student comments in addition to SAIS ratings would be a means of documenting exceptional teaching, but other kinds of documentation usually would be needed to warrant such a high performance rating. For example, receiving an instructional award or positive peer review are two ways of demonstrating that the teaching performance is worthy of an "exceeds expectations" rating. Thus, the general criterion for receiving the rating is a clear and important contribution to the CFS instructional program that is beyond the usual expectations, one that is recognized by the department head, CFS faculty, and students, and perhaps peers from other departments as an exceptional effort.

Service Accomplishments

Service to the department, college, university, and community is valued and encouraged, but must be balanced against the need for faculty to meet their scholarly and instructional goals. Service in any area or at any level should not become so demanding as to impede progress in other performance areas.

For tenure-leading faculty, no amount of service activity can substitute for establishing a solid record of independent research and quality instruction. For most tenure-leading faculty, the level of expectation should be measured by service rendered to the department, college, or community and usually in participatory rather than leadership roles. It may be important to pursue leadership roles in professional organizations. However, numerous service activities at any rank, especially for tenure-leading faculty, may be a sign of poor career management rather than an indicator of expected service accomplishments. One important exception would be activities that are undertaken in the service of research. That is, a service grant that meets the needs of people in the community, but also functions as a base for student and faculty research projects is highly desirable.

Meets Expectations

Tenure-leading faculty should serve on one or two committees. Service on a university committee might be appropriate, but the decision to participate or not should be made in consultation with the department head and one's faculty mentor. The most important consideration should be what the individual can contribute and do well without sacrificing accomplishments in the research or instructional areas. Service to community agencies or professional organizations might be appropriate, perhaps even desirable, but should not be pursued without input from the department head and one's faculty mentor. In general, community service should be limited for tenure-leading faculty to activities that relate to research and instructional goals.

Tenured faculty members often assume a heavier service load than tenure-leading faculty and do so, in part, to give tenure-leading faculty more time to achieve their individual goals and responsibilities. Two or three committees are the average annual load. Tenured faculty also are expected to exercise leadership on some committees by serving as chairperson of one of them, particularly departmental standing committees over a multi-year period. As a rule, tenured faculty members also assume responsibility for more difficult committee functions. Regular service to the community and UTK is the standard for most tenured faculty. However, this does not mean that a tenured faculty member must be highly engaged in service every year. Participation in professional organizations and consultation to local, national and international private and/or government organizations is appropriate, too, especially when the individual has achieved positive national or international recognition for her or his accomplishments and is invited to serve in some capacity related to his or her area of expertise. Generally, tenured faculty members are in the best position to decide the amount of time and effort they want to devote to service activities. The department head is not likely to raise questions about their involvement, unless there are concerns that service activities are having a detrimental effect on a faculty member's ability to meet instructional and scholarly expectations.

An important way that tenured faculty members can serve the department, college, and university is to mentor a tenure-leading faculty person. Mentoring new faculty members is highly valued by the department and deserves the kind of commitment and attention to process that is on par with teaching and research activities. Of course, the same principle applies to faculty members who supervise and mentor graduate students. Still, whether the task is mentoring faculty, students, or both, instructional and research activities should not suffer.

Exceeds Expectations

When a faculty person serves as chairperson of a committee, writes committee reports, serves as chair of a major college or university body (e.g., Faculty Senate or All College Council), she or he is performing as expected (assuming that other faculty expectations have been reduced, such as a course release for chairing a committee and other service assignments are in line with what is described above). Speaking to local groups or a class is an expected aspect of being a university faculty person and is not considered something unusual or exceptional. Serving on a program committee of a national organization that has an extremely heavy and difficult workload, however, is considered beyond what is expected, assuming that the faculty member also carries the expected service load in the department. Serving on several editorial boards; reviewing journal articles and/or grants for federal, state, or private agencies; or otherwise representing the department at national and international professional events that involve activities other than paper presentations also would be evidence of exceeding service expectations.