

Department of Mathematics

March 2021

Contents

1 Governance and Organization	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Voting Faculty	1
1.3 Department Head	1
1.3.1 Appointment of the Head	1
1.3.2 Role of the Head	1
1.3.3 Annual Evaluation of the Head	1
1.4 Advisory Committee	1
1.4.1 Advisory Committee Elections	2
1.4.2 Role of the Advisory Committee	2
1.5 Faculty meetings	2
1.5.1 Statement on Attendance at Faculty Meetings	2
1.6 Major Standing Committees	2
1.6.1 Curriculum	3
1.6.2 Admission and Retention of Graduate Students	3
1.6.3 Doctoral Dissertation Advising	3
1.7 Other Committees	3
1.8 Amendments and Exceptions	3
2 Faculty Workload for all Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty	4
2.1 Research	4
2.2 Teaching	4
2.2.1 Semester Banking and Faculty Leaves	4
2.3 Service	4
3 Appointment, Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Review for All Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty	4
3.1 Appointment	4
3.2 Annual Retention Review of Tenure-track Faculty	5
3.3 Enhanced Review of Probationary Faculty	5
3.4 Tenure and Promotion	5
3.4.1 Departmental Criteria and Expectations for Tenure and Promotion	5
3.4.1.1 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	6
3.4.1.2 Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor	6
3.4.2 Committees	6
3.4.3 Teaching Materials	6
3.4.4 Research Materials	6
3.4.5 Service Materials	7
3.4.6 Faculty Recommendation	7
3.5 Annual Evaluation of Tenured, Tenure-Track, and Joint Faculty	7
3.6 Expectations for Teaching, Research, and Service	7
3.6.1 Teaching	7
3.6.2 Research	8

3.6.3	Service	8
3.6.4	Annual Review of Joint Faculty.....	8
3.7	Definitions for Overall Rating of Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty.....	8
4	Non-Tenure-Track Faculty	9
4.1	Appointment.....	9
4.2	Lecturer Advisory Committee.....	9
4.3	Annual Review of Non-Tenure-track Faculty	9
4.3.1	Expectations for Teaching.....	9
4.3.2	Definitions of "Falls Short of Expectations" and "Falls Far Short of Expectations"	9
4.4	Promotion.....	10

Department Bylaws

1 Governance and Organization

1.1 Introduction

These bylaws represent this department's implementation of the provisions on faculty governance that appear in the University Faculty Handbook, the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, and the bylaws of the College of Arts and Sciences. The departmental bylaws are a supplement to the other three documents and are not in themselves complete.

1.2 Voting Faculty

In these Bylaws, the term "Voting Faculty" always refers to tenured and tenure-track faculty and joint faculty with tenure base in the Mathematics Department, with the following provisions. Voting faculty with higher administration appointments of 50% or more are not normally considered as Voting Faculty unless they request otherwise and their request is approved by the Advisory Committee. Full-time lecturers are also considered as Voting Faculty in votes concerning curricular matters involving courses numbered below 300. Full-time lecturers with a PhD in Mathematics are considered as Voting Faculty in votes concerning the MM program. Full-time lecturers are also considered as Voting Faculty in all matters concerning Section 1.2 and Chapter 4 of these Bylaws.

1.3 Department Head

1.3.1 Appointment of the Head

The Department Head is appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences following the procedures in the Faculty Handbook.

1.3.2 Role of the Head

In addition to the role set out in the Faculty Handbook, college bylaws, and Evaluation Manual, the Head has responsibilities specific to the mathematics department. The Head presides over meetings of the whole faculty and the Advisory Committee. The Head may appoint additional faculty to assist in administration within the department. The Head will seek the recommendations of the major standing committees and/or the Advisory Committee regarding scheduling of courses, registration policies, and other procedures necessary to administer the mission of the department.

1.3.3 Annual Evaluation of the Head

The performance of the department head will be reviewed annually in accordance with policies of the College of Arts and Sciences.

1.4 Advisory Committee

The Advisory Committee consists of the Head, four members elected at large by the tenured, tenure-track, and voting joint faculty, and two additional members appointed by the Head. The term of office of members elected at large will be two years, two new members being elected each year. At the discretion of the Head, departmental administrators who are not members of the Advisory Committee may attend Advisory Committee meetings.

Regular meetings of the Advisory Committee will be held each month during the academic year; additional meetings may be called as needed.

1.4.1 Advisory Committee Elections

Advisory Committee elections will be held between April 1 and April 15 each year. The Head will call for nominations from the Voting Faculty, each member of which may nominate two people. Any tenured or tenure-track faculty member who receives three or more nominations will be named on the ballot unless that member declines nomination. Voting will be by secret ballot and counted under the direction of the Advisory Committee. If three or more people tie for the largest number of votes, a run-off election between them will be held. Otherwise, the two candidates with the largest number of votes will be elected. If two or more people tie for the second largest number of votes, a run-off election between them will be held.

The Head will appoint two additional members promptly after the election, and the new Advisory Committee will take office on August 1.

When elected members will be absent from the university for three months or longer, the Department Head will rely on the most recent election to select a substitute to serve during the period of absence.

1.4.2 Role of the Advisory Committee

The Advisory Committee will advise the Head on policies and procedures governing the recruitment of new faculty members, salary determinations, allocations of funds, committee and administrative assignments, and any other matters designated by the Head. The Head will circulate the agenda of upcoming Advisory Committee meetings to all faculty and will notify the department of progress on important topics.

1.5 Faculty meetings

The agenda of each faculty meeting will be distributed to the faculty at least five calendar days before the meeting. Items may be placed on the agenda by the Head, any standing committee of the faculty, faculty action at a previous faculty meeting, or petition signed by ten percent of the Voting Faculty.

A quorum consists of a majority of tenured and tenure-track faculty who are eligible to vote at the meeting. Faculty meetings are conducted in accordance with the procedures set down in the revised Robert's Rules of Order except as otherwise provided in these bylaws.

1.5.1 Statement of Attendance at Faculty Meetings

There is a strong expectation that voting faculty will attend faculty meetings, as there is often discussion and vote on important departmental matters. Faculty members unable to attend in person due to a compelling personal or professional reason or an emergency will inform the department head, and may be given the option to attend the meeting online or receive an absentee ballot. An exception is that for meetings related to tenure-promotion-retention (TPR) the option of online attendance will not be available. Exceptionally during the Covid-19 pandemic, all faculty meetings will be held online until further notice. Absentee ballots will be available for the above-mentioned reasons.

1.6 Major Standing Committees

The major standing committees are the Undergraduate Committee and the Graduate Committee. These committees will report directly to the faculty at faculty meetings.

Each major standing committee consists of at least seven Voting Faculty members appointed by the Head in consultation with the Advisory Committee. The Head will designate one member of each committee to chair the committee.

The major standing committees meet at least once during each term. Additional meetings may be called by the chair or on petition of three members. A majority will constitute a quorum.

1.6.1 Curriculum

All changes to the undergraduate or graduate catalogs must first be approved by the respective standing committee. Changes that are approved by the standing committee are presented in finished form for approval at a faculty meeting. Each committee will periodically review the respective curriculum in light of the changing needs of students and the requirements of other departments, the college, and the university.

The major standing committees will ensure that, when appropriate, course materials are developed and made available either by subcommittees or administrators within the department such as course coordinators.

The major standing committees will either consider petitions from students concerning catalog requirements or designate consideration of petitions to an appropriate departmental administrator.

1.6.2 Admission and Retention of Graduate Students

A subcommittee of the Graduate Committee will screen applications for admission to graduate programs. The Graduate Committee will advise the Head regarding criteria for appointment and retention of graduate teaching assistants, including making policies concerning graduate students' rights and responsibilities

1.6.3 Doctoral Dissertation Advising

A faculty member from a department other than Mathematics can only direct a mathematics doctoral dissertation if that faculty member has a joint or adjunct status in the Mathematics Department, and if there is a faculty member from the Mathematics Department serving as a co-advisor for that doctoral candidate.

1.7 Other Committees

Additional standing and ad hoc committees may be formed by either the faculty at a faculty meeting or by the Head. The chair of any committee is designated by the Head in consultation with the Advisory Committee and must be a member of the Voting Faculty.

1.8 Amendments and Exceptions

The faculty will have the power to amend these bylaws according to the following procedures.

- 1) Amendment proposals will originate through a petition to the Advisory Committee signed by at least seven members of the Voting Faculty or directly from the Advisory Committee itself.
- 2) The Advisory Committee will present proposed amendments to the faculty in writing at least 14 days before the next regular faculty meeting following receipt of a petition.
- 3) At that faculty meeting (or subsequent meetings when in order) a motion to poll the faculty for the purpose of adopting the prospective amendment may be made and voted upon according to the usual rules of parliamentary procedure, a majority vote being sufficient to carry the motion.
- 4) After a motion to poll the faculty has carried, a ballot will be distributed immediately to all Voting Faculty and, after seven days, votes will be counted under the direction of the Advisory Committee. An affirmative vote by two-thirds of the faculty who do vote will constitute an enactment of the amendment, provided at least two-thirds of the tenured and tenure-track faculty do vote.

Amendments will become effective immediately following the vote of enactment, and the Voting Faculty will be informed in writing.

Specific exceptions to the bylaws may be made following procedures 1) and 4) above, with a successful motion to poll not being required. Exceptions are effective immediately following the vote of enactment, and the Voting Faculty will be informed in writing.

2 Faculty Workload for all Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty

2.1 Research

Tenured and tenure-track mathematics faculty members are expected to be engaged in ongoing research programs with clear goals. Research output includes publication of books or articles in peer-reviewed journals, presentations at conferences or in mathematics departments at other universities, and external funding from grants and contracts.

External funding obtained by mathematics department faculty provides recognition for the department's research program and many other benefits such as support to travel to conferences and other universities for collaboration, funds for short-term research visits to the department, salaries for postdoctoral researchers, and support for graduate and undergraduate student research. By way of encouraging grant proposals, the department provides Research Incentive Funds (RIF) to the Principle Investigator of any grant: 25% of any RIF received from the College or 60% of any RIF received from the College associated with salary recovery. Faculty whose research output is low, in the absence of exceptional service or administrative activities, are required to assume greater teaching and/or service responsibilities.

2.2 Teaching

The normal course load for tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Math Department is three courses per (academic) year. Course loads may be reduced for very time-consuming administrative assignments, through course banking or course buyouts, and via approved faculty leaves.

Differential teaching loads provide a way for faculty whose research outputs do not meet departmental expectations to continue to fully contribute to the department's mission by taking on greater responsibilities for teaching. A faculty member who receives a rating of "falling short of expectations" for research will normally be given a teaching assignment of four courses for the subsequent academic year. A faculty member who receives a rating of "falling far short of expectations" for research will normally be given a teaching assignment of six courses for the subsequent academic year. Faculty with increased teaching loads are expected to at least meet expectations for quality of teaching and amount of service.

2.2.1 Semester Banking and Faculty Leaves

Policies regarding faculty leaves and semester (course) banking will be in accordance with University and College policies. All faculty leaves and zero-course semesters must be approved in advance by the College and Head, normally three semesters or more in advance. If a faculty member takes a one-semester leave of any sort, the normal teaching load for the remaining semester of that academic year will be two courses. Courses to be banked, and reductions using banked courses, normally should be identified and approved by the Head at least two semesters in advance. One banked course may be used to reduce the teaching load in a later semester by one course. Two banked courses may be used to extend a Faculty Development Leave to an entire year of paid leave.

2.3 Service

All faculty, and to a larger degree tenured faculty, are expected to participate in departmental governance, administration, and committees; academic advising and mentoring of students; college and university committees and taskforces; community outreach activities; and service to the profession.

3 Appointment, Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Review for All Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty

3.1 Appointment

The Head is responsible for writing requests for positions to be sent to the College. In advance of writing such a

request, the Head will ask for proposals from the faculty. A proposal must be supported by at least 3 faculty members to be considered valid. All valid proposals will be circulated to the tenured, tenure-track, and joint voting faculty. A meeting will be held in which the hiring proposals are discussed and ranked via a single Borda ballot. The Head will be advised by this ballot and other discussion at this meeting.

When authorization to search has been obtained, the Head will appoint a search committee of at least 3 tenured, tenure-track, or voting joint faculty. The search committee will advise the Head regarding which candidates to interview. When the interviews are complete, a meeting of the tenured, tenure-track, and voting joint faculty will be held. At this meeting the search committee will provide input regarding the candidates, after which the candidates will be ranked via a Borda ballot. This ballot will constitute a recommendation to the Head.

3.2 Annual Retention Review of Tenure-track Faculty

The head will appoint a retention committee consisting of one or more members of the department in, or close to, the faculty member's research area. The committee will solicit the documentation required by the faculty handbook and write a brief summary of these materials. During a meeting of tenured faculty, the records of tenure-track faculty will be discussed and the faculty will vote for or against retention of the candidate. The retention committee will add to the earlier statement a summary of the discussion at the meeting. The vote total and the narrative will be shared with the faculty member. A positive recommendation for retention will result from a simple majority of votes for retention.

3.3 Enhanced Review of Probationary Faculty

Probationary faculty will undergo enhanced review in accordance with the Faculty Handbook, and in addition the Mathematics Department solicits outside reviews of the candidate's research. The process for selecting outside reviews of the candidate's research for the enhanced review is the same as that described below for tenure and promotion, except that the number of external letters solicited will be determined by the department, subject only to the restrictions that at least two, but not all, of the solicited letters be from the candidate's list, and letters from the candidate's dissertation advisor, postdoctoral mentor, or recent co-author will be acceptable. Candidates for enhanced review will be evaluated based on their progress toward meeting, by the end of their probationary period, the expectations for tenure stated below.

3.4 Tenure and Promotion

Candidates for tenure and promotion will be evaluated according to the standards and procedures in the Faculty Handbook, the College of Arts and Sciences Statement of Criteria for Promotion and Tenure, and the Departmental Criteria and Expectations for Tenure and Promotion below. In this section, "candidate" will refer to the faculty member who is being considered for tenure, promotion, or midpoint retention. "Eligible voting faculty" will refer to tenured faculty for tenure or midpoint retention cases and to tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate for promotion cases.

3.4.1 Departmental Criteria and Expectations for Tenure and Promotion

Candidates must meet an acceptable standard in each of the areas of research, teaching, and service, as described below. Candidates are also expected to exhibit excellence or strong promise of excellence in some area or areas.

Evaluation of research is based on regular publication of papers in reputable, refereed journals or books having substantial new research content. Other indicators of quality research include invited presentations at conferences, invited seminars or colloquia, interdisciplinary collaboration, research grant proposals, and quality of directed doctoral dissertations. Factors which may constitute evidence of excellence in research include significant research grant support or other major research awards, a publication record that is much stronger than the norm, invited plenary talks at prestigious conferences (as indicated by the institutions at which the organizers and main speakers are based), and invited seminars or colloquia in highly ranked departments.

Factors that may contribute to an evaluation of teaching include teaching materials, feedback from students, peer visitations, and grade distributions. Factors which may constitute evidence of excellence in teaching include significant involvement in advising theses or dissertations, giving seminars or colloquia primarily intended for students,

involvement in undergraduate research, publication of textbooks or other works relevant to teaching, awards for teaching, significant involvement in curriculum development, and external funding for teaching-related activities or to support the department's teaching mission.

Service will be evaluated on the basis of service to the university through departmental, college, and university committee work or administrative duties, and service to the profession through refereeing, reviewing, editorial work, conference or special session organization, serving on regional, national, or international committees or organizations related to the mathematics profession, or through significant outreach work related to mathematics. Factors which may give evidence of excellence in service include leadership roles within the university, such as significant service on College or University committees, or in regional, national, or international organizations, outreach which contributes significantly to the visibility of the department, or significant grant support for service-related activities.

3.4.1.1 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should have a strong publication record and an active research program at a level consistent with the department's ranking among mathematics departments by the National Research Council, be visible and active professionally, and have national research recognition. Candidates should exhibit good teaching practice at all levels, including organizing classes carefully, presenting material clearly in class, following fair grading procedures, and being receptive to student questions in class and office hours.

Candidates are expected to participate in the administrative work of the department by serving on departmental committees or by carrying out other department tasks when asked. Candidates are expected to serve the profession by doing referee, review or organizational work, or by participating in mathematical organizations.

3.4.1.2 Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

Candidates for promotion to Full Professor should satisfy all the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor. In addition, candidates must have an outstanding publication record in an established and ongoing research program that has received international recognition. Candidates should have had substantial involvement in promoting undergraduate or graduate student research, and should exhibit the potential for leadership in the department. Candidates are expected to have served on a "major committee" (as defined by the Advisory Committee) at every other year as Associate Professor.

3.4.2 Committees

The Teaching Effectiveness Committee will review the teaching of each candidate and write one or more Peer Review of Teaching reports for the candidate, in accordance with the Faculty Handbook. A peer teaching review will be carried out for Professors below the rank of Full Professor during the academic year prior to the year in which they are considered for enhanced (midterm) retention, tenure, or promotion. The process for a peer teaching review is established by the Teaching Effectiveness Committee in consultation with the Department Head. For Assistant Professors, all Peer Review of Teaching reports will be included in the dossier. For Associate Professors, only the Peer Review of Teaching report or reports since promotion to Associate Professor will be included in the dossier.

The Head will form a Research Committee for each candidate. The Research Committee will review the relevant materials in the candidate's dossier and write an objective report that becomes part of the dossier.

3.4.3 Teaching Materials

Teaching materials submitted to the Peer Review of Teaching Committee will include, for Assistant Professors, all available UT teaching evaluations from past years, and copies of teaching materials from selected courses as determined by the committee. For Associate Professors, only materials for courses taught since promotion to Associate Professor will be solicited or considered.

3.4.4 Research Materials

The candidate will provide the Head with a list of the names of several people qualified to evaluate his/her research.

After consultation with the Research Committee, the Head will solicit evaluations of the candidate's research. Letters may not be solicited from someone with whom the candidate has submitted a joint paper in the past 48 months. The evaluation letters will be included in the candidate's dossier. The candidate will also provide access to all journal publications or books, preprints of submitted papers, and any other evidence of a strong research program.

3.4.5 Service Materials

In addition to the written statement of the candidate, the chair of any committee on which the candidate has served, and participants in any interdisciplinary or interdepartmental activities involving the candidate, are welcome to provide comment

3.4.6 Faculty Recommendation

The candidate's completed dossier will be made available to eligible voting faculty at least two weeks prior to a meeting called expressly for the purpose of making a tenure/promotion recommendation. Eligible voting faculty who will be absent may submit sealed ballots in advance. During the meeting, the chair of each of the candidate's two committees will make an objective presentation of the candidate's qualifications.

After some discussion, those present will vote by secret ballot. After a vote has been taken, the ballots (including absentee ballots, if any) will be counted and the totals for, against, and the number of abstentions, will be announced. When more than one candidate is being considered at a certain rank, this count and announcement will be made after votes for all candidates at that rank have been collected.

A faculty member who is not a member of the candidate's research committee will be chosen by the Head to write a summary of the faculty discussion and vote. This summary will be reviewed by the eligible voting faculty and then sent to the Head. This summary comprises the recommendation of the faculty to the Head. The minimum number of votes necessary to constitute a positive recommendation by the faculty for tenure or promotion is two-thirds of the number of votes cast. A positive recommendation for midpoint retention will result from a simple majority of votes for retention.

3.5 Annual Evaluation of Tenured, Tenure-Track, and Joint Faculty

The Head will conduct an annual review of each faculty member as set forth in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation.

3.6 Expectations for Teaching, Research, and Service

In addition to required materials, faculty member may provide other relevant documents, such as student evaluations and comments, copies of published reviews of his or her work, etc. Each faculty member will receive individual ratings for teaching, research, and service, as well as an overall rating. Except in cases of serious professional misconduct, a faculty member will not be given a rating of "falls far short of meeting expectations" in one of the three areas unless he/she has previously received a rating at most "falls short of meeting expectations" in the same area in one or more of the previous three years. Standards will be modified accordingly for faculty accepting positions within or outside the department whose descriptions include significantly greater administrative or service responsibilities.

3.6.1 Teaching

To meet expectations for teaching, tenured faculty must be good teachers who communicate and work effectively with students. Tenure-track faculty are expected to show a clear interest in, and promise of, developing these attributes in themselves. Factors that may contribute to the evaluation of teaching include teaching materials, feedback from students, peer visitations, and grade distributions.

Factors that may contribute to a rating of "exceeds expectations" or "far exceeds expectations" include significant involvement in advising theses and dissertations, giving seminars or colloquia primarily intended for students, involvement in undergraduate research, publication of textbooks or other works relevant to teaching, awards for teaching, significant involvement in curriculum development, and external funding for teaching-related activities or to support

the department's teaching mission.

Any tenured or tenure-track faculty member who is rated as "falls short of meeting expectations" or "falls far short of meeting expectations" in teaching must prepare a teaching improvement plan. The plan must be prepared according to a timetable and guidelines set by the Advisory Committee, to be completed no later than the end of the semester following the semester in which the annual evaluation occurred. In order for the faculty member to be rated as "meets expectations" in the subsequent annual evaluation, the teaching improvement plan must be approved by a majority of members of the Advisory Committee.

A peer teaching review will be carried out for Professors of any rank who fail to meet expectations for teaching in an annual review, once in the same academic year in which the faculty Member failed to meet expectations, and once in the subsequent academic year.

3.6.2 Research

Normally, a faculty member will meet expectations for research if there is at least one publication in a top quartile journal in the prior three years (the period of the annual review), and a second paper accepted or published in a top quartile journal in the previous five years. In the case of an accepted paper, a copy of any publication acceptance letter must be uploaded to the annual review site. Other indicators of research productivity that may contribute to meeting expectations for research include, but are not limited to, substantial external research funding, plenary talks in prestigious venues, refereed proceedings, review articles, and authorship of substantial monographs. A faculty member who does not meet expectations for research but has at least two papers accepted or published in top quartile journals in the last five years normally will be rated as "falling short" of expectations for research. Without at least two papers accepted or published in a top quartile journal in the last five years, the faculty member will normally be rated as "falling far short" of expectations.

3.6.3 Service

To meet expectations for service, tenured faculty are expected to show leadership within the department; to participate, when asked, in the work of the college and the university, including outreach; and to put effort into service to the discipline through the refereeing process and/or involvement in regional, national, and international organizations. Full professors are expected to serve on at least one "major committee", as defined by the Advisory Committee, per year while not on leave. Associate Professors are expected to serve on a "major committee" (as defined by the Advisory Committee) at least once every other year. Assistant Professors are expected to participate in departmental activities, normally contributing to at least one active departmental committee each year.

Factors that may contribute to a ranking of "exceeds expectations" or "far exceeds expectations" include significant leadership roles within the department, university or national organizations, outreach that contributes significantly to the visibility of the department, and significant grant support for service-related activities such as outreach or conference organization.

3.6.4 Annual Review of Joint Faculty

Joint faculty will be reviewed by the procedures and criteria for tenured or tenure-track faculty at the corresponding rank, with the percentage of effort in the department taken into account.

3.7 Definitions for Overall Rating of Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty

The overall rating for a faculty member who is meeting expectations for research will be the average of the ratings for Research, Teaching, and Service, rounded down to the nearest whole number.

A faculty member who had a normal teaching load in the year under review and who did not meet expectations for research will normally be rated as falling short of meeting expectations overall.

A faculty member who fell short of meeting expectations for research who had a teaching load of at least four courses in the year under review, and who meets expectations for teaching and service, will normally be rated as meeting expectations overall.

A faculty member who fell far short of meeting expectations for research who had a teaching load of six courses in

the prior year, and who met expectations for teaching and service, will normally be rated as meeting expectations overall.

4 Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

4.1 Appointment

Appointment of non-tenure-track faculty is carried out by the Head in consultation with the advisory committee and departmental administrators.

4.2 Lecturer Advisory Committee

The Lecturer Advisory Committee will advise the Undergraduate Director and the Department Head on matters relating to Lecturers. The Lecturer Advisory Committee consists of four voting members, and the Lower Division Chair, who serves as an ex-officio member and chair of the Lecturer Advisory Committee. The Lower Division Chair is not a voting member, unless he or she is also an elected member. Each year in August, two voting members are elected to two year terms, by a vote of the full time, part time, and term Lecturers. If the vote results in a tie, the Undergraduate Head will choose who wins the tie. Only full time regular Lecturers are eligible to serve on the Lecturer Advisory Committee. After serving a two year term, a member may not serve a consecutive term; he or she must wait at least one year before being eligible to run again. If a member cannot complete his or her two year term, a special election will be held to find a replacement to complete the remainder of that member's term.

4.3 Annual Review of Non-Tenure-track Faculty

Evaluation of non-tenure-track faculty will follow the procedures given in the Faculty Handbook and Evaluation Manual. Evaluation of non-tenure-track faculty is based on evidence of high-quality teaching, with additional consideration given to administrative work and scholarly activity related to the department's teaching mission. Performance evaluation normally includes data from the preceding three calendar years, which will be provided to the Head by the faculty member. In addition to any required data, the faculty member may provide other relevant information such as student comments or evidence of scholarly or service activity.

4.3.1 Expectations for Teaching

Lecturers who have been teaching the equivalent of three full-time years are expected to be good teachers who communicate effectively and work enthusiastically with students. Lecturers who have been teaching for less than three years are expected to show a clear interest in, and promise of, developing these attributes in themselves. Factors that may contribute to the evaluation of teaching include teaching materials, feedback from students, peer evaluation, and grade distributions.

Factors that may contribute to a rating of "exceeds expectations" include significant involvement in innovative curriculum development; evidence of very high student success and satisfaction, significant administrative or service leadership in the department or university, teaching awards, significant scholarly activity related to mathematics or mathematics education, leadership positions in education-oriented organizations, and external funding for teaching-related activities or to support the department's teaching mission.

4.3.2 Definitions of "Falls Short of Expectations" and "Falls Far Short of Expectations"

Non-tenure-track faculty who do not meet or exceed expectations will be rated as "Falls Short of Expectations" unless: (1) serious professional misconduct has occurred or (2) the faculty member has been rated as "Falls Short of Expectations" or below in one or more of the preceding three years. In case of (1) or (2), a rating of "Falls Far Short of Expectations" could be given.

4.4 Promotion

Promotion criteria and procedures for Lecturers are as stated in the Lecturer Promotion Guidelines on the Provost's website.