

Faculty Handbook

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville



Office of the Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor

Effective September 8, 2025

This handbook provides a summary of university policies, procedures, implementation guidance, practices, and resources. When official university policies and procedures are changed by the Board of Trustees or other duly constituted authority, those changes become effective on the date designated at the time of their adoption and supersede any conflicting or inconsistent provision in this handbook. Revisions of this handbook are made in accordance with Board Policy BT0007 and Chapter. The appendices form part of the handbook and are revised in the same manner as the body of the handbook.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE: Governance and Organization	5
1.1 Nature and Purpose	5
1.2 Board of Trustees	5
1.3 The University of Tennessee System Administration	5
1.4 University of Tennessee, Knoxville Administration	6
1.5 College and Departmental Administration	6
1.6 Shared Governance	10
1.7 The Faculty Senate.....	12
1.8 Faculty Role in Selection and Evaluation of University Administrators.....	13
1.9 Faculty Role in Budget Making.....	13
1.10 Office of Ombuds Services.....	14
1.11 Other Useful University Resources	15
CHAPTER TWO: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities	16
2.0 Board of Trustees Policy.....	16
2.1 Rights	16
2.2 Responsibilities	17
CHAPTER THREE: Appointment, Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure and Review for All Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty Responsibilities	21
3.0 Board of Trustees Policy.....	21
3.1 Process for Appointment of New Faculty to Tenure-track Positions	21
3.2 Criteria for Appointment to Faculty Rank	22
3.3 Classifications of Appointment.....	24
3.4 Special Faculty Titles.....	24
3.5 Joint and Intercampus Appointments.....	25
3.6 Summer Appointments	26
3.7 Faculty Duties and Workload	26
3.8 Faculty Review and Evaluation	26
3.9 Salary	33
3.10 Promotion.....	33
3.11 Tenure	34
3.12 Procedures for Terminating Tenured Faculty	53
3.13 Disciplinary Sanctions Other than Termination for Adequate Cause.....	65
3.14 Notice of Resignation and Retirement.....	66

CHAPTER FOUR: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments.....	67
4.1 Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Titles and Ranks	67
4.2 Recruitment and Appointment.....	73
4.3 Reappointment	75
4.4 Annual Planning and Performance Review	76
4.5 Promotion.....	77
4.6 Appeals	79
4.7 Termination.....	79
4.8 Professional Development and Support.....	79
CHAPTER FIVE: Faculty Rights of Appeal	80
5.1 Introduction.....	80
5.2 Appeals through the Administrative Channel.....	82
5.3 Appeals through the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee.....	82
5.4 Appeals through the Tennessee Uniform Administrative Procedures Act	84
5.5 Termination of Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members Before The Stipulated Term of Employment.....	85
CHAPTER SIX: Benefits and Leaves of Absence	86
6.1 Introduction.....	86
6.2 Benefits for all Faculty Members	86
6.3 Faculty Leave.....	87
6.4 Additional Benefits and Leave for Nine-Month Faculty Members	90
6.5 Leave for 12-Month Faculty Members	91
6.6 Records of Leave	91
CHAPTER SEVEN: Compensated Outside Services.....	93
7.1 Introduction.....	93
7.2 General Principles	93
7.3 Specific Guidelines	94
CHAPTER EIGHT: Revision of the Faculty Handbook	96
8.0 Board of Trustees Policy.....	96
8.1 Faculty Handbook Review.....	96
8.2 Revision of Titles and Editorial, Technical, and Housekeeping Changes	96
8.3 Faculty Handbook Revisions	96

APPENDIX A: Procedures for Annual Performance and Planning Review	98
APPENDIX B: Procedures for APPR Improvement Plan.....	102
APPENDIX C-1: UTK Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review (PPPR) ...	103
APPENDIX C-2: UTIA Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review (PPPR) ..	110
APPENDIX D: Procedures for Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR)	117
APPENDIX E: Assembly of the Tenure and/or Promotion Dossier	125
APPENDIX F: Evaluation and Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty	132

CHAPTER ONE: Governance and Organization

1.1 Nature and Purpose

This handbook contains material that applies to all faculty at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, including faculty at the Institute of Agriculture, and faculty at the Space Institute.

As the state's leading comprehensive research and land-grant institution, UT's primary purpose is to move forward the frontiers of human knowledge and enrich and elevate society, as further elaborated in its Mission Statement. The university is committed to the principle that decisions concerning employment, admission, and performance should be based on an individual's qualifications and performance and not on characteristics unrelated to job or academic requirements. The university does not discriminate on the basis of race, gender, color, religion, national origin, age, disability, or veteran status in provision of educational opportunities or employment opportunities or benefits. The university and its employees shall not discriminate against or harass any employee or student on the basis of sexual orientation; gender identity; marital status; parental status; or similar characteristics, regardless of whether those characteristics enjoy a protected status under state or federal law.¹

The institution welcomes and honors people of all races, creeds, cultures, and sexual orientations, and values intellectual curiosity, pursuit of knowledge, and academic freedom and integrity. Faculty prepare students to lead lives of personal integrity and civic responsibility.

1.2 Board of Trustees

The governing body of The University of Tennessee is the Board of Trustees. The board has delegated administrative authority to the president, who exercises this authority through delegation to, and in consultation with, a staff of vice presidents and chancellors. The board has delegated to campus faculty senates the authority, subject to the approval of the chief academic officer(s), chancellor(s), the president, and the board itself, to determine general educational objectives, as well as policies and regulations related to those objectives, such as requirements for admission, retention, readmission, graduation, and honors for all degree and certificate programs.

1.3 The University of Tennessee System Administration

The system administration, headed by the president, enunciates the general mission of the university, and coordinates comprehensive, long-range plans, growth, and development of the campuses and statewide operating divisions.

¹ This paragraph is interpreted in a manner consistent with university policies, including HR0220, and applicable law.

1.4 University of Tennessee, Knoxville Administration

1.4.1 Chancellor

The chancellor is the chief executive officer, or administrative head, of the campus. As chief executive officer, the chancellor is fully responsible for the administration and management of the campus. The chancellor represents the campus in all matters that go before the president and the Board of Trustees. The chancellor delegates responsibility for various campus operations to vice chancellors.

1.4.2 Chief Academic Officer

The provost is the chief academic officer of the campus. The provost reports directly to the chancellor and is responsible for the supervision of all academic matters at UTK.

1.5 College and Departmental Administration

Academic units of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville are varied and diverse both in their role and scope and in their mode of organization. In most colleges, department heads administer the work of academic departments and report to the dean. Other administrators include assistant deans, associate deans, and/or directors. In some smaller colleges, the dean also has responsibilities assigned to department heads. All administrators are expected to act on principles of shared governance and hence seek the advice and recommendations of faculty.

1.5.1 Academic Deans

Generally, the dean has these administrative concerns:

1. the academic program in its college-wide aspects, in the special relationships among its departments, and its relation to the larger university and public;
2. the faculty of the college and the leadership of the college (directors, department heads, college committees, and task forces), their development, review, assessment, reappointment or renewal;
3. encouragement and support of teaching, research, creative activity, and public service;
4. coordinating support services for the conduct of college business (staff, facilities, equipment);
5. strategic planning;
6. budget preparation, review, and analysis for the college; and
7. fund-raising and developing relationships with outside constituents.

The university looks to the dean for definitive recommendations about the curriculum; staffing; faculty promotion, tenure, and review; development needs; and all financial aspects of college operation. These recommendations are made after consultation with appropriate faculty and/or college or department level committees, as well as department heads.

Deans are appointed after an internal or external search conducted according to university policies and any specific guidelines established by the Office of the Provost. The chief academic officer selects the chair of the search committee from outside the college and appoints members of the committee from persons nominated by tenured and tenure-track faculty members of the college. A majority of the search committee is composed of tenured and tenure-track faculty members of the college, chosen to represent a balance among the academic areas of the college. The committee may include representation from non-tenure-track faculty members, departmental staff members, students, and where appropriate faculty members from outside of the college, as covered by collegiate bylaws.

The dean is expected to take an active role in decision making that may or may not be in agreement with faculty and/or department heads and that may involve identification of needs that have not been made explicit in department reports, or that recommend the orchestration of joint programs and ventures, and the development and execution of alternative means for doing the work of the college. An administrative appointment as Dean, like all other administrative offices, carries no tenure. The dean serves at the will of the chief academic officer, normally for a five-year term that may be renewed. The chief academic officer shall conduct annual reviews of the dean, including surveys of tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty as well as staff. The chief academic officer provides a summary assessment of the dean's performance, including goals established for the coming year, which is available for inspection by the college's faculty. The decision to reappoint a dean shall be made after a reappointment review, based on annual reviews by the chief academic officer and a survey of the members of the college, similar to that administered for the annual review. In no case should a decision on retention or non-retention be made without consultation with the faculty, who are involved to a degree at least co-extensive with their role in the selection process.

1.5.2 Department Head

In colleges not organized into schools or departments, the dean serves as both dean and department head. In this handbook, the term "department head" includes administrators with other titles, such as director, who performs the duties of a unit administrator. The head is a member of the faculty who is assigned the special duty of administering the department. The head is appointed in consultation with the faculty of the unit that he or she will administer.

The department head's responsibilities include:

1. providing leadership for the departmental academic program in relation to the comprehensive academic program of the university, including:
 - a. recruiting faculty and staff,
 - b. working with faculty to plan, execute, and review curriculum,
 - c. encouraging and supporting faculty teaching, research, creative activity, and public service,

- d. counseling and advising students majoring in the discipline, and
 - 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 staff,
 - 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, and
 - e. authorization of all expenditures from the department budget;
 3. conducting or overseeing annual performance reviews for faculty and staff.

1.5.3 Effective Departmental Governance

Successful governance of a department is critical to achieving the teaching, research, and service missions of the unit. The collaboration of the department head and the departmental faculty is an essential cornerstone of this success. This collaboration is best implemented through departmental bylaws that define the policies and procedures of the department, and a departmental strategic plan that articulates the vision for the future of the department. Ideally, the head is but one voice in the construction of such documents, with the added responsibility of guiding the faculty toward a clear articulation of their policies and vision. Faculty members are responsible for participating constructively in the creation of these documents, which should represent a strong departmental consensus. Departmental bylaws must be congruent with this handbook and college and university policies and procedures. The bylaws address issues, such as the governance structure of the department; search process for new tenure-track faculty; departmental voting protocols; criteria for promotion, retention and evaluation of tenure-track and tenured faculty members; selection, evaluation and roles of non-tenure-track faculty members in the department; input into criteria for evaluation of department heads; application of faculty evaluations to salary adjustments; and the role of the faculty in setting departmental budget priorities. A departmental strategic plan discusses the needs, goals, and aspirations of the department, providing guidance to both the head and the faculty members about achieving departmental objectives in teaching, research, and service. Such plans should be constructed and revised as necessary in the context of college and university goals.

Departmental bylaws and the strategic plan provide the head with guidance for day-to-day decisions about conducting performance evaluations, handling budgetary responsibilities, dealing with facilities issues, improving the student experience, and representing the department to the college and university. The head conducts regular faculty meetings (at least two per semester) and facilitates the work of departmental faculty committees as outlined in the bylaws. After approval by the dean, the head conducts searches for new faculty and staff members in accordance with departmental bylaws and university policies. The head meets annually with each faculty member to conduct a performance review and write an evaluation, in accordance with this handbook and departmental bylaws.

1.5.4 Selection of Department Heads

The head is appointed to a five-year term, serving at the will of the dean, and can be reappointed by the dean. Prior to initiating a search for a new department head, the departmental faculty meets and drafts a statement, using input from all departmental constituencies including minority opinions, that is sent to the dean, containing their expectations for the position in the context of the departmental vision and their recommendation for an internal or external search. This communication is followed by a meeting of the dean with all departmental faculty members. Typically, the dean's decision to conduct an external or internal search is a function of departmental, college, and institutional priorities and budget. The dean will communicate a decision to the departmental faculty about the search, with allowance for response and discussion, particularly where the decision of the dean disagrees with the departmental expectations. However, the dean's decision is final and must be consistent with university policies.

For internal and external searches, the dean appoints the chair of the search committee from outside the department. Departmental tenure-track and tenured faculty members collectively recommend a slate of departmental faculty for the search committee, from which the dean selects all departmental representatives on the search committee. A majority of the search committee is composed of tenured faculty members of the department, representing the academic constituencies of the unit, but the committee may include representation from tenure-track faculty members, non-tenure-track faculty members, students, and where appropriate, faculty members from outside the department, as covered by departmental bylaws. The dean has the responsibility to ensure appropriate representation in search committee membership.

The search committee must follow all applicable university policies or procedures. After selected candidates for the headship are interviewed, the departmental employees meet to discuss their preferences. While all departmental constituencies have input into the discussion, only the tenure-track and tenured faculty members conduct an anonymous vote for their choice, unless non-tenure-track faculty are otherwise permitted by departmental bylaws to vote in department head selections. A summary of the faculty discussion and a record of the vote become part of the narrative that the search committee submits to the dean with the recommendation of the committee about candidates for the headship. Normally, the vote of the faculty guides the recommendation of the search committee. Similarly, the vote of the faculty and the recommendation of the search committee guide the decision of the dean. If the dean's choice of candidate for the headship disagrees with the vote of the faculty, he or she will provide reasons in writing to the departmental faculty and offer the tenure-track and tenured faculty members as a group the opportunity to discuss the decision. The faculty has a right to meet with the chief academic officer about the dean's decision.

1.5.5 Annual Evaluation of Department Heads

Departmental faculty members provide annual objective and systematic evaluation of the head to the dean of the college, following procedures stated in departmental bylaws that are consistent

with university policy². The dean meets with the head annually to discuss job performance. This discussion is based on the review of the departmental faculty and the evaluation of the dean. The dean provides a summary assessment, including goals established for the coming year, which is available for inspection by departmental faculty.

1.5.6 Reappointment of Department Heads

The final decision on the reappointment of a department head rests with the dean – or deans in cases where a department head reports to more than one dean. (The singular form is understood to represent the plural form in this Section 1.5.6, as applicable.) A department head may be reappointed for an additional five-year term after a reappointment review. The dean shall base the review on the annual evaluations of the department head by the departmental faculty and the annual assessment of the department head by the dean (as provided for in Section 1.5.5) and on input from relevant constituencies.

In particular, prior to making a decision on reappointment, the dean shall (a) solicit input from all departmental groups, including students, staff, and faculty and (b) consult extensively with tenured, tenure-track, and other full-time departmental faculty having voting rights on matters other than tenure and promotion, as may be determined in the departmental bylaws (collectively, the “Voting Faculty”). The process for input solicitation and consultation shall include a vote of the Voting Faculty on the reappointment and may be further defined in collegiate or departmental bylaws. The faculty vote and the bases for that vote shall be documented in writing and promptly sent to the dean for review. Absent compelling circumstances, the dean shall give great weight to the consensus views of the Voting Faculty in making reappointment decisions. The dean shall issue a written report to the Voting Faculty that states his or her final decision on the reappointment of the department head and the reasons for that decision, citing support from the annual evaluations and other input.

The department head serves at the will of the dean. If a department head is not reappointed, the dean shall begin the process of selecting a new department head in accordance with Section 1.5.4.

1.6 Shared Governance

The responsibilities of the faculty in the governance of the university are important and varied. They are discharged in two basic ways: (1) through the work of the faculty senate (regarding the general policies of the campus as a whole), and (2) through the work of faculty and faculty committees within departments, colleges, and the university as a whole. Faculty members should be active participants in deliberations and decisions on all policy and procedure committees.

Faculty members have the right to contribute to campus and university discourse that is at the heart of the shared governance of the campus and the university. When contributing to campus and university discourse, at any level within the university or the community at large, faculty

² In cases where a department head reports to more than one dean, unit bylaws determine inclusion of additional supervisors.

members have the freedom to raise and to address, without fear of institutional discipline or restraint or other adverse employment action, any issue related to professional duties; the functioning of academic units, the campus, or the university; and department, college, campus, or university actions, positions, or policies.

The perspectives of administrators, students, and professional and support staff are also essential to shared governance. It is the responsibility of the faculty to work collaboratively with these and other university constituencies.

The university practices shared governance. It acts on principles derived from in-depth conversation among faculty representatives and academic administrators that are in accordance with the following principles:

1. communication – regular and timely sharing of information among faculty, staff, students, administration, and trustees,
2. faculty responsibility – primary role in determining curriculum, educational policy, standards for evaluating teaching and scholarship, selection of new faculty, and promotion and tenure,
3. faculty representation in university decision-making that directly or indirectly affects faculty ability to function effectively,
4. timely consultation between faculty and administrators on academic matters, and
5. peer nomination of faculty to serve on university committees.

The process of shared governance depends upon:

1. transparency – of information and responses of others, so that constituents are able to fully understand policy and related issues,
2. accessibility – to information and the responses of others, so that constituents are able to consider various perspectives,
3. adequate time – to reflect on information and the responses of others as well as share one's own response, so that constituents can fully participate,
4. opportunity – to communicate collaboratively, so that constituents can reach decisions that serve the common good, and
5. consistency – in the process of shared governance, so that an atmosphere of openness and trust prevails.

Dissemination of information is only one part of the process. Responses from constituents need to be shared as appropriate, in a format accessible to everyone who chooses to review this information. In many cases, face-to-face dialogue provides the best opportunity to communicate

collaboratively. While the faculty senate and other university committees provide a major source of faculty representation in shared governance, faculty should have the opportunity to share their input prior to the establishment of policy related to academic matters and the welfare of the university community. All faculty members are expected to accept the responsibility of shared governance and act as good university citizens through service on committees, task forces, and the senate.

1.7 The Faculty Senate

The faculty senate is authorized, subject to the approval of the chancellor, the president, and the Board of Trustees, to formulate policies and regulations regarding the general educational objectives of the university, including those policies and regulations related to the overall general requirements for admission, readmission, retention, graduation, and honors for the degree programs and certificate programs of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. The faculty role in campus-wide governance is through the senate, the representative body specifically charged by the board (a) to formulate the university's educational standards and degree requirements, including approval of academic programs and their curricula; and (b) to consider, advise, and recommend to the administration policies about a wide range of issues affecting the general welfare of the faculty. Among these issues are:

1. criteria for faculty appointment, dismissal, evaluation, promotion, tenure, and retirement;
2. criteria for the selection of the chancellor, the chief academic officer, and other campus administrative officers;
3. criteria for the selection of the president and other statewide executive officers of UT (in conjunction with other faculty senates or corresponding bodies of the other entities within the UT system);
4. priorities for the university development plan;
5. changes in physical facilities;
6. policies regarding student life, rights, and responsibilities; and
7. coordination with the faculty senate president to nominate faculty members for service on university committees.

The senate is authorized to review curriculum, including admission and graduation requirements for programs of all academic units. The review process takes place through designated committees at the college and university level, proceeding to the senate through the Undergraduate and/or Graduate Councils. Departmental proposals for the curriculum are transmitted by a departmental representative (or head) for review by divisional, college, and university committees. The head does not have veto power in curricular recommendations approved by departmental faculty, although it is important for college and university committees to have full benefit of the head's advice and judgment about such recommendations. Each academic unit is represented on the senate by an equitable number of senators as stated in the

Faculty Senate Bylaws. Other faculty members may serve on faculty senate committees and task forces to assist in this process.

The senate has no management or administrative functions either in itself or through its committees since such functions are expressly reserved to the president (as delegated by the Board of Trustees) and through the president to the chancellor. But the advice and recommendation of the senate about all of the concerns listed above are considered carefully by all administrators. The Faculty Senate Bylaws contain detailed information about the operation of the senate, its organization, officers, meetings, committees, appointment of faculty members to senate committees and task forces and recommendation of faculty members to serve on administrative committees and task forces. Administrative committees and task forces are determined by the chancellor or chief academic officer. Other task forces are established by the senate according to its bylaws. In an effort to act on shared governance, the chancellor works closely with the senate president in establishing joint task forces.

1.8 Faculty Role in Selection and Evaluation of University Administrators

All administrators at the department head level or higher who have responsibilities touching or affecting the academic programs of the university must understand and respect the values of the academic profession and its ethos of commitment to freedom in open and objective inquiry. That is why the university seeks always to ensure appropriate faculty participation in the appointment of its administrators. The faculty should nominate their peers to serve on search advisory committees, interview prospective candidates, and submit evaluations of those candidates for academic administrative offices.

The faculty will be involved in the annual evaluation of department heads, deans, the chief academic officer, and the chancellor and their staffs through a process approved by the faculty senate. A more extensive evaluation, including a survey, is conducted during the fifth year of the five-year appointment. Input is sought from all faculty across the university, or within the college or department, as appropriate.

1.9 Faculty Role in Budget Making

Faculty judgments about the academic program have significant bearing on the shape of the budget, and budgetary decisions affect the shape of the academic programs. The faculty are asked to participate in establishing major institutional priorities in several ways. The faculty senate, through its Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council, gives approval for establishing new programs and for terminating existing ones. Administrative judgments about the costs of these programs inform this deliberation and in turn are affected by the judgments of the faculty as to the pedagogical and intellectual soundness of such proposals. Deans, department heads, and the chief academic officer consult with appropriate faculty groups at their respective levels concerning the general fiscal implications of decisions about the curriculum, enrollment, class-size, and admission policies. The faculty senate Finance and Benefits Committee participates in the presentation of budgetary needs to the chief academic officer on an annual basis. The chair of the faculty senate Finance and Benefits Committee serves on the Executive Budget Committee.

1.10 Office of Ombuds Services

The university Ombudsperson and other staff from the Office of Ombuds Services serve faculty, staff, and graduate students. The ombuds serves as a no-barrier first stop when faculty are seeking information and insight from a trusted consultant who is neutral, confidential, and informal. The ombuds advocates for neither the faculty nor the university, but rather supports fair practices and mutual respect, fostering probity and timeliness in the administration of campus policies and practices.

It is expected that the ombuds will be experienced in both alternative dispute resolution and university faculty affairs (including tenure, promotion, evaluation, dispute resolution, and governance), and is responsible for facilitating informal conflict resolution at the request of faculty, staff, and graduate students. As a consultant, the ombuds acts as a resource for information on university policies, faculty rights and responsibilities, appeal procedures and other due process. The ombuds helps faculty members decide how best to solve problems early and generally at the lowest levels. If the faculty member has initiated an appeal through the administrative or faculty senate channels under section 5.2 or 5.3, the faculty member may continue to consult the ombuds for an impartial opinion and advice, but the ombuds is not permitted to participate actively in those appeals. Except as required by law, consultations with the ombuds will not be communicated to a third party unless the faculty member gives their permission or the ombuds concludes that there is imminent risk of harm to the faculty member or others.

The ombuds is not permitted to provide legal advice; assist in problems that are unrelated to the university; or represent the faculty member in administrative appeals or Faculty Senate Appeals Committee hearings or appeals. The ombuds' role as a consultant or informal mediator is separate from the administrative appeals and faculty senate appeals processes. The ombuds does not make binding decisions for the university or overrule administrative decisions. Rather, the ombuds makes recommendations based upon their understanding of the situation, university policies and procedures, experience, and sense of fairness.

The faculty senate shall provide ongoing advice and assistance to the university Ombudsperson on the rules and policies applicable to university faculty. The university Ombudsperson will issue a report to the faculty senate once each year on (a) the number of faculty members served, (b) the types of matters handled, (c) any recommended change to university or faculty rules or policies and the basis for the recommended change, and (d) any other matters that the university Ombudsperson or the faculty senate shall deem necessary or advisable in connection with their respective roles in faculty support and governance. The annual report of the Office of Ombuds Services will not disclose any information that the ombuds is required to keep confidential in accordance with this section or ombuds best practices.

The Office of Ombuds Services staff are appointed under the university's human resources policies and procedures. The university Ombudsperson will be appointed after a search process led by the chancellor or a designee, and the search committee will include representation from the faculty senate. All other ombuds staff will be appointed after a search led by the university Ombudsperson, and when feasible, the search committee will include at least one member of the faculty senate.

1.11 Other Useful University Resources

Faculty should be aware of university policies, procedures, and guidelines related to their work, including all online repositories of policies, procedures, and guidance. Those include (but are not limited to):

- UTK Policy Central³;
- UT System Policies⁴;
- Office of the Provost procedures and guidance⁵;
- Office of Research, Innovation & Economic Development procedures and guidance⁶;
- UT Research Foundation policies, procedures, and guidance⁷.

³ <https://policycentral.utk.edu>

⁴ <https://policy.tennessee.edu/ut-system-policies/>

⁵ <https://liveutk.sharepoint.com/sites/provost/SitePages/Faculty-Affairs.aspx?csf=1&web=1&c=dMGGGy>

⁶ <https://research.utk.edu/oried/references/forms-policies/>

⁷ <https://utr.f.tennessee.edu/>

CHAPTER TWO: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities

2.0 Board of Trustees Policy

The Board of Trustees Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure, (BT0006) adopted in 1998, and all subsequent amendments, govern faculty rights and responsibilities. The following sections are intended as a general summary of those rights and responsibilities. In the event of any conflict or inconsistency between the board's policy and this handbook, the board's policy will control.

2.1 Rights

2.1.1 Academic Freedom

Faculty members have the right to academic freedom and are expected to seek and to speak the truth as they perceive it on the basis of expertise and research in their discipline. Academic freedom is this right for faculty members to teach, research, create, and perform about their knowledge and understanding in their discipline. This freedom persists even when faculty members hold a minority view within their discipline and when others in and beyond the institution find these views contrary or objectionable. The right of academic freedom applies to all faculty members, including non-tenure track faculty members. A faculty member should recognize that the right of academic freedom is enjoyed by all members of the academic community. She or he should be prepared at all times to support actively the right of the individual to freedom of research and communication.

2.1.2 Tenure

Tenure is defined in board policy and protects academic freedom. This status is awarded to a junior tenure-track faculty member after serving a successful probationary period that is typically six years, to a senior faculty member with previously demonstrated academic excellence who maintains excellence for a shorter probationary period, or to a senior faculty member of outstanding excellence or who is assuming a senior administrative position at the time of appointment. Additional information about tenure is found in Chapter 3.

2.1.3 Freedom as a Citizen

When faculty members communicate as citizens on matters of public concern, they operate independently of the university. In this situation, faculty members have rights common to all citizens, including the rights to organize associations, join associations, participate in public meetings, run for, and serve in government offices subject to applicable state and federal laws and university Human Resources (HR) policies, demonstrate, picket, and voice their opinions. When exercising their rights as citizens, faculty members must also respect the university by not claiming to represent the positions or views of the university and by not using institutional resources.

2.2 Responsibilities

2.2.1 The Importance of Scholarship

Faculty members at The University of Tennessee pursue scholarship throughout the course of their academic careers. Junior faculty members on tenure-track appointments are expected to focus their scholarly activities on establishing a reputation as experts in their disciplines by constructing new knowledge and understanding that is presented in respected venues in a manner recognized by their discipline and the university. Senior faculty members, having established a recognized expertise, build an even greater contribution to the scholarship of their disciplines; contribute to the scholarship about improved learning and teaching; and contribute to the scholarship of improved outreach to K-12 education, applied research focused on the needs of the community, and applied service to benefit the community. Successful faculty members maintain disciplinary expertise even when pursuing scholarship in learning, teaching, and outreach. The university also encourages and supports interdisciplinary activities by faculty members.

While the responsibilities of a faculty member are divided among research, teaching, and service, these arenas are not isolated, particularly at an institution such as UT, which is both a land-grant and research university for the state. For example, faculty members might involve undergraduate students in research or involve the greater community through outreach in basic and applied research. Each faculty member makes a distinct contribution to the university that is in accordance with her or his terms of appointment, departmental bylaws, discipline, and rank. Specific responsibilities in each of the three areas described below are evaluated and modified as appropriate annually.

2.2.2 Teaching

Faculty members are responsible for teaching effectively by employing useful methods and approaches that facilitate student learning. Faculty members design courses to achieve clearly defined learning objectives with appropriate evaluation tools and teaching methods. Advising and mentoring undergraduate and graduate students concerning educational and professional opportunities, degree plans, and career goals are also important. Faculty members may educate students through distance learning. Faculty members may pursue the scholarship of education, so as to improve teaching of faculty members and other educators, such as primary and secondary teachers, or extension agents. Other faculty members through outreach instruct non-traditional audiences in off-campus settings to improve professional expertise and public understanding.

2.2.3 Research / Scholarship / Creative Activity

Faculty members make intellectual and creative contributions through the scholarship of discovery and application, both within and across disciplines. Faculty disseminate their scholarly work through venues respected in their disciplines and beyond academia, secure funding where appropriate for their scholarly endeavors through organizations and disciplinary opportunities, and mentor undergraduate and graduate students in the research experience. Some faculty members pursue the scholarship of discovery by creating new knowledge and skills. Some faculty members pursue the scholarship of application, which typically involves outreach to the

community to co-develop successful practices to address problems to benefit individuals and organizations.

2.2.4 Service

Faculty members should participate in department, college, and university governance. Faculty members serve their disciplines by providing leadership in appropriate public, private, professional, and governmental organizations. Faculty members benefit the community beyond the institution by lending their professional expertise to aid or lead organizations that create beneficial linkages between the university and the community.

2.2.5 Professional Conduct

Within the university, faculty members treat colleagues, staff, and students with respect and fairness. They listen to the views of others, work constructively as members of the diverse academic community, and safeguard the recognition of achievements of others, including those in subordinate positions. Faculty honesty in financial and personal matters is expected. Beyond the university, individual faculty members are representatives to the wider community, which they treat with respect and fairness.

2.2.6 Relationships with Students

2.2.6.1 Definitions

This policy applies to all faculty as defined in Chapters 3 and 4 of this handbook, whether employed full-time or part-time, whether paid or unpaid. For the purpose of this policy, “relationship” includes any amorous or sexual conduct, whether occurring one time, occasionally, or regularly. Colleges, departments, offices, or other units may impose more restrictive policies governing relationships with students, which shall take precedence over this policy except to the extent such policies violate any Board of Trustees policy or conflict with law.

2.2.6.2 Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to preserve the trust and respect that are essential to the faculty-student relationship and the instructional mission of the University of Tennessee. Trust and respect are diminished when a person in a position of authority abuses – or appears to abuse – his or her power. Faculty members are in positions of authority and exercise power over students in many ways, whether in giving praise or criticism, evaluating academic or clinical work, evaluating research, making recommendations for further studies or future employment, or in many other subtle expressions of authority over students. An amorous or sexual relationship with a student greatly increases the potential for a faculty member’s abuse of power because of the inherently unequal status of the persons involved in the relationship. Even in cases where such a relationship begins with the mutual consent of the participating persons, it can result in exploitation of the student or the creation of a hostile learning or work environment for the student. Other students and employees may also be adversely affected by the amorous or sexual relationship because the faculty member is positioned to favor or advance one student’s interest

at the expense of others. In all such cases, the trust and respect essential to the university's instructional mission are diminished.

2.2.6.3 Prohibited Relationships

Amorous or sexual relationships between a faculty member and a student are prohibited when the faculty member has professional authority over, or responsibility for, the student. This professional authority or responsibility encompasses both instructional and non-instructional contexts as defined below:

1. Relationships in the Instructional Context: A faculty member shall not have an amorous or sexual relationship (consensual or otherwise) with a student who is simultaneously enrolled in a course being taught by the faculty member or whose academic or work performance is subject to supervision or evaluation by the faculty member. The instructional context includes not only classroom teaching and direct instruction, but also academic advising, mentoring, or tutoring.
2. Relationships outside the Instructional Context: Outside the instructional context, a faculty member shall not take any action or make any decision that may reward or penalize a student with whom he or she has, or has had, an amorous or sexual relationship. Faculty members must be especially cautious to avoid taking any action that rewards or penalizes the student or influences others responsible for taking such action.

A faculty member violates this policy by engaging in an amorous or sexual relationship with a student over whom he or she has authority or professional responsibility, even when both parties have consented (or appear to have consented) to the relationship or conduct.

Relationships that do not fall under the prohibition in this Section 2.2.6.3, even if they appear to be consensual, are strongly discouraged. Voluntary consent by a student to an amorous or sexual relationship with a faculty member is inherently suspect, given the fundamentally asymmetrical nature of the relationship. Furthermore, conduct that begins as consensual can become non-consensual at any time. Even when both parties initially consent to particular conduct, past consent does not preclude a finding of sexual harassment if the conduct was unwelcome (the standard for sexual harassment) or if later conduct was unwelcome. Moreover, conduct that is *consensual* for purposes of criminal statutes may be nonetheless *unwelcome* and therefore may constitute a violation of the university policy prohibiting Sexual Harassment (HR0280) or the Policy on Sexual Harassment, Sexual Assault, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking.

2.2.6.4 Disciplinary Sanctions

When a faculty member is found to have violated this policy, an appropriate sanction, up to and including termination, will be imposed pursuant to the disciplinary procedures applicable to faculty (Board policies, this handbook, and HR policies). Disciplinary sanctions may be appealed through any applicable appeal procedures.

2.2.6.5 Administrative Actions

Before – or in addition to – any disciplinary sanctions, university officials may take administrative actions (in consultation with the chief academic officer) for any of the following or similar reasons: to ensure the safety of any person; to protect the integrity of an academic course or other program; to end or prevent a hostile learning or work environment; to end or prevent retaliatory conduct; or for any other reason required to comply with state or federal law. Administrative actions may include (but are not limited to): temporary administrative leave pending investigation of an alleged violation of this policy; temporary reassignment of courses; temporary reassignment of research projects; or temporary removal from campus. Any such administrative action may be appealed through the applicable appeal process, but the administrative action will not be held in abeyance during the appeal.

2.2.6.6 Reporting Violations of the Policy

Faculty members who have knowledge of a possible violation of this policy are encouraged to report that concern to the Office of Investigation and Resolution (OIR) for review or investigation. Certain conduct described in this policy may also trigger a mandatory reporting obligation: (a) if the involved student is a minor; (b) if the conduct appears to violate the Policy on Sexual Harassment, Sexual Assault, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking⁸; or (c) if reporting is otherwise required by law or university policy. In the case of uncertainty about the reporting obligation, OIR officials may be consulted without providing personally identifiable information in order to clarify the reporting obligation, or to get more information about how OIR might handle a possible violation of this policy.

2.2.6.7 Retaliation Prohibited

Retaliation is prohibited against any person who reports a possible violation of this policy or related policies. Retaliation is also prohibited against any person who participates in an OIR investigation. Faculty members who have reason to suspect that the prohibition against retaliation has been violated or are the objects of retaliation themselves are directed to contact OIR.

⁸ <https://titleix.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/96/2023/08/77960398-Title-IX-Policy-2023-2024.pdf>

CHAPTER THREE: Appointment, Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure and Review for All Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty Responsibilities

3.0 Board of Trustees Policy

The Board of Trustees Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure⁷ (BT0006) adopted in 1998, and all subsequent amendments, govern faculty rights and responsibilities. The following sections are intended as a general summary of those rights and responsibilities. In the event of any conflict or inconsistency between the board's policy and this handbook, the board's policy will control.

This chapter concerns the academic status of tenure-track and tenured faculty. In the typical case, a faculty career begins with appointment as a tenure-track assistant professor with a probationary period of six years. The probationary faculty member will apply for tenure during the sixth year, and if tenure is not granted, the faculty member will be permitted to serve a seventh year as a terminal year.

Faculty may apply for early consideration for tenure, may have their probationary period extended, or may petition for a suspension of one or more years of the probationary period, as described in Section 3.11.4.1.

Tenured associate professors may be promoted to 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 professor.

Throughout this career path, all faculty members have annual reviews and appropriate reviews for promotion and tenure.

3.1 Process for Appointment of New Faculty to Tenure-track Positions

- A. The department head or dean, where there is no department, obtains authorization to search for a new tenure-track faculty member after consultation regarding the needs of the program with departmental faculty, the dean, and the chief academic officer of the university. An authorization to search does not necessitate appointment, as financial conditions within the university or the inability to hire an appropriate candidate may prevent appointment.
- B. A thorough search and careful selection must precede any departmental recommendation of appointment. As part of this process, departmental faculty nominate potential search committee members from which the department head selects a search committee in consultation with the tenured and tenure-track faculty. It is the department head's responsibility to assure appropriate search committee representation in accordance with departmental bylaws and university search procedures. The search committee recommends the applicant pool and identifies candidates to be considered for interviews. The tenured and

tenure-track faculty will evaluate and vote on the candidates and make a recommendation to the department head. The head will then recommend a candidate to the dean. If the dean agrees with the recommendation, the dean will then recommend the candidate to the chief academic officer, who will then make a recommendation to the chancellor. If the head's recommendation diverges from that of the faculty, the head must explain his or her reasons in detail to the faculty, who have the right to meet with the dean and chief academic officer about the recommendation.

- C. Following the decision to recommend appointment, the head and prospective faculty member typically discuss informally rank, salary, and other terms of employment. Such discussions inform the recommendations of the department head but do not constitute a binding commitment by the university.
- D. Notification of appointment is made by letter from the chief academic officer. This appointment letter specifies (a) rank, (b) salary and related financial conditions, (c) the academic year during which a tenure decision must be reached, (d) general duties and expectations, and (e) the home department, in the case of joint appointments. Correspondence between the department head, dean, and prospective faculty member concerning these matters is unofficial and not binding on the university.
- E. Written acceptance of the letter of appointment, together with execution of normal university employment forms, completes the initial appointment. The employment of tenure-track faculty members is governed by the terms of the appointment letter, applicable provisions of this handbook, and applicable provisions of university policies and procedures.

3.1.1 Terms

Generally, regular academic-year appointments begin August 1 and end July 31. Normally, faculty members on academic-year appointments are expected to be on campus a week before the beginning of classes and through commencement in the spring. Generally, regular 12-month appointments run July 1 through June 30.

3.2 Criteria for Appointment to Faculty Rank

All who are appointed as tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to contribute to the missions of teaching, research / scholarship / creative activity, and public service. While the general scope of performance at a particular rank is consistent across the university, the particular requirements of the varying ranks are a function of the discipline and are typically defined by the faculty of the department in which an appointment resides. The exact apportionment of effort in teaching, research / scholarship / creative activity, and service is a function of the skills of the faculty member and the needs of the department and university. All tenured and tenure-track faculty, however, are expected to pursue and maintain excellence in research / scholarship / creative activity.

In addition to the expectations listed for each rank below, the university requires the head to determine and attest that each person appointed to the faculty is competent in written and spoken English.

Professors are expected to

1. hold the doctorate or other terminal degree of the discipline, or present equivalent training and experience appropriate to the particular appointment
2. be accomplished teachers
3. have achieved and maintain a nationally recognized record in disciplinary research / scholarship / creative activity/ engaged scholarship⁹
4. have achieved and maintain a record of significant institutional, disciplinary, and/or professional service or outreach engagement¹⁰
5. serve as mentors to junior colleagues
6. have normally served as an associate professor for at least five years
7. have shown beyond doubt that they work well with colleagues and students in performing their university responsibilities

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 achieved and maintain a recognized record in disciplinary research / scholarship / creative activity/ engaged scholarship
4. have achieved and maintain a record of institutional, disciplinary, and/or professional service or outreach engagement
5. have normally served as an assistant professor for at least five years
6. have demonstrated that they work well with colleagues and students in performing their university responsibilities

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
3. show promise of developing a program in disciplinary research / scholarship / creative activity that is gaining external recognition
4. have a developing record of institutional, disciplinary, and/or professional service
5. show evidence that they work well with colleagues and students in performing their university responsibilities

In all of these ranks, concerned and effective advising and responsible service to the university are understood to be part of the normal task of a university faculty member.

⁹ Outreach research, scholarship and creative activity extends faculty endeavors to serve the public. This may include: basic discovery research, applied or action research, original performances, and creative applied policy. These activities bring together faculty and community collaborators to address real world problems and opportunities. The best examples of outreach research and creative activities are those that engage 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.

¹⁰ Outreach service engages professional skills of faculty to benefit external communities and extends the intellectual resources of the university to seek solutions to problems.

It is incumbent upon faculty and administrators to engage in professional development activities. Such activities lead to continual improvement in performance and enhance the ability of all to contribute at the leading edge of the discipline and/or in leadership roles. Many types of opportunities are available, including one- or two-semester faculty professional leaves, small professional development grants through the university, larger grants through external funding, and participation in professional conferences and workshops, opportunities to focus on teaching and scholarly outreach, and participation in a wide variety of interdisciplinary activities available to faculty separate from more formal interdisciplinary programs.

3.3 Classifications of Appointment

There are two types of appointment for tenured and tenure-track faculty: full-time academic-year appointments and full-time 12-month appointments. Those on 12-month appointment accrue sick leave and vacation time in accordance with university HR policies.

3.4 Special Faculty Titles

Emeritus or Emerita: At the discretion of the chancellor and upon the recommendation of the department head, dean, and chief academic officer, faculty members who are professors at the time of retirement may be awarded the rank of emeritus or emerita. In special cases of long and meritorious service, persons who have retired with the rank of associate professor or assistant professor may also be awarded the rank of emerita or emeritus.

Endowed chairs, professorships, and fellowships: The university has received endowments to fund chairs, professorships, and fellowships. Nominations for these positions are made on the basis of the terms set by the endowments. These positions may provide a salary supplement, additional research funds, secretarial support, graduate student funding, or release time to pursue research and/or creative projects.

Distinguished professor: This title may be awarded to a faculty member at the rank of professor who has displayed an exceptional record of teaching, research and/or creative activity, and service.

Distinguished scientist: Appointments as a distinguished scientist may be awarded to faculty who contribute significantly to nationally and internationally recognized research. Distinguished scientists are typically joint faculty with Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL).

University distinguished research professor: This title may be awarded to faculty at the rank of professor for exceptional records in research.

University professor: This title may be awarded to faculty at the rank of professor in recognition of exceptional academic accomplishments.

3.5 Joint and Intercampus Appointments

Joint Faculty appointments typically involve participation in two or more departments or research units within the university or under the terms of a Joint Faculty Agreement between the university and another entity, such as Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL). Joint appointments with the Herbert College of Agriculture, UT Extension, and UT AgResearch are common in the Institute of Agriculture. The primary department with which the faculty member is affiliated, through which all matters of promotion, salary raise, and tenure are processed, is the “home” department. On all matters, the home department should consult with the department head and faculty of the other unit. Where joint appointments involve equal time in two or more units or service primarily within an interdisciplinary program, it is the shared responsibility of the heads, deans, or other administrative officers to make appropriate recommendations; and in such cases, one of the two units should be designated as the home department. The original appointment letter must specify the faculty member’s home department, administrative reporting relationships, and the peer group(s) to be consulted in tenure and promotion recommendations. The university recognizes that as the shape of knowledge changes, new disciplinary and interdisciplinary needs may emerge which do not precisely correspond to existing administrative or departmental lines.

Transfers from one University of Tennessee system campus to another follow procedures outlined above for all other appointments. Advice from the faculty, recommendation of the head, and approval of the dean and chief academic officer are all necessary. All aspects of the new appointment – title, rank, term of appointment, and tenure – are freshly determined. This renegotiation does not jeopardize the faculty member’s participation in group insurance, retirement plans, and other standard employment benefits of the statewide university.

Joint Faculty appointments may also be authorized when a faculty member in one department has expertise that qualifies him or her for participation in the work of another department on the same or another campus, and when the department has need of his or her services. The nature and extent of such interdepartmental or intercampus joint faculty appointments are determined by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department heads in consultation with appropriate faculty of the academic units involved, and the respective deans, vice chancellors, or other campus officers.

In these cases, the following guidelines are observed:

1. The appointment may be with or without salary or tenure in the cooperating or second department (i.e., the unit awarding the interdepartmental or intercampus Joint Faculty appointment);
2. Tenure continues to be linked with the base or home department;
3. The head of the home department recommends the interdepartmental or intercampus Joint Faculty appointment to the head of the cooperating department, following informal discussion or negotiation;

4. The Joint Faculty appointment is made by the cooperating department with approvals by the dean, chief academic officer, and chancellor; and
5. The specific Joint Faculty title of the faculty member in the cooperating department is determined by mutual agreement between the head and the faculty member, subject to approval by the dean and chief academic officer. Joint Faculty appointments may carry the title Joint Faculty Assistant Professor, Joint Faculty Associate Professor, or Joint Faculty Professor.

3.6 Summer Appointments

Faculty holding regular full-time academic-year appointments may teach up to six credit hours during the summer semester. Exceptions to this limit may be granted by petition to the chief academic officer. Ordinarily, faculty are paid extra compensation for summer semester teaching. Appropriate percentages of full-time effort and pay are arranged by the department head, dean, and the chief academic officer.

3.7 Faculty Duties and Workload

The assigned workload for full-time faculty consists of a combination of teaching, advising, research / scholarship / creative activity, and institutional and/or public service. The individual mix of these responsibilities is determined annually by the department head, in consultation with each faculty member, with review and approval of the dean and chief academic officer. The university requires that each member of the faculty perform a reasonable and equitable amount of work each year.

The normal maximum teaching responsibility of a full-time faculty member engaged only in classroom teaching is 12 credit hours each semester. The precise teaching responsibility of each individual will be based on such things as class size and the number of examinations, papers, and other assignments that require grading and evaluation. In addition, the number of different courses taught and other appropriate considerations will be used to determine teaching responsibility. Classroom teaching responsibility may be reduced by the department head for other justifiable reasons including student advising, active involvement in research and/or creative activities (with publications or other suitable forms of recognition), direction of graduate theses or dissertations, teaching non-credit courses or workshops, administrative duties, and institutional and/or public service.

3.8 Faculty Review and Evaluation

3.8.1 Annual Performance and Planning Review (APPR)

The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure (BT0006) requires that each faculty member and his or her department head engage in a formal annual performance and planning review. Each faculty member's annual performance and planning review must proceed from guidelines and criteria contained in BT0006, this handbook, and all relevant bylaws.

Except as provided in Section 3.8.5.5 of this handbook relating to tenured faculty members undergoing Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review, every tenure-track and tenured faculty member who is not on leave is reviewed annually. The goals of these reviews are to:

1. review accomplishments as compared to previously set specific objectives for the faculty member by the faculty member and the head consistent with this handbook and departmental bylaws;
2. establish new objectives for the coming year, as appropriate, using clearly understood standards that are consistent with this handbook and departmental bylaws;
3. provide the necessary support (resources, environment, personal and official encouragement) to achieve these objectives;
4. fairly and honestly assess the performance of the faculty member by the department head and, where appropriate, by colleagues; and
5. recognize and reward outstanding achievement.

3.8.1.1 Rating Scale to be Applied in Evaluating Faculty Performance

Faculty performance must be evaluated in a manner consistent with all applicable campus, college, and/or departmental policies, procedures, and bylaws, and must apply the following performance ratings:

- Far exceeds expectations for rank
- Exceeds expectations for rank
- Meets expectations for rank
- Falls short of meeting expectations for rank
- Fall far short of meeting expectations for rank

This section explains the articulation between this performance rating scale and the scale provided in the Board of Trustees Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure (BT0006). That articulation is necessary for application of certain policies and procedures (for example the APPR process and the Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review process):

An overall performance rating of falls short of meeting expectations for rank is consistent with “Needs Improvement for Rank” in the UT Board of Trustees “Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure.” An overall performance rating of falls far short of meeting expectations for rank is consistent with “Unsatisfactory for Rank” in the same document.

A faculty member with an overall performance rating of meets, exceeds, or far exceeds expectations for rank is eligible for any merit pay or other performance-based salary increase that may be authorized under campus, college, and/or departmental rules or guidelines. He/she is also eligible for any across-the-board salary increase.

A faculty member with an overall performance rating of falls short of meeting expectations for rank is not eligible for any merit pay or other performance-based salary increase that may be authorized under campus, college, and/or departmental rules or guidelines, but he/she is eligible for any across-the-board salary increase unless UT System guidelines specify otherwise.

A faculty member with an overall performance rating of falls far short of meeting expectations for rank is not eligible for any merit pay or other performance-based salary increase that may be authorized under campus, college, and/or departmental rules or guidelines, nor is he/she eligible for any across-the-board salary increase.

Within 30 days of receipt of the fully executed annual review form, any faculty member whose overall performance is rated falls short of meeting expectations for rank must collaborate with the Department Head on an APPR Improvement Plan unless the performance rating triggers Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review. The APPR Improvement Plan is to be reviewed by the Head and recommended by him/her to the Dean for review and approval/denial. The next year's annual review must include a progress report that clearly describes improvements in any area(s) rated at the level of falls short or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank in the evaluation that necessitated the improvement plan.

If a faculty member's overall performance is rated falls far short of meeting expectations, the chief academic officer will initiate an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (Section 3.8.5).

If a faculty member's overall performance is rated falls short of meeting expectations in any two years during any four consecutive annual review cycles, the chief academic officer will initiate an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (Section 3.8.5).

3.8.1.2 Timetable for APPR

Each faculty member at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, is evaluated annually on his or her performance during the previous three academic years. Each faculty member at the University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture is evaluated annually on his or her performance during the previous three calendar years. In either case, the three-year period is referred to as the "Evaluation Period." For each tenured or tenure-track faculty member at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, the APPR will be completed in the fall semester of each academic year, as set forth in the Faculty Evaluation Calendar. For each tenured or tenure-track faculty member at the University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture, the APPR will be completed in the spring semester of each academic year, as set forth in the Faculty Evaluation Calendar.

3.8.1.3 Annual Retention Review for Tenure-Track Faculty Members

In addition to the APPR described in Section 3.8.1, tenure-track faculty members receive an annual retention review, which is described in Section 3.11.4.3.

3.8.2 Procedures for the APPR

The department head manages the APPR process for tenured and tenure-track faculty in a timely way to ensure compliance with all deadlines for submission of the review forms to the dean and chief academic officer. The APPR has three levels of review: by the department head, the dean, and the chief academic officer. In colleges without departments, the dean may also fulfill the functions of the department head or may appoint someone within the college (for example, an associate dean), as stipulated in the college's bylaws. A full account of the APPR process can be found in Appendix A.

3.8.2.1 No *Ex Parte* Communications During APPR Annual Review Process

The annual review process exists to provide fair, objective, and constructive feedback and relevant support to faculty members. As a means of preserving the integrity of the process, until the APPR has been fully executed by the chief academic officer, neither the faculty member under review nor any administrator managing or conducting the review is permitted to communicate substantive information about the review with others involved in the review process, especially those charged with making a recommendation at subsequent stages of review. For example, a department head shall not communicate with a dean about the substance of a faculty member's review except through the transmission of the APPR materials. Nothing in this paragraph is intended to prohibit a faculty member under review from (a) consulting with his or her mentor regarding the substance or process of the review, (b) consulting with a university ombudsperson, (c) consulting with representatives of the Office of Investigation and Resolution or (d) pursuing possible rights of appeal available under Chapter 5 of this handbook.

3.8.2.2 APPR Improvement Plan

Faculty members who receive notice from the chief academic officer that they have received ratings of "falls short of meeting expectations for rank" must develop a plan of improvement and submit the plan to the department head within 30 days of receipt of the fully executed APPR unless the rating triggers an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review. The faculty member has the responsibility of developing a written response for each area needing attention in the APPR, including the goals and benchmarks for improvement and the resources, if any, to be allocated for this purpose. The faculty member will follow up on this plan at subsequent annual reviews. A complete description of the APPR Improvement Plan can be found in Appendix B.

3.8.3 Right to Appeal an APPR

The faculty member's right to appeal is in addition to and different from the right to respond to each level of review, as described in Appendix A. An appeal may begin once the APPR is fully executed: that is, once the chief academic officer has confirmed or changed the APPR ratings and attached his or her signature. The faculty member's right to appeal is described in Chapter 5 of this handbook. According to BT0006, an APPR rating is not appealable to the president.

3.8.4 Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review (PPPR)

As required by the Board of Trustees Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure, every tenured faculty member will receive a comprehensive performance review no less often than every six years. The procedures for this periodic review are set forth in Appendices C-1 and C-2.

3.8.5 Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR)

Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR) is an expanded and in-depth performance evaluation conducted by a committee of tenured peers and administered by the chief academic officer. Procedures for conducting an EPPR are set forth in Appendix D.

This policy recognizes that the work of a faculty member is not neatly separated into academic or calendar years. To ensure that performance is evaluated in the context of ongoing work, the period of performance subject to enhanced review is the five most recent annual performance review cycles. The chief academic officer must collect and maintain sufficient data regarding annual performance reviews to implement this policy effectively.

An Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review must be initiated when the chief academic officer determines that a faculty member has:

- requested an EPPR, after at least four annual performance review cycles since the last enhanced review (such as a previous EPPR or a review in connection with tenure or promotion); or
- received one overall annual performance rating of “Falls Far Short of Expectations”; or
- received two overall annual performance ratings of “Falls Short of Expectations” during any four consecutive annual performance review cycles; or
- been deemed to fail to satisfy expectations for rank by a Periodic Post-Tenure Review Committee.

3.8.5.1 Administration of the EPPR by the Chief Academic Officer¹¹

The EPPR process will be administered under the direction and oversight of the chief academic officer. As with any performance evaluation, the chief academic officer may overrule a performance rating assigned by a department head or dean during the annual review process with a detailed, written justification. The practice ensures that when an EPPR process is activated by one or more negative annual performance ratings, the chief academic officer is aware of existing concerns.

The task of administering the EPPR requires implementation of this policy and the procedures detailed in Appendix D, as well as any additional steps the chief academic officer finds necessary to comply with the policy objectives. For example, the chief academic officer may be required to adapt the implementation of this policy to satisfy legal requirements (such as limitations on

¹¹ Where indicated in the relevant appendix to this handbook, the chief academic officer may delegate tasks associated with the EPPR to a vice provost or other appropriate academic administrator but will remain responsible for making any decisions assigned to the chief academic officer.

disclosure of student information) or respond to unexpected events (such as replacement of a committee member who becomes unable to serve).

3.8.5.2 Peer Review Committee's Charge

The peer review committee is charged to review the information relevant to the faculty member's performance during the review period and to conclude whether or not that performance has satisfied the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank.

As detailed in Appendix D, the expectations for faculty performance may differ by campus, college, department, and even among sub-disciplines within a department or program. Those expectations may be commonly held standards in the discipline or sub-discipline. Those expectations may be stated explicitly in the faculty member's own past annual performance reviews, work assignments, goals or other planning tools (however identified), as well as department or college bylaws, this handbook, Board policies, and in other generally applicable policies and procedures (for example, fiscal, human resources, safety, research, or information technology policies and procedures).

The peer review committee must reach a conclusion as to whether or not the performance has satisfied expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank. If the peer review committee concludes that the faculty member's performance has not met the expectations for the discipline and academic rank, the committee must also recommend either that an EPPR improvement plan be developed as detailed in Appendix D, or that tenure be terminated for Adequate Cause, as detailed in Chapter 3 of this handbook.

The committee must report its conclusions and recommendations in writing, including an explanation for each conclusion or recommendation, and enumerating the anonymously cast vote and dissenting explanation for any conclusion or recommendation that is not adopted unanimously. The faculty member must have an opportunity to review and respond to the committee's report.

All written conclusions, reasoning upon which they are based, and recommendations of the peer review committee must be reviewed and considered by the chief academic officer and the chancellor.

3.8.5.3 Review and Action by the Chancellor

The chancellor may accept the peer review committee's conclusions and recommendations or make different conclusions in a written explanation provided to the faculty member with copies to the chief academic officer, dean, department head, and members of the peer review committee. Based on those conclusions, the chancellor may take further action as deemed appropriate, including (without limitation) actions described in Board policy, this handbook, or in any other policy and procedures generally applicable to faculty. If the chancellor concludes (based on the recommendation of a peer review committee or based on independent review of the EPPR materials) that an EPPR improvement plan is warranted, the chancellor will promptly direct the chief academic officer to oversee development of the plan.

3.8.5.4 Final Review and Action Following Any EPPR Improvement Plan

If an EPPR improvement plan is implemented, the peer review committee must reconvene to review performance under the plan and to decide whether or not performance under the plan satisfies the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank. The committee must report its conclusions and recommendations in writing, as described in Appendix E. The chief academic officer and the chancellor must review all conclusions and recommendations of the peer review committee. The chancellor may: accept the committee's conclusions and recommendations; provide a written explanation of different conclusions to the faculty member with copies to the chief academic officer, dean, department head, and members of the peer review committee; or take further action deemed appropriate, including (without limitation) actions described in Board policy, this handbook, or any other policy and procedures generally applicable to faculty.

3.8.5.5 Coordination of the APPR and the EPPR Review Processes

In the case where a faculty member is undergoing EPPR at the same time that an APPR is due, the department head will coordinate the APPR with the EPPR peer review committee.

Coordination will take one of the following forms:

1. In the case where a faculty member is undergoing an EPPR during the time that an APPR is due, when possible, the department head will postpone the APPR until the EPPR committee has issued its report and the report has been accepted by the chancellor. The report will be advisory to the department head in preparing the APPR, and it will become part of the APPR materials. The faculty member has the right to respond to the report. If it is not possible to postpone the review until the EPPR committee's report has been accepted, then the department head will perform APPR without input from the committee.
2. In the case where a faculty member is under an EPPR improvement plan, as described in Appendix D of this handbook, the peer review committee will provide a written interim report to the faculty member and the department head on the faculty member's progress in satisfying the expectations established in the EPPR improvement plan. The report will be advisory to the department head, and the faculty member has the right to respond to the report. The EPPR committee's report will become part of the APPR materials.

The overall APPR rating awarded to the faculty member undergoing EPPR or under an EPPR improvement plan will determine eligibility for merit and across-the-board pay increases, as specified in Section 3.8.1.1. Any APPR materials produced while a faculty member is undergoing EPPR or under an EPPR improvement plan will be made available to the EPPR committee.

3.9 Salary

In general, annual salary recommendations are made by the head. Departmental bylaws may allow salary decisions to be made by faculty committees or determined by numerical rankings. When the head makes the salary recommendations, he or she is expected to share with the departmental faculty as a whole the general principles and reasoning in determining salary recommendations. Faculty members may appeal salary determinations, using the procedures discussed in Chapter 5. Committees of the faculty senate regularly review priorities for budget allocations for salaries.

Recommendations for salary adjustments are reviewed and approved, altered, or rejected by each of the following officers: dean and chief academic officer. Alteration or rejection of salary adjustments at any level will be communicated through the administrative line to the head. The Board of Trustees must give final approval. Faculty members will be notified of their salary adjustments in a timely manner.

3.10 Promotion

The criteria for promotion to a rank are the same as those given above for initial appointment to that rank. Annual performance reviews form the basis of a cumulative record that prepares a faculty member for promotion. Generally, assistant professors will be considered for promotion to the rank of associate professor at the same time as they are considered for tenure. Associate professors serve at least four years in rank before applying for promotion to professor. Exceptions to this policy require approval by the chief academic officer.

An associate professor should consult with his or her department head before initiating promotion procedures. The final decision on proceeding rests with the faculty member. However, if the faculty member is denied promotion after completion of the process described in the next paragraph, then he or she must forgo at least one full promotion cycle before again initiating promotion procedures.

The process begins with submission of materials by the candidate and departmental solicitation of external letters assessing the record of scholarship and/or creative activity. Departmental faculty at or above the rank to which promotion is sought review these materials and vote on promotion. The department head reviews the material and faculty vote and then makes an independent recommendation to the dean. The college committee reviews the file and makes an independent recommendation to the dean, who reviews the file and makes a recommendation to the chief academic officer. The chief academic officer reviews the file and makes a recommendation to the chancellor, who makes the final decision regarding promotion.

The candidate has a right to review his or her file at any stage of the process. The candidate is to be informed of any additions made to his or her file after submitting it and be given an opportunity to review and respond to the addition at any stage of the process.

3.11 Tenure

Board of Trustees policy governs tenure at the University of Tennessee (BT0006). Board policy requires each campus to implement the board tenure policy and allows each campus to adopt more specific provisions with respect to certain tenure matters. The following sections describe implementation of the board tenure policy at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

3.11.1 Definition of Tenure

Tenure is a principle that entitles a faculty member to continuation of his or her annual appointment until relinquishment or forfeiture of tenure or until termination of tenure for adequate cause, financial exigency, or academic program discontinuance. The burden of proof that tenure should be awarded rests with the faculty member. Tenure at the University of Tennessee is acquired only by positive action of the Board of Trustees, or by the President, as delegated by the Board, and is awarded in a particular department, school, college, or other academic unit. The award of tenure shifts the burden of proof concerning the faculty member's continuing appointment from the faculty member to the university.

3.11.2 Eligibility for Tenure Consideration

Eligibility for tenure consideration will be subject to the following minimum standards:

1. regular, full-time, tenure-track faculty appointments at the academic rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor are eligible for tenure consideration;
2. temporary, term, and part-time appointments are not eligible for tenure consideration; and
3. faculty members pursuing degrees at the campus where they are appointed are not eligible for tenure consideration.

At the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, an assistant professor normally will not be considered for tenure until he or she is also eligible for promotion to the rank of associate professor.

3.11.3 Tenure upon Initial Appointment

No faculty member shall be granted tenure upon initial appointment except by positive action of the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the president, which shall include documentation of compliance with all tenure review and recommendation procedures stated in Sections 3.11.4 and 3.11.5 of this handbook. The Board of Trustees will grant tenure upon initial appointment only if (1) the proposed appointee holds tenure at another higher education institution and the Board determines that the president has documented that the proposed appointee cannot be successfully recruited to the university without being granted tenure upon initial appointment; or (2) the Board of Trustees determines that the president has documented other exceptional circumstances warranting the grant of tenure upon initial appointment.

3.11.4 Probationary Period

3.11.4.1 Length of the Probationary Period

A tenure-track faculty member must serve a probationary period prior to being considered for tenure. Except as otherwise provided in Board policy, the probationary period will be six years. The faculty member will apply for tenure during the sixth year, and if tenure is not granted, the faculty member will be permitted to serve a seventh year as a terminal year.

If a faculty member begins employment after July 1 and before January 1, the remaining term of the faculty member's initial appointment will count as the first year of the probationary period, so that what is treated as the first year of a faculty member's probationary period will not be shorter than six months. The provision of a probationary period and any statement in an appointment letter or otherwise regarding the probationary period and the year of mandatory tenure consideration do not guarantee retention of the faculty member for the full probationary period.

Probationary faculty should not be encouraged to engage in administrative work.

- A. Early tenure consideration: A faculty member may request an early consideration for tenure before the sixth year of his or her probationary period but no sooner than the next regular tenure cycle after completion of the first year of the probationary period. The request for early consideration is initiated in the department that will be the locus of tenure, if tenure is granted, after discussion with the department head. If the department head approves, the head will write a memo to the dean, justifying the request and asking for approval. Upon review of the request, the dean will indicate approval or disapproval in a letter to the chief academic officer. For colleges without departments, the request begins with the dean.

The chief academic officer will review the request and make the final determination whether early consideration is warranted, based on a review of the applicant's credentials and all applicable criteria. If the chief academic officer denies the request, the faculty member cannot apply for early consideration. The decision of the chief academic officer is final and not appealable to the chancellor.

A faculty member whose application for early consideration is denied will be permitted to reapply one additional time. If the initial application is submitted before the fifth year of the probationary period, the applicant cannot reapply until one full academic year after the unsuccessful attempt. If the initial application is submitted in the fifth year, the reapplication must be submitted at the beginning of the sixth year of the probationary period. New external letters of assessment are required for a reapplication. If tenure is not granted upon reapplication, the faculty member will be permitted to serve one year after the reapplication is denied as a terminal year.

- B. Subsequent appointment (no extension): In the rare situation in which the appointment of a tenure-track faculty member is interrupted (e.g., due to change of employment status related to visa processing) and the faculty member is appointed to a new tenure-track position in the same unit, the subsequent appointment may be made at the discretion of

the chief academic officer, with no loss of credit toward completion of (and no extension of) the full six- year probationary period.

- C. Extension of Probationary Period: For good cause that is either related to procedural error or results from a significant disruption of university operations that has impeded the faculty member's opportunity to conduct required research or other scholarly activity, teaching, and/or service, the university and a tenure-track faculty member may agree in writing to extend a six-year probationary period for a maximum of two additional years (not including any extension granted due to the coronavirus crisis as authorized by the Board's March 27, 2020 action). The proposed extension must be approved in advance by the chief academic officer, the chancellor, and the vice president for academic affairs.
- D. Suspension of Probationary Period: The chief academic officer will decide whether the probationary period will be suspended when the following circumstances occur:
1. the faculty member accepts a part-time faculty position;
 2. the faculty member accepts an administrative position, or
 3. the faculty member is granted a leave of absence or modified duties assignment under the UT Knoxville Faculty and Family Care Policy.

In general, the chief academic officer will not approve suspension of the probationary period for work that advances the faculty member's record in teaching, research, or service. The chief academic officer shall give the faculty member written notice of the decision concerning suspension of the probationary period.

3.11.4.2 Notice of Non-Renewal

Notice that a tenure-track faculty member's appointment will not be renewed for the next year will be made in writing by the chief academic officer, upon the recommendation of the department head and dean, according to the following schedule:

- In the first year of the probationary period, not later than March 1 for an academic year appointment and no less than three months in advance for any other term of appointment;
- In the second year of the probationary period, not later than December 15 for an academic-year appointment and no less than six months in advance for any other term of appointment; and
- In the third and subsequent years of the probationary period, not less than 12 months in advance.

These notice requirements relate only to service in a probationary period with the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Credit for prior service with another campus or institution will not be considered in determining the required notice. Notice of non-renewal will be effective upon personal delivery or upon mailing, postage prepaid, to the faculty member's residential address on file with the university.

3.11.4.3 Annual Retention Review

An annual retention review of tenure-track faculty is conducted by the department head in consultation with the tenured faculty, coincident with the annual performance and planning review process described in Section 3.8.1. The regular and thorough assessment of tenure-track faculty is an important step in the professional development of those faculty members. The annual retention review process is designed to ensure that a tenure-track faculty member receives clear and timely feedback from the tenured faculty and the department head about his or her contribution to the department, development, and prospects for advancement. Accordingly, the tenured faculty plays an important role in the retention process and is responsible for providing the faculty member with a clear, thoughtful, and professional consideration of both (a) the faculty member's ability to sustain a level of activity that comports with the department's expectations for faculty members at the rank of the faculty member under review and (b) the faculty member's progress toward promotion and tenure in the context of the Faculty Handbook, his or her appointment, and departmental bylaws.

A. Departmental Procedures for the Retention Review

1. Schedule: Each tenure-track faculty member will first be reviewed in the fall of his or her second year of appointment and in each subsequent year of the probationary period leading up to (but not including) the year of tenure consideration. Each tenure-track faculty member will undergo an Enhanced Tenure-Track review (ETTR) in the academic year following the midpoint in his or her probationary period (typically, the faculty member's fourth year of employment), as stipulated in Section 3.11.4.4.
2. Mentor: Working with the probationary faculty member, the department head assigns a faculty mentor or a mentoring committee for each tenure-track faculty member. The mentor should be a senior member of the same department or another unit, who can serve as a model and as a source of information for the tenure-track faculty member. Department heads should not serve as mentors for faculty within their own departments. The mentor or mentoring committee may participate in the annual retention review in a manner to be determined in collegiate and/or departmental bylaws.
3. Preparation for Retention Review: Except in the year of the ETTR, the faculty member prepares and submits to the department head (for distribution to the tenured faculty) a written summary of his or her accomplishments in teaching, research / scholarship / creative activity, and service for the previous academic year in accordance with departmental bylaws. (In units that employ a Faculty Activity Report in the APPR process, such a report may satisfy this requirement for a summary of accomplishments.) On behalf of the tenured faculty, the department head requests this summary in writing from each tenure-track faculty member at least two weeks before it is needed for the review. Faculty members may be required or permitted to submit other materials in accordance with collegiate and/or departmental bylaws. Once all required materials are submitted, the department head will make the materials available to the tenured faculty in advance of the meeting on retention.

4. Review by the tenured faculty: The tenured faculty will review information submitted by the faculty member and solicit input from the faculty member's mentor or mentoring committee. The tenured faculty will develop a narrative review specifically addressing (among other things) the faculty member's establishment and development of teaching methods and tools, program of disciplinary research / scholarship / creative activity, and record of institutional, disciplinary, and professional service, as well as progress toward promotion (where applicable) and tenure. The tenured faculty's review and narrative will rely on and include documented and substantiated information available to the tenured faculty at the time of the review and will not be based on rumor or speculation.
5. The vote of the tenured faculty: The tenured faculty will take a formal anonymous retention vote and will write a report (the Retention Review Report) to the department head that will contain the tally of the anonymous vote; a list of the participating tenured faculty members; suggestions for enhancing the faculty member's progress toward the grant of tenure; and the majority and minority report, if applicable.

In the years before any enhanced retention review, this vote will focus primarily (but not exclusively) on the tenure-track faculty member's ability to sustain a level of teaching, research / scholarship / creative activity, and service that comports with the unit's expectations for faculty members at the rank of the faculty member under review.

Beginning in the year in which the tenure-track faculty member is subject to ETTR, the tenured faculty's vote will focus primarily (and increasingly, in succeeding years) on the tenure-track faculty member's ability to meet the requirements for tenure in the department, college, campus, and university. The tenured faculty will share the report with the faculty member and the department head.

6. The department head's review: The department head conducts an independent retention review based upon the faculty member's written summary, the written narrative and vote of the tenured faculty, and a scheduled meeting with the faculty member. In conducting his or her independent retention review, the department head also may have other consultations with the tenured faculty as needed.
 - a. If the retention decision is positive, the department head will convey the outcome to the faculty member in writing and in a timely manner. The department head will also advise the faculty member as to the time remaining in the probationary period and as to how the quality of his or her performance is likely to be assessed by the tenured faculty and the head in the context of tenure consideration. The department head will ensure that the written report includes express guidance to the faculty member on ways to improve performance.
 - b. If the retention review results in a recommendation by the department head not to retain the tenure-track faculty member, the department head includes in the report specific reasons for that decision.
7. Dissemination of the Retention Review Report: The department head will provide to the faculty member a copy of the finalized Retention Review Report, including the

department head's retention report and recommendation. The department head will furnish to the tenured faculty a copy of the department head's retention report and recommendation.

8. Dissenting statements: Any member of the tenured faculty may submit a dissenting statement to the department head. A copy of the dissenting statement will be furnished to the faculty member under review. The dissenting statement will be attached to the Retention Review Report.
9. Faculty member's review and response to the Retention Review Report: The faculty member reviews the Retention Review Report. The faculty member's signature indicates that she or he has read the entire evaluation, but the signature does not necessarily imply agreement with its findings. The faculty member under review has the right to submit a written response to the vote and narrative of the tenured faculty, to the report and recommendation of the department head, and/or to any dissenting statements. The faculty member will be allowed 14 calendar days from the date of receipt from the head of the finalized Retention Review Report and its complete set of attachments to submit any written response. If no response is received after 14 calendar days of the date of receipt, the faculty member relinquishes the right to respond. For good cause, and upon approval by the chief academic officer, the response time may be extended once for an additional 14 days.

B. Dean's Review of the Retention Review Report

1. The dean's review and recommendation: The dean makes an independent review and recommendation on retention after reviewing the Retention Review Report. The dean will prepare a statement summarizing his or her recommendation when it differs from that of the department head or tenured faculty or stating any other concerns the dean might wish to record, as appropriate.
2. Transmission of the dean's recommendation and statement: The dean will indicate his or her recommendation for retention or non-retention on the Retention Review Report, attach his or her statement, if any, and forward the Retention Review Report with its complete set of attachments to the chief academic officer. The dean will send a copy of his or her recommendation and statement, if any, to the department head and the faculty member.
3. Faculty member's and department head's right to respond: The faculty member and / or the department head have the right to submit to the chief academic officer a written response to the dean's retention recommendation or any accompanying statement. Any response by the faculty member should be copied to the dean and the department head. Similarly, any response by the department head should be copied to the dean and the faculty member. The faculty member and the department head will be allowed 14 calendar days from the date of receipt of the dean's recommendation to submit any written response. If no response is received after 14 calendar days from the date of receipt, the faculty member or department head, as applicable, relinquishes the right to respond.

C. Chief Academic Officer's Review of Recommendations for Retention

1. The chief academic officer's review: The chief academic officer will review the retention recommendation, make the final decision on retention, and indicate his or her decision on retention on the Retention Review Report. The chief academic officer sends a copy of the fully executed Retention Review Report to the faculty member with copies to the dean and department head.
2. Notification in cases of non-retention: If the chief academic officer decides that the faculty member will not be retained, he or she will give the faculty member written notice of non-renewal in accordance with the notice requirements described in Section 3.11.4.2 above. The faculty member is entitled to a statement in writing of the reasons for the non-renewal decision. This statement, together with any subsequent correspondence concerning the reasons, is a part of the official record.

3.11.4.4 Enhanced Tenure-Track Review (ETTR)

For each tenure-track faculty member, the department and department head will conduct an enhanced review to assess and inform the faculty member of his or her progress toward the grant of tenure during the third or fourth year of the probationary period, which may be extended past the fourth year of the probationary period for any faculty member who has been granted an extension of the probationary period (with the year to be determined by the department head after consultation with the faculty member and, if applicable, the faculty member's mentor).

For the ETTR, the faculty member will, with the guidance and counsel of the department head, prepare and submit to the department head (for distribution to the tenured faculty) a file on 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 will be prepared by the faculty member as a preliminary draft of the faculty member's file in support of a tenure dossier) will contain:

- the faculty member's Faculty Activity Reports for each previous APPR;
- computer-tabulated teaching evaluations;
- annual retention reports compiled during the faculty member's probationary period;
- copies of research / scholarship / creative activity published or otherwise completed during the probationary period;
- teaching materials;
- evidence of research / scholarship / creative activity work in progress;
- a statement prepared by the faculty member describing other research / scholarship / creative activity in progress but not included in the file;
- a summary of service to the department, college, university, and other relevant constituencies; and
- any other materials that the department head requests or the faculty member desires to make available to the tenured faculty.

The tenured departmental faculty will confer regarding the faculty member's performance and will then write a report to the department head that will contain a list of the participating tenured faculty members; suggestions for enhancing the faculty member's progress toward the grant of tenure; the majority and minority report, if applicable; and the summary anonymous vote on whether the faculty member is progressing satisfactorily toward the grant of tenure.

The department head will present and discuss the tenured faculty's report, as well as his or her own written assessment, with the faculty member. Copies of the ETTR documents will be given to the faculty member. A favorable ETTR does not commit the tenured departmental faculty, the department, or the college to a subsequent recommendation for the grant of tenure.

The faculty member may appeal the outcome of the retention review or the ETTR under the general appeals procedures outlined in Chapter 5 of this handbook. According to Board Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure, the final decision on an appeal of the outcome of a retention review or ETTR lies with the chancellor and is not appealable to the president.

3.11.5 Criteria for Tenure

Tenure is awarded after a thorough review, which culminates in the university acknowledging a reasonable presumption of the faculty member's professional excellence and the likelihood that excellence will contribute substantially over a considerable period of time to the mission and anticipated needs of the academic unit in which tenure is granted. Professional excellence is reflected in the faculty member's teaching (which includes advising and mentoring), research, and service or other creative work in the discipline, participation in professional organizations, willingness to contribute to the common life of the university, and effective work with colleagues and students, including the faculty member's ability to interact appropriately with colleagues and students.

More specifically, tenure is granted on the basis of a demonstrated record of achievement and the promise of continued excellence. A decision not to award tenure is not necessarily a judgment of incompetence. Not all competent persons meet the high standards necessary for tenure, nor are all those who meet such standards automatically fitted to serve the needs of the university's programs. Faculty are expected to become good, solid teachers who work enthusiastically with students, try new approaches to pedagogy, and contribute to the development of departmental programs. Faculty must also establish an independent record of accomplishment in scholarly work, normed to the standards of the discipline, which can be documented and validated by peers. In most cases, tenure-track faculty should be encouraged to develop first as teachers and scholars, leaving serious involvement in service until after a sound academic record is established.

It is the responsibility of departments and colleges to define professional excellence in terms of their respective disciplines. Each college may establish a statement of criteria and expectations, which elaborates on the general criteria found in this handbook and is consistent with the mission of the college and the professional responsibilities normally carried out by faculty members in the college. Each department shall establish more specific criteria for tenure in that unit that are consistent with but may be more restrictive than the criteria stated in this handbook and any

criteria established by the college and campus. Departmental criteria for tenure shall not be required if more specific criteria have been established by the applicable college, and the dean and chief academic officer have approved application of the college criteria in lieu of departmental criteria. College criteria for tenure shall be effective upon approval by the chief academic officer and will be published in the bylaws of the college. Departmental criteria for tenure shall be effective upon approval by the dean and chief academic officer and will be published in the bylaws of the department.

Deans will ensure that copies of the current collegiate and departmental bylaws are on file in the office of the chief academic officer. The chief academic officer will maintain a master set of approved statements of criteria and expectations and will ensure that faculty members are informed about the criteria and expectations that have been developed for their respective colleges (as applicable) and departments as stated in collegiate and departmental bylaws.

3.11.6 Procedures for Consideration and Grant of Tenure

The university's procedures for consideration and grant of tenure are contained in Appendix A of the Board Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure (BT0006-Appendix A).

Each department, school, or college must adopt bylaws concerning tenure consideration consistent with the procedures outlined in the university's tenure policies, this handbook, and all superseding bylaws. Such bylaws must – at a minimum – require these fundamental components:

- A requirement for external reviews;
- A requirement for the peer review of teaching;
- The required contents of the tenure dossier to be submitted by the candidate;
- A requirement for a meeting of the tenured faculty to debate and discuss the tenure candidacy;
- The manner of taking and recording a formal anonymously cast vote of the tenured faculty on whether the candidate should be recommended for tenure;
- The minimum number of votes necessary to constitute a positive recommendation;
- A method for ensuring two levels of faculty review of every tenure dossier before a positive tenure recommendation is considered by the campus administrators (e.g. for small colleges without departments or divisions, a supra-college committee comprised of two faculty members from affected colleges will review the dossier and make a recommendation regarding tenure to the campus administration.)

3.11.6.1 Promotion and Tenure Review Procedures

- A. Required review materials: Although the substance of the materials required for adequate review of a faculty member's activities in teaching, research / creative achievement / scholarship, and service will vary with the academic discipline, the following elements are required to be presented in any tenure and / or promotion process:

1. Cover sheet: A standard form is provided by the office of the chief academic officer to record basic data of the candidate's employment, and eligibility for tenure and/or promotion review.
2. The dossier: The dossier is divided into sections that contain information about the primary criteria by which candidates are assessed. It is used for review at the departmental, collegiate, and campus levels. A description of the materials required for each section and the order of their assembly is given in Appendix E to this handbook. The following is a list of the sections and a brief summary of their contents:
 - a. Factual information about the candidate and tenure and/or promotion criteria: This section includes information on educational and employment history, a statement of the candidate's responsibilities, tenure and / or promotion criteria statements, and certification of competence to communicate in English;
 - b. Factual information about the candidate's teaching: The material in this section documents the candidate's teaching ability and effectiveness. It includes the candidate's self-assessment of instructional practices, summaries of student satisfaction surveys, and peer reviews of teaching. Dossiers of applicants for tenure are required to have two peer reviews of teaching that have been completed during the probationary period. Applicants for promotion only are required to have one peer review of teaching that has been completed since the last promotion. Dossiers lacking peer reviews, student satisfaction summaries, and the applicant's self-assessment of instructional practices will not be considered for promotion and/or tenure;
 - c. Factual information about the candidate's research/scholarship, creative activity: The material in this section documents the candidate's achievements in research / scholarship / creative activity (according to the terms of the candidate's appointment);
 - d. Factual information about the candidate's service: The material in this section documents the candidate's activities and achievements in institutional, disciplinary, and/or professional service;
 - e. Evaluative Materials: The department head furnishes previous evaluative reports.
 - (1) For candidates for promotion only – that is, for candidates who already hold tenure at the university – the Annual Performance and Planning Review (APPR) evaluative materials since the most recent promotion or tenure action will typically be included.
 - (2) For candidates for tenure only or for tenure and promotion, in addition to the APPR materials listed above, materials from annual retention reviews during the probationary period will be included in the dossier.
 - f. Faculty member's review and signature statement: Each faculty member shall sign a statement certifying that he/she has reviewed sections a through e of the dossier for accuracy and completeness prior to the beginning of the review process. Once the

candidate has signed and submitted this statement, additional factual information for sections b, c, and d of the dossier may be added by administrators only Section 3.11.5.1-A.5. below);

g. External letters of assessment: The department head manages the process of obtaining required letters of assessment from external evaluators. The head may designate responsibility for obtaining the letters to another tenured member of the department, such as the chair of a departmental tenure and promotion committee. External evaluators are charged with assessing the candidate's research / scholarship / creative activity only;

(1) Qualifications of external evaluators: External evaluators should be distinguished individuals in the candidate's field who are in a position to provide an authoritative and objective assessment of the candidate's research record and to comment on its significance in the discipline. Whenever possible, letters should be solicited from individuals at peer or aspirational institutions. If individuals at non-peer institutions are solicited for letters, the department head must explain the reasons for the choice of these individuals (including, without limitation, evidence of the reviewer's exemplary experience and standing in the candidate's field). Evaluators will normally hold the rank of professor and must have attained at least the rank to which the candidate aspires.

Evaluators may not be former advisors, post-doctoral supervisors, close personal friends of the candidate, or others whose relationship with the candidate could reduce objectivity. If the evaluator has had a collaborative scholarly or research relationship with the candidate, the nature of that collaboration and the relative contributions of the candidate must be clearly described by the evaluator. Questions concerning the eligibility of potential evaluators should be referred to the office of the dean and, where appropriate (e.g., where the department is a college or where the dean is uncertain about how to resolve the matter), the chief academic officer well in advance of making a request to the individuals in question. Each evaluator will be asked to state expressly in his or her review letter the nature of any association with the candidate.

(2) Solicitation of the letters: The head or designee initiates the process of obtaining external letters of assessment far enough in advance of the review process that letters are in the dossier and available to peer review committees and administrators at all levels of review. In no case should the candidate directly solicit the external letters of assessment or contact prospective or actual external evaluators. The following process may be followed:

(a) The department head or designee, in consultation with departmental faculty, assembles a list of potential external evaluators;

(b) The department head or designee requests the names of potential evaluators from the candidate;

(c) The department head or designee also requests names of individuals the candidate wants excluded and the reasons for the exclusions;

(d) The department head or designee will normally solicit 8-10 letters. No more than half of the letters solicited may come from the list suggested by the candidate;

(e) The department head or designee will send to the external evaluators information and documentation for use in preparing the external assessment including the candidate's *curriculum vitae*, appropriate supporting materials concerning the candidate's research or creative activity, and the departmental and collegiate statements of criteria for promotion and/or tenure;

(f) The dossier will include a log documenting all requests for letters from external evaluators. The log documents the dates on which each external letter was requested and entered into the dossier. The log will also indicate which evaluators come from the candidate's list and which are from the list of the department head or designee. All requests should be entered regardless of whether a response was obtained;

(g) The dossier will typically include no fewer than five letters from external evaluators. In the event that a dossier has fewer than five letters from external evaluators, the department head must discuss the reasons with the dean and/or chief academic officer. The dean or the chief academic officer may ask the department head to solicit additional letters in order to meet the typical required minimum number of external assessments;

(h) All letters solicited and received must be included in the dossier unless the chief academic officer approves their removal from the review process.

(3) Form for submission of letters: Letters from external evaluators must be submitted on institutional letterhead and carry the evaluator's signature. These letters, or their images, may be submitted via regular mail, e-mail, or facsimile. If multiple versions of a letter are received, then all versions should be retained in the candidate's dossier.

(4) Brief biography of evaluators: The department head or designee is responsible for providing and including in the candidate's dossier a brief biographical statement about the credentials and qualifications of each external evaluator; special attention should be given to documenting the evaluator's standing in his or her discipline as part of the biographical statement.

(5) Right of the Faculty Member to Review External Letters: External letters of assessment will be made available to the candidate upon the candidate's written request to the department head.

3. The curriculum vitae: The *curriculum vitae* is used to provide background for the department head's request for external assessments and for general reference at all levels of review. One copy of the *curriculum vitae* accompanies the dossier to all peer committees and administrators.
4. Supporting materials: Supporting materials, such as sample publications, videos, recordings, and/or other appropriate forms of documentation, must be made available for

review in the department and the college, in accord with departmental and collegiate bylaws.

5. Changes in Informational Sections of the Dossier: In the event that additional material is submitted for inclusion either by the department head or other administrator, all peer review committees and administrators who have completed their review of a candidate shall be informed about additions that are made to the original materials subsequent to their review. All peer review committees and administrators who are informed about these submissions will have the opportunity to reconsider their recommendation. The candidate for tenure and/or promotion will also be invited to review the additional material and respond to it.

B. Roles in assembly of the dossier:

1. Candidate: The candidate provides accurate factual information for Subsections A.2.b. – A.2.d., above; reviews and certifies that the information provided in a through paragraph e. is complete and accurate by electronically signing the statement described in paragraph f. above; and provides the department head with a list of potential external reviewers and those to be excluded from review.
 - a. Department head: The department head provides the material for sections f and g of the dossier; is responsible for ensuring that the required number of peer reviews of teaching have been done and included in the dossier; may provide a selection of student comments taken from end-of-course surveys; and ensures that the dossier is in the proper form.
 - b. Dean: Each collegiate dean shall ensure that faculty members in his or her college are informed about the dossier's required contents and standard form.
 - c. Chief Academic Officer: The chief academic officer shall be responsible for ensuring that tenure and promotion workshops to inform faculty members, review committees, and academic administrators about dossier preparation and review procedures are conducted annually.

C. Principles Governing the Review

The procedures for promotion and for tenure are the same. Careful professional judgment of the accomplishments, productivity, and potential of each candidate is expected at each level of review. All levels of review are also concerned with procedural adequacy and equity. All peer review committees and administrators shall limit deliberations to the review of the content of the complete dossier, curriculum vitae, supporting materials, and attachments as forwarded.

Consultation among different levels of review should take place when there is a need to clarify differences that arise during the review process or there are conflicting statements at the different levels of review.

D. Levels of Review

The promotion and tenure review process has several sequential stages and levels. The review includes peer review by the department, review by the department head, review by the college or intercollegiate promotion and tenure committee, review by the dean, and review by the campus. Each stage of review produces an evaluative statement or recommendation assessing the candidate's case for tenure and/or promotion. The statements and any responses become part of the dossier.

1. Departmental Review: Initial peer review (e.g., at the department level) will focus on criteria for promotion and/or tenure within the discipline as set forth in departmental and collegiate bylaws and this handbook.
 - a. Departmental procedures: Each department will develop and state in bylaws detailed review procedures, supplemental to and consistent with general university procedures. These procedures should be made known to prospective and current faculty members, as well as the general university community, and should reflect the organizational arrangements of each department.
 - b. Departmental review committees: Departmental faculty members constitute the departmental review committees according to the following rules.
 - (1) When conducting the initial departmental review, only tenured faculty members make recommendations about candidates for tenure;
 - (2) When conducting the initial departmental review, only faculty members of higher rank than the candidate make recommendations about promotion;
 - (3) In unusual circumstances, e.g., insufficient numbers of tenured and higher-ranked faculty members within a department, exceptions may be permitted by the chief academic officer upon request from the department head and dean;
 - (4) When a candidate has not received a unanimous committee vote, the statement must include a discussion of the reasons for the divergent opinions.
 - c. Departmental subcommittees: Departments may form subcommittees of the departmental review committee to review the candidate's file and present the case to the departmental review committee. The subcommittee shall consist of members of the departmental review committee selected according to departmental bylaws. The bylaws of the department shall determine the size of the subcommittee, but in no case should a subcommittee consist of fewer than three members. In no instance will the subcommittee make a recommendation to the review committee on tenure and/or promotion of the candidate; rather, the subcommittee presents an objective summary of the factual and evaluative material found in the dossier.
 - d. Role of the department head in departmental review: Department heads may attend the discussion of a tenure and/or promotion candidate by the departmental review

committee; however, since the department head has an independent review to make, the department head shall not participate in the discussion except to clarify issues and assure that proper procedure is followed.

e. Faculty vote on the candidate: Tenured faculty with the appropriate rank will participate in a formal vote upon the candidate according to departmental bylaws. All votes will be anonymous. Ballots must have space for written comments on the candidate's strengths and weaknesses along with space for recording the vote.

f. Statement from the faculty: A representative of the departmental review committee, selected according to departmental bylaws, shall prepare a written summary of the faculty discussion. The written summary of the discussion and the vote of the review committee constitute the faculty recommendation and are transmitted to the department head. This written recommendation must be made available to the candidate and to the departmental review committee at the same time it is sent to the department head so that they may (if they wish) prepare a dissenting statement. This recommendation, the vote, and any dissenting statements become part of the dossier.

g. The department head's review: The vote of the tenured faculty is advisory to the department head. The department head conducts an independent review of the candidate's case for tenure and/or promotion. The department head prepares a letter that addresses the candidate's employment history and responsibilities as they relate to the departmental and collegiate criteria for the rank being sought by the candidate. The department head's letter will also provide an independent recommendation and summary explanation for the recommendation based on the department head's review and evaluation of materials in the dossier. If the head's recommendation differs from the recommendation of the tenured faculty, the summary must explain the reasons for the differing judgment. The department head's letter must be made available to the candidate and to the departmental review committee at the same time it is sent to the dean so that they may (if they wish) prepare a dissenting statement. The department head's letter, together with any dissenting statements, becomes part of the dossier.

h. Dissenting statements: Faculty members may individually or collectively submit dissenting statements to the faculty recommendation or to the department head's recommendation. Dissenting reports should be based on an evaluation of the record and should be submitted to the department head before the dossier is forwarded to the dean or to the dean before the deadline for dossiers to be submitted to the dean's office for review by the collegiate or intercollegiate tenure and promotion committee. Dissenting statements must become part of the dossier and must be available to the candidate at the same time they are sent to the department head, the departmental review committee, the college review committee, the dean, and the chief academic officer.

i. Right of the faculty member to respond: The faculty member may prepare a written response to the recommendation and vote of the faculty and/or to the department head's recommendation and/or to any dissenting statements. The faculty member's response becomes part of the dossier and must be available to the department head, the

departmental review committee, the college or intercollegiate review committee, the dean, and the chief academic officer.

2. College Review: Reviews at the college level bring broader faculty and administrative judgments to bear and also monitor general standards of quality, equity, and adequacy of procedures used. Collegiate reviews are based on criteria for promotion and/or tenure as set forth in departmental and collegiate bylaws and this handbook.
 - a. The college or intercollegiate review committee: College review committees shall consist of members of the faculty selected by procedures outlined in collegiate bylaws. A faculty member serving on the college review committee shall recuse himself or herself from the discussion of a colleague from his or her department in the college review committee and shall not participate in the college review committee vote on that faculty member.
 - (1) A college with a small number of departments will provide for the constitution of the college review committee in the collegiate bylaws in a manner suitable to the context.
 - (2) Colleges without departments, including the university libraries, will form an intercollegiate review committee. The composition of the committee will be determined by the colleges and their faculty.
 - (3) The college or intercollegiate review committee shall prepare a summary of its recommendation for each candidate along with a record of the committee vote and submit these documents to the dean. The committee summary and vote become part of the dossier. This written recommendation must be made available to the candidate at the same time it is sent to the dean so that the candidate has an opportunity to respond to the recommendation.
 - b. The dean's review. The recommendation of the college or intercollegiate review committee is advisory to the dean. The dean of the college shall prepare a letter providing an independent recommendation and summary explanation for the recommendation based on his or her review and evaluation of the materials in the dossier and provide it to the faculty member at the same time it is included in the dossier. The dean's letter becomes part of the dossier.
 - c. Right of the faculty member to respond. The faculty member may prepare a written response to the recommendation and vote of the college or intercollegiate review committee and/or the dean's recommendation. The faculty member's response becomes part of the dossier and must be available to the chief academic officer.
3. Campus Review. Review at the campus level will involve similar but less detailed evaluations and, in addition, will provide an essential campus-wide perspective. Campus-level review is based on criteria for promotion and/or tenure as set forth in departmental and collegiate bylaws and this handbook.

- a. Review by the chief academic officer. The chief academic officer will review each dossier and prepare a letter providing an independent recommendation and summary explanation for the recommendation based on his or her review and evaluation of the materials in the dossier and provide it to the faculty member at the same time it is included in the dossier. The chief academic officer's letter becomes part of the dossier.
- b. Right of the faculty member to respond. The faculty member may prepare a written response to the chief academic officer's recommendation. The faculty member's response becomes part of the dossier and must be available to the chancellor.
- c. Review by the chancellor: All tenure recommendations of the chief academic officer, whether positive or negative, shall be reviewed by the chancellor. After making an independent judgment on the tenure candidacy, the chancellor shall forward only positive recommendations, with a summary explanation for the recommendation, to the president, with a copy provided to the tenure candidate at the same time.
4. President's action or recommendation: The president acts only on the chancellor's positive recommendation for tenure. If the president concurs in the positive recommendation, he or she shall grant tenure if he or she is authorized to do so, and the chancellor shall give the faculty member written notice of the effective date of tenure. If only the Board is authorized to grant tenure, the president shall submit the recommendation to grant tenure, and summary explanation for the recommendation, to the Board of Trustees. If the president does not concur in the positive recommendation of the chancellor, the chancellor shall give the faculty member written notice that tenure will not be awarded.
5. Action by the Board of Trustees when required: Only the Board of Trustees is authorized to grant tenure in certain cases specified in Article III.B of the Board Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure (BT0006). In those cases, the Board of Trustees acts only on the president's positive recommendation for tenure. After positive action by the Board of Trustees to grant tenure, the president shall give the faculty member written notice of the effective date of tenure.

3.11.7 Location of Tenure

Tenure at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, is granted in a particular academic unit (e.g., department, school) in a position appropriate to the faculty member's qualifications. Reorganizations that result in the merger or splitting of academic units do not affect the tenure or probationary status of the faculty involved. Tenured faculty members in such reorganization will have tenure in the new unit or program to which they are assigned.

If a tenured faculty member voluntarily transfers from one University of Tennessee campus to another, his or her tenure status is not transferred. However, a review by the responsible administrators in consultation with the tenured faculty of the receiving department may result in an immediate recommendation to the Board of Trustees that tenure at the new campus be granted to the transferred individual; on the other hand, a new probationary period in the receiving unit

may be established. There shall be no involuntary transfer of faculty members between campuses.

Voluntary transfers of tenure between departments at UTK do not require board approval but must be approved by the responsible campus administrator in consultation with the tenured faculty of the receiving unit, with notice to the board of trustees. In any event, prior to the effective date of the transfer all conditions relating to tenure must be documented and accepted, in writing, by the transferring faculty member. If a tenure-track faculty member transfers from one existing department to another, a new probationary period must be established and documented under the same guidelines that would be followed if the faculty member came from another institution. All conditions relating to the new probationary period must be documented and accepted, in writing, by the transferring faculty member.

If a tenured faculty member accepts a part-time faculty position at UTK or an administrative position with UTK or university-wide administration, neither of which can carry tenure, the faculty member retains tenure in the full-time faculty position he or she vacated.

3.11.8 Termination of Tenure

3.11.8.1 Grounds for Termination

A. Relinquishment or forfeiture of tenure: A tenured faculty member relinquishes tenure upon resignation or retirement from the university. A tenured faculty member forfeits tenure upon taking an unauthorized leave of absence or failing to resume the duties of his or her position following an approved leave of absence. Forfeiture results in automatic termination of employment. The chief academic officer shall give the faculty member written notice of the forfeiture of tenure and termination of employment. The faculty member may appeal this action under the general appeals procedures outlined in Chapter 5.

B. Extraordinary circumstances: Extraordinary circumstances warranting termination of tenure may involve either financial exigency or academic program discontinuance. In the case of financial exigency, the criteria and procedures outlined in the board approved UT Knoxville Financial Exigency Plan shall be followed. In the case of academic program discontinuance, the termination of tenured faculty may take place only after consultation with the faculty through appropriate committees of the department, the college, and the faculty senate.

If termination of tenured faculty positions becomes necessary because of financial exigency or academic program discontinuance, the campus administration shall attempt to place each displaced tenured faculty member in another suitable position. This does not require that a faculty member be placed in a position for which he or she is not qualified, that a new position be created where no need exists, or that a faculty member (tenured or non-tenured) in another department be terminated in order to provide a vacancy for a displaced tenured faculty member. The position of any tenured faculty member displaced because of financial exigency or academic program discontinuance shall not be filled within three years unless the displaced faculty member has been offered reinstatement in writing and a reasonable time in which to accept or decline the offer.

Tenured faculty given notice of termination because of financial exigency may appeal termination in accordance with the provisions of the UT Knoxville Financial Exigency Plan. Tenured faculty given notice of termination because of academic program discontinuance may appeal termination in accordance with the general appeal procedures outlined in Chapter 5.

C. Adequate Cause: Adequate cause for terminating a tenured faculty member means the following:

1. Unsatisfactory Performance in Teaching, Research, or Service, which includes the following and similar types of unsatisfactory performance:

- a. failure to demonstrate professional competence in teaching, research, or service;
- b. failure to perform satisfactorily the duties or responsibilities of the faculty position, including but not limited to failure to comply with a lawful directive of the department head, dean, or chief academic officer with respect to the faculty member's duties or responsibilities;
- c. inability to perform an essential function of the faculty position, given reasonable accommodation, if requested;
- d. loss of professional licensure if licensure is required for the performance of the faculty member's duties;
- e. loss of appointment (or substantive alteration of the faculty member's work) with an affiliated entity unless approved in advance by the chief academic officer (or designee) (for example, loss of employment with an affiliated medical practice group or loss of "joint faculty" support from Oak Ridge National Laboratory);
- f. as specified in BT0006-Appendix D, paragraph 3, of the Board Policies on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure, cessation of employment with an external entity / primary employer if tenure was granted contingent upon remaining employed by the external entity / primary employer; or
- g. dishonesty or other serious violation of professional ethics or responsibility in teaching, research, or service; or serious violation of professional responsibility in relations with students, employees, or members of the community.

2. Misconduct, which includes the following and similar types of misconduct:

- a. failure or persistent neglect to comply with university policies, procedures, rules, or other regulations, including but not limited to violation of the university's policies against discrimination and harassment;
- b. falsification of a university record, including but not limited to information concerning the faculty member's qualifications for a position or promotion;

- c. theft or misappropriation of university funds, property, services, or other resources;
- d. admission of guilt or conviction of (1) a felony, or (ii) a non-felony directly related to the fitness of a faculty member to engage in teaching, research, service, or administration; or
- e. any misconduct directly related to the fitness of the faculty member to engage in teaching, research, service, or administration.

3.12 Procedures for Terminating Tenured Faculty

3.12.1 Termination Procedures for Adequate Cause

Termination Procedures for Adequate Cause are governed by Board Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure (BT0006). Section 3.12.2 below applies in cases of unsatisfactory performance in teaching, research, or service. Section 3.12.3 below applies in cases of misconduct. The procedures in Section 3.12.2 below shall apply if the Adequate Cause grounds for termination include both (i) unsatisfactory performance in teaching, research, or service and (ii) misconduct.

3.12.2. Termination Procedures for Unsatisfactory Performance in Teaching, Research, or Service

The following procedures shall apply to termination of a tenured faculty appointment, or termination of a tenure-track appointment before expiration of the annual term, for unsatisfactory performance in teaching, research, or service within the definition of Adequate Cause, Section 3.11.8.1-C.1., above.

3.12.2.1 Suspension with Pay or Reassignment Pending Completion of Termination Proceedings

After consultation¹² with the President of the faculty senate or the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (or campus equivalent), the chief academic officer may suspend the faculty member with pay, or change his or her assignment of duties, pending completion of the university's termination proceedings described in Board policy, this handbook, and campus procedures related to termination proceedings. The chief academic officer may combine actions under this paragraph with any other procedures in BT0006-Appendix B or this Section 3.12.

¹² Wherever "President of the faculty senate" or the "Faculty Senate Executive Committee" appears in Section 3.12, it is understood to mean that the chief academic officer will engage in meaningful discussion with faculty senate leaders (typically the President, immediate past President, and President-Elect of the faculty senate or their designees) before making a decision regarding termination, suspension, or reassignment of duties.

3.12.2.2 Tenured Faculty's Recommendation

The department head shall direct the tenured departmental faculty to consider the faculty member's performance in teaching, research, and service and, by an anonymously cast vote taken in accordance with applicable department or college bylaws, to make a recommendation on the question of whether the faculty member's performance constitutes Adequate Cause for termination. The faculty vote shall be advisory to the department head. If an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR) has been completed in the preceding four years, the report of the EPPR peer committee shall be provided to the tenured faculty, along with any other evaluative information provided for their review. The faculty member under review shall be provided with a copy of the material provided to the tenured faculty and shall be given a reasonable opportunity to submit responsive written materials before the vote of the tenured faculty.

3.12.2.3 Department Head's Recommendation

The department head shall consider the faculty member's performance in teaching, research, and service, and the recommendation of the tenured departmental faculty, and make a recommendation on the question of whether the performance constitutes Adequate Cause for termination. The department head shall forward his or her recommendation and the reasoning supporting the recommendation to the dean, together with the history of efforts to encourage the faculty member to improve his or her performance and a report of the recommendation of the tenured faculty (including the anonymously cast vote tally) on the question of whether the faculty member's performance constitutes Adequate Cause for termination.

3.12.2.4 Dean's Recommendation

The dean shall consider the faculty member's performance in teaching, research, and service, and the recommendation of the tenured departmental faculty and department head, and make a recommendation on the question of whether the performance constitutes Adequate Cause for termination. The dean shall forward his or her recommendation and the reasoning supporting the recommendation to the chief academic officer, together with the recommendations of the tenured faculty and the department head.

3.12.2.5 Decision by the Chief Academic Officer

A. Review by the Chief Academic Officer

1. If the chief academic officer concludes that Adequate Cause for termination may exist, he or she shall call the faculty member to a meeting to discuss a mutually satisfactory resolution of the matter.
2. If a mutually satisfactory resolution is not achieved within 30 calendar days, the chief academic officer shall ask the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee to make a recommendation as to whether Adequate Cause for termination exists. The recommendation of the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee, along with supportive

reasoning, shall be provided to the chief academic officer within 30 calendar days of the request and shall be advisory to the chief academic officer.

3. If the chief academic officer concludes that Adequate Cause does not exist, then the chief academic officer shall provide the faculty member with written notice of the conclusion (with a copy to the dean and the department head) and shall include in the notice any further instructions regarding the matter as may be necessary.

B. Sanctions Less than Termination for Adequate Cause

1. If the chief academic officer concludes Adequate Cause exists but that a sanction other than termination or suspension without pay should be imposed, then the chief academic officer may impose the lesser sanction. The faculty member may appeal the lesser sanction to the chancellor, whose decision shall be final and not appealable to the president.
2. If the chief academic officer concludes Adequate Cause exists but that the sanction should be suspension without pay rather than termination, the chief academic officer shall employ the procedures set forth in Section 3.12.2.5-C, appropriately tailored to reflect that the proposed sanction is suspension without pay rather than termination. If the faculty member wishes to contest the suspension without pay, the procedures in Section 3.12.2.7 of this handbook apply, appropriately tailored to reflect that the proposed sanction is suspension without pay rather than termination.

C. Termination for Adequate Cause

1. Notice of Adequate Cause and Opportunity to Respond: Before deciding that the faculty member's appointment should be terminated for Adequate Cause, the chief academic officer shall give the faculty member written notice, including a statement of the grounds for termination, framed with reasonable particularity, and the opportunity to respond to the stated grounds and the proposed termination in a meeting with the chief academic officer. The faculty member may choose to respond in writing instead of, or in addition to, a meeting with the chief academic officer. Any written response must be submitted to the chief academic officer within 10 calendar days of delivery of the written statement of the grounds for termination.
2. Notice of Termination: If, after considering any information provided by the faculty member and after consulting with the chancellor and the president, the chief academic officer concludes that the faculty member's appointment should be terminated for Adequate Cause, the chief academic officer shall provide written notice of termination to the faculty member:
 - a. providing a statement of the grounds for termination, framed with reasonable particularity, and the date on which the termination will become effective unless the faculty member elects to contest the termination in a pre-termination hearing before a hearing tribunal (Section 3.12.2.7-A);

b. providing notice of the faculty member's right to contest the proposed termination in a pre-termination hearing before a tribunal, as described below, or in a post-termination hearing conducted under the provisions of the Tennessee Uniform Administrative Procedures Act; and

c. providing notice that the faculty member has 15 calendar days after receipt of the written notice to elect in writing to contest the termination and to elect in writing the form of hearing. Selection of one type of hearing waives the opportunity to contest the termination through the other type of hearing. The chief academic officer shall send a copy of the written notice to the faculty senate at the same time.

3.12.2.6 Failure to Contest Termination

If the faculty member does not contest the charge(s) in writing and make the required hearing election within 15 calendar days after receipt of the written notice described in Section 3.12.2.5-C.2. above, the faculty member shall be terminated, and no appeal of the matter will be heard within the university.

3.12.2.7 Options to Contest Termination

The rights provided in this paragraph 3.12.2.7 are in lieu of any other rights of grievance or appeal in this handbook or any appeal to the president.

A. Pre-Termination Hearing before a Tribunal

If the faculty member makes a timely election to contest the charge(s) through a hearing by a university tribunal, the faculty member must confirm in writing the decision to waive the right to a hearing under the Tennessee Uniform Administrative Procedures Act, and the chancellor shall ask the faculty senate, or a designated committee of the faculty senate, to appoint a tribunal within 15 calendar days and shall notify the faculty member in writing of this action. The matter shall then proceed in accordance with the tribunal procedures described below with the faculty member's termination stayed pending the conclusion of those procedures.

1. Composition of the tribunal: The university tribunal shall consist of five members of the tenured faculty and the administration. Members of the administration who are members of the tribunal must also hold tenure, and the majority of the tribunal must be full-time faculty members. The tribunal shall select its own chair. Either the chancellor or the faculty member may challenge the appointment of a tribunal member on the ground of bias or conflict of interest. A challenge shall be judged by the faculty senate, or a designated committee of the faculty senate, whose decision on the challenge shall be final and not subject to appeal.
2. Notice of hearing: The chancellor shall give the faculty member written notice of the hearing date at least 30 calendar days in advance. The chancellor shall issue a scheduling order to ensure that the tribunal's written findings, reasoning, and conclusions are submitted to the chancellor within 120 calendar days from the date the faculty member has been provided with written notice of termination under Section 3.12.2.5-C.2. A

scheduling order shall not be modified except by leave of the chancellor upon a showing of good cause.

3. Representation: If the university intends to be represented by legal counsel, the written notice of the hearing date shall so advise the faculty member. The written notice shall also state the faculty member's right to be represented by legal counsel or other representative of his or her choice. If the faculty member intends to be represented by legal counsel, he or she must notify the tribunal chairperson within 10 days of receipt of the written notice of the hearing date. If the faculty member fails to give timely notice of legal representation, the hearing date shall be postponed at the university's request.
4. Waiver of hearing: If, at any time prior to the hearing date, the faculty member decides to waive his or her right to a hearing and respond to the charge(s) only in writing, the tribunal shall proceed to evaluate all available evidence and rest its recommendation upon the evidence in the record.
5. Pre-hearing preparation: The faculty member and the university shall have a reasonable opportunity prior to the hearing to obtain witnesses, specific documents, or other specific evidence reasonably related to the charge(s).
6. Evidence: The tribunal is not bound by legal rules of evidence and may admit any evidence of probative value in determining the issues. The tribunal shall make every reasonable effort, however, to base its recommendation on the most reliable evidence. If the charge is "failure to demonstrate professional competence in assigned roles in teaching, research, or service," the evidence shall include the testimony of qualified faculty members from this and/or other comparable institutions of higher education.
7. Confrontation and cross-examination of witnesses: The faculty member and the university shall have the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses. If a witness cannot or will not appear, but the tribunal determines that his or her testimony is necessary to a fair adjudication of the charge(s), the tribunal may admit as evidence the sworn affidavit of the witness. In that event, the tribunal shall disclose the affidavit to both parties and allow both parties to submit written interrogatories to the witness.
8. Adjournments: The tribunal shall grant adjournments to allow either party to investigate evidence to which a valid claim of surprise is made. The tribunal may grant one such adjournment for a period of no more than five calendar days. If the tribunal wishes to grant an adjournment for more than five calendar days, or wishes to grant more than one adjournment, the tribunal shall notify the chancellor of the proposed adjournment, provide an explanation of the need for the adjournment, and provide a recommendation regarding the length of the adjournment. If the chancellor concurs in the tribunal's recommendation that an adjournment be granted, the chancellor shall give the faculty member written notice of the date on which the hearing will resume.
9. Burden of proof: The burden of proof that adequate cause exists rests with the university and shall be satisfied only by clear and convincing evidence in the record considered as a whole.

10. Findings and conclusions: The tribunal shall make written findings and conclusions and shall provide a copy to the faculty member at the time of submission to the chancellor.
- a. If the tribunal concludes Adequate Cause for termination has not been established, it shall so report to the chancellor, with supporting reasons. In the case of a split decision, a minority report should be included.
 - b. If the tribunal concludes Adequate Cause for termination has been established but that a sanction other than termination should be imposed, it shall so recommend to the chancellor, with supporting reasons. In the case of a split decision, a minority report should be included.
 - c. If the tribunal concludes Adequate Cause for termination has been established and that termination is the appropriate sanction, it shall so report to the chancellor, with supporting reasons. In the case of a split decision, a minority report should be included.
11. Transcript of the hearing: A verbatim record of the hearing shall be made, and a transcript shall be provided to the faculty member and the chancellor at the time of the tribunal's submission of the findings, reasoning, and conclusions.
12. Final Decision by the Chancellor: Upon receipt of the tribunal's findings, reasoning, and conclusions, the chancellor shall provide an opportunity for written argument by the parties and may provide the parties an opportunity to present oral argument. After considering the tribunal's findings, reasoning, and conclusions and any arguments of the parties, the chancellor will determine whether Adequate Cause has been established and whether termination is the appropriate sanction.

If the chancellor concludes that Adequate Cause has not been established, the chancellor shall provide the faculty member with written notice of the conclusion (with a copy to the tribunal, chief academic officer, dean, and department head) and shall include in the notice any further instructions regarding the matter as may be necessary.

If the chancellor concludes that Adequate Cause has been established but that a sanction other than termination should be imposed, including without limitation suspension without pay, the chancellor may impose the lesser sanction by written notice to the faculty member (with a copy to the tribunal, chief academic officer, dean, and department head). The notice shall include the date on which the sanction will become effective. The decision of the chancellor shall be final and not appealable to the president.

If the chancellor concludes that Adequate Cause has been established and that termination is the appropriate sanction, the chancellor shall provide the faculty member with a written notice of termination stating the grounds for termination (with a copy to the tribunal, chief academic officer, dean, and department head). The notice of termination may include or adopt the written findings and conclusions of the tribunal if applicable to the chancellor's decision. The notice shall include the date on which

termination will become effective. The decision of the chancellor shall be final and not appealable to the president.

B. Post-Termination Hearing under the TUAPA

1. Contested Case Procedures: If the faculty member makes a timely election to contest the charge(s) under the Tennessee Uniform Administrative Procedures Act (TUAPA), the chancellor shall appoint an administrative judge, the faculty member's employment will be terminated on the date specified in the notice provided under Section 3.12.2.5-C.2. of this handbook, and the matter shall proceed post-termination in accordance with the contested case procedures promulgated by the university under the TUAPA. The TUAPA contested case procedures are published in the Compiled Rules and Regulations of the State of Tennessee, Tenn. Comp. R. & Regs. § 1720-1-5.
2. Initial Order: In accordance with the TUAPA contested case procedures, upon completion of the hearing, the administrative judge shall render an initial order, which either party may appeal to the chancellor within 15 calendar days. In addition, the chancellor, on his or her own motion, may elect within 15 calendar days to review the administrative judge's initial order.
3. Final Order: The administrative judge's initial order shall become the final order unless review is sought by either party or the chancellor within the fifteen-day period. If review is sought, the chancellor shall review the initial order and issue a final order in accordance with applicable provisions of the TUAPA contested case procedures. The final order, whether rendered by the chancellor or by virtue of neither party appealing the initial order, shall be the final decision on the charge(s) within the university. If the university's final order is favorable to the faculty member and concludes that the faculty member's employment should not have been terminated for Adequate Cause, then full restitution of salary, academic position and tenure lost during the termination will be made.
4. Judicial Review: If the final order is unfavorable to the faculty member, he or she is entitled to judicial review of the final order in accordance with applicable provisions of the Tennessee Uniform Administrative Procedures Act.

3.12.3 Termination Procedures for Misconduct

The following procedures shall apply to termination of a tenured faculty appointment, or termination of a tenure-track appointment before expiration of the annual term, for misconduct within the definition of Adequate Cause. Application of this section may be adapted in cases controlled by Title IX regulations requiring a different procedure (see Policy BT0006-Appendix C-1).

3.12.3.1 Suspension or Reassignment Pending Completion of Termination Proceedings

The following procedures shall apply to termination of a tenured faculty appointment, or termination of a tenure-track appointment before expiration of the annual term, for misconduct within the definition of Adequate Cause. The chief academic officer may combine action under this paragraph with any other procedures in Policy BT0006-Appendix C or this Section 3.12.

- A. Suspension with Pay or Reassignment of Duties: After consultation with the President of the faculty senate or the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (or campus equivalent), the chief academic officer may suspend a faculty member with pay, or change his or her assignment of duties, pending completion of the university's termination proceedings described in Policy BT0006, this handbook, and any campus procedures related to termination proceedings.
- B. Suspension without Pay: After consultation with the chancellor, the president, and the President of the faculty senate or the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (or campus equivalent), the chief academic officer may suspend a faculty member without pay, pending completion of termination proceedings only for the following types of alleged misconduct (and only in accordance with the procedures outlined in Section 3.12.3.8 of this handbook entitled "Expedited Procedure for Termination or Suspension Without Pay in Certain Cases of Misconduct"):
 - 1. alleged misconduct involving:
 - a. acts or credible threats of harm to a person or university property; or
 - b. theft or misappropriation of university funds, property, services, or other resources, or
 - 2. indictment by a state or federal grand jury, or arrest and charge pursuant to state or federal criminal procedure, for:
 - a. a felony; or
 - b. a non-felony directly related to the fitness of a faculty member to engage in teaching, research, service, or administration.

If the university's final determination after either a TUAPA proceeding or an ad hoc hearing committee proceeding is favorable to the faculty member and concludes both that the faculty member's employment should not be terminated for Adequate Cause and that the faculty member should not have been suspended without pay pending completion of termination proceedings, then full restitution of salary, academic position and tenure lost during the suspension without pay will be made.

In cases where a faculty member has been suspended without pay based on indictment or arrest, as described above, the chief academic officer may – upon full acquittal of all charges – re-characterize some or all of the suspension as a suspension *with pay*, allowing payment of salary that would have otherwise accrued.

3.12.3.2 Consultation with the tenured faculty

The department head shall consult with the departmental tenured faculty before making a recommendation regarding whether a faculty member's alleged misconduct constitutes Adequate Cause for termination.

3.12.3.3 Department head's recommendation

If the department head concludes that a faculty member's alleged misconduct constitutes Adequate Cause for termination, he or she shall forward a written recommendation and the reasoning supporting the recommendation to the dean. At the same time, the department head shall send a copy of his or her recommendation to the faculty member. The recommendation shall include a report of the head's consultation with the tenured faculty.

3.12.3.4 Dean's recommendation

If the dean concludes that a faculty member's alleged misconduct constitutes Adequate Cause for termination, he or she shall forward a written recommendation and the reasoning supporting the recommendation to the chief academic officer.

3.12.3.5 Decision by the Chief Academic Officer

A. Review by the Chief Academic Officer

1. If the chief academic officer concludes that Adequate Cause for termination may exist, he or she shall call the faculty member to a meeting to discuss a mutually satisfactory resolution of the matter.
2. If the chief academic officer concludes that Adequate Cause does not exist, the chief academic officer shall provide the faculty member with written notice of the conclusion (with a copy to the dean and the department head) and shall include in the notice any further instructions regarding the matter as may be necessary.

B. Sanctions Less than Termination for Adequate Cause

1. If the chief academic officer concludes Adequate Cause exists but that a sanction other than termination or suspension without pay should be imposed, the chief academic officer may impose the lesser sanction. The faculty member may appeal the lesser sanction to the chancellor, whose decision shall be final and not appealable to the president.
2. If the chief academic officer concludes Adequate Cause exists but that the sanction should be suspension without pay rather than termination, the chief academic officer shall employ the procedures set forth in Section 3.12.3.5-C, below, all as appropriately tailored to reflect that the proposed sanction is suspension without pay rather than termination. If the faculty member wishes to contest the suspension without pay, the procedures shall be those set forth in Section 3.12.3.7 of this handbook, all as appropriately tailored to reflect that the proposed sanction is suspension without pay rather than termination.

C. Termination for Adequate Cause

- a. Notice of Adequate Cause and Opportunity to Respond: Before deciding that the faculty member's appointment shall be terminated for Adequate Cause, the chief academic officer shall give the faculty member written notice, including a statement of the grounds for termination, framed with reasonable particularity, and the opportunity to respond to the stated grounds and the proposed termination in a meeting with the chief academic officer. The faculty member may choose to respond in writing instead of, or in addition to, a meeting with the chief academic officer. Any written response must be submitted to the chief academic officer within 10 calendar days of delivery of the written statement of the grounds for termination.
- b. Notice of Termination: If, after considering any information provided by the faculty member, and after consulting with the chancellor and the president, the chief academic officer concludes that the faculty member's appointment should be terminated for Adequate Cause, the chief academic officer shall provide written notice to the faculty member (a) providing a statement of the grounds for termination, framed with reasonable particularity, and the date on which the termination will become effective unless the faculty member elects to contest the termination in a pre-termination hearing before an ad hoc hearing committee (Section 3.12.3.7-A of this handbook); (b) notice of the faculty member's right to contest the proposed termination in a pre-termination hearing before an ad hoc hearing committee (Section 3.12.3.7-A of this handbook) or in a post-termination hearing under the provisions of the Tennessee Uniform Administrative Procedures Act; and (c) notice that the faculty member has 15 calendar days after receipt of the written notice to elect in writing to contest the termination. Selection of one type of hearing waives the opportunity to contest the termination through the other type of hearing. The chief academic officer shall send a copy of the written notice to the faculty senate at the same time.

3.12.3.6 Failure to Contest

If the faculty member does not contest the charge(s) of misconduct in writing within 15 calendar days after receipt of the written notice described in Section 3.12.3.5-C.2. of this handbook, the faculty member shall be terminated, and no appeal of the matter will be heard within the university.

3.12.3.7 Options to Contest Termination

The rights provided in this Section 3.12.3.7 are in lieu of any other rights of grievance or appeal in the handbook or any appeal to the president.

A. Pre-Termination Hearing before an Ad Hoc Hearing Committee

If the faculty member contests the charge(s) of misconduct but elects to waive his or her right to formal hearing under the contested case procedures of the TUAPA, the faculty member must confirm in writing the decision to waive the right to a hearing under the TUAPA, and

the chancellor shall appoint an ad hoc hearing committee to conduct an informal hearing on the charges, with the faculty member's termination stayed pending the conclusion of the procedures set forth in this Section 3.12.3.7-A.

The chancellor shall give the faculty member written notice of the hearing date at least 30 calendar days in advance. The chancellor shall issue a scheduling order to ensure that the hearing committee's written findings, reasoning, and conclusions are submitted to the chancellor within 120 calendar days from the date the faculty member has been provided with written notice of termination under Section 3.12.3.5-C.2. of this handbook. A scheduling order shall not be modified except by leave of the chancellor upon a showing of good cause.

The faculty member may be represented before the hearing committee by legal counsel or other representative of his or her choice. If the faculty member intends to be represented by legal counsel, he or she must notify the committee chairperson within 10 calendar days of receipt of the written notice of the hearing date. If the faculty member fails to give timely notice of legal representation, the hearing date shall be postponed at the university's request.

The hearing committee shall grant adjournments to allow either party to investigate evidence to which a valid claim of surprise is made. The hearing committee may grant one such adjournment for a period of no more than five calendar days. If the hearing committee wishes to grant an adjournment for more than five calendar days, or wishes to grant more than one adjournment, the hearing committee shall notify the chancellor of the proposed adjournment, provide an explanation of the need for the adjournment, and provide a recommendation regarding the length of the adjournment. If the chancellor concurs in the hearing committee's recommendation that an adjournment be granted, the chancellor shall give the faculty member written notice of the date on which the hearing will resume.

The hearing committee shall make a written report of its findings, reasoning, and conclusions to the chancellor. In the case of a split decision, a minority report should be included.

Upon receipt of the hearing committee's findings, reasoning, and conclusions, the chancellor shall provide the opportunity for written argument by the parties and may provide the parties an opportunity to present oral argument. After considering the hearing committee's findings, reasoning, and conclusions and any arguments of the parties, the chancellor will determine whether Adequate Cause has been established and whether termination is the appropriate sanction.

If the chancellor concludes that Adequate Cause has not been established, the chancellor shall provide the faculty member with written notice of the conclusion (with a copy to the hearing committee, chief academic officer, dean, and department head), and shall include in the notice any further instructions regarding the matter as may be necessary.

If the chancellor concludes that Adequate Cause has been established but that a sanction other than termination should be imposed, including without limitation suspension without pay, the chancellor may impose the lesser sanction by written notice to the faculty member (with a copy to the hearing committee, chief academic officer, dean, and department head).

The notice shall include the date on which the sanction will become effective. The decision of the chancellor shall be final and not appealable to the president.

If the chancellor concludes that Adequate Cause has been established and that termination is the appropriate sanction, the chancellor shall provide the faculty member with a written notice of termination stating the grounds for termination (with a copy to the hearing committee, chief academic officer, dean, and department head). The notice of termination may include or adopt the written findings, reasoning, and conclusions of the hearing committee if applicable to the chancellor's decision. The notice shall include the date on which termination will become effective. The decision of the chancellor shall be final and not appealable to the president.

B. Post-Termination Hearing under TUAPA

Contested Case Procedures: If the faculty member makes a timely election to contest the charge(s) under the Tennessee Uniform Administrative Procedures Act (TUAPA), the chancellor shall appoint an administrative judge, the faculty member's employment will be terminated on the date specified in the notice provided under Section 3.12.3.5-C.2., and the matter shall proceed post-termination in accordance with the contested case procedures promulgated by the university under the TUAPA. The TUAPA contested case procedures are published in the Compiled Rules and Regulations of the State of Tennessee, Tenn. Comp. R. & Regs. § 1720-1-5.

1. Initial Order: In accordance with the TUAPA contested case procedures, upon completion of the hearing, the administrative judge shall render an initial order, which either party may appeal to the chancellor within 15 calendar days. In addition, the chancellor, on his or her own motion, may elect within fifteen calendar days to review the hearing officer's initial order.
2. Final Order: The administrative judge's initial order shall become the final order unless review is sought by either party or the chancellor within the fifteen-day period. If review is sought, the chancellor shall review the initial order and issue a final order in accordance with applicable provisions of the TUAPA contested case procedures. The final order, whether rendered by the chancellor or by virtue of neither party appealing the initial order, shall be the final decision on the charge(s) within the university. If the university's final order is favorable to the faculty member and concludes that the faculty member's employment should not have been terminated for Adequate Cause, then full restitution of salary, academic position and tenure lost during the termination will be made.
3. Judicial Review: If the final order is unfavorable to the faculty member, he or she is entitled to judicial review of the final order in accordance with applicable provisions of the Tennessee Uniform Administrative Procedures Act.

3.12.3.8 Expedited Procedure for Termination or Suspension without Pay in Certain Cases of Misconduct

In the following cases of alleged misconduct by a faculty member, the chief academic officer, after consulting with the chancellor, the president, and the President of the faculty senate or the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (or campus equivalent), may invoke an expedited procedure to accomplish termination or suspension without pay, with comprehensive due process procedures to be offered after termination or suspension without pay:

- A. alleged misconduct involving:
 - 1. acts or credible threats of harm to a person or university property; or
 - 2. theft or misappropriation of university funds, property, services, or other resources, or
- B. indictment by a state or federal grand jury, or arrest and charge pursuant to state or federal criminal procedure, for:
 - 1. a felony; or
 - 2. a non-felony directly related to the fitness of a faculty member to engage in teaching, research, service, or administration.

Under the expedited procedure, the faculty member shall be offered the following process before termination or suspension without pay:

- notice of the charges;
- an explanation of the evidence; and
- an informal opportunity to refute the charges in a meeting with the campus chief academic officer.

After termination or suspension without pay, the faculty member shall be offered the full range of due process options available to faculty members in other Adequate Cause proceedings as set forth in Section 3.12.3.7 of this handbook, except that the termination or suspension without pay shall not be stayed pending the outcome of an ad hoc hearing committee if the faculty member elects that method of contesting the action. If the university's final determination after either a TUAPA proceeding or an ad hoc hearing committee proceeding is favorable to the faculty member and concludes that the faculty member should not have been suspended without pay or that the faculty member's employment should not have been/should not be terminated for Adequate Cause, then full restitution of salary, academic position and tenure lost during the suspension without pay or termination will be made.

3.13 Disciplinary Sanctions Other than Termination for Adequate Cause

This section applies only to the imposition of disciplinary sanctions when the University does not propose to terminate a faculty member for Adequate Cause.

Disciplinary sanctions other than termination may be imposed against a faculty member. If the proposed sanction is suspension without pay for a definite term (no more than one year), the procedures applicable to termination in BT0006-Appendix B or BT0006-Appendix C, and in Section 3.12 above (as applicable and tailored to reflect that the proposed sanction is suspension without pay rather than termination) shall be offered in connection with the suspension. A

decision by the chancellor on appeal shall be the final decision for the university and is not appealable to the president.

If the proposed sanction does not involve suspension without pay, the department head shall make a recommendation to the dean, and the dean shall make a recommendation to the chief academic officer. The chief academic officer shall give the faculty member written notice of the proposed sanction and the supporting reason(s) and shall offer him or her an opportunity to respond both in writing and in person. The faculty member may appeal the proposed sanction through established appeal procedures, and the sanction shall be held in abeyance until conclusion of the appeal.

Before such disciplinary action may be taken, the department head or dean must notify the faculty member of his or her intent to take disciplinary action. This written notice shall include a detailed specification of the alleged misconduct and the nature of the proposed discipline. It shall also inform the faculty member of his or her right to appeal the proposed discipline or to request a review by the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee in accordance with the provisions of this chapter or to the president through the chancellor.

3.14 Notice of Resignation and Retirement

3.14.1 Notice of Resignation

Tenure (see above) is relinquished upon resignation from the university. If a faculty member resigns, but is re-employed by the university, tenure will be awarded only subsequent to the procedures outlined above.

Since faculty appointments are made for the academic year (or, in exceptional cases, for one or more designated semesters), it is expected that faculty members who wish to resign will do so effective at the end of the academic year (or, again in exceptional cases, at the end of a semester). In all cases notification of resignation must be made early enough to allow the university to cover any scheduled assignments.

Teaching faculty on academic-year appointments who resign before the end of the academic year are paid for the number of semesters they have taught, at one half of annual salary per semester. Faculty members on 12-month appointments will receive leave pay due on resignation.

3.14.2 Notice of Retirement

Under normal circumstances, a member of the faculty controls the decision to retire. The effective date of retirement for academic-year faculty is normally at the end of either the fall or spring semesters. Computation of the final payment for the last year of service is calculated in the same way as for resignations (above). Thus, a faculty member who resigns at the end of the fall semester will have been paid five of the six monthly payments earned and will be due one additional payment. Faculty on 12-month appointments will receive annual leave pay due on retirement.

CHAPTER FOUR: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments

Non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) are an integral and significant part of the university community. Some NTTF expect their employment to be for one or two semesters, while others dedicate their careers to the university. NTTF are appointed to address specific needs related to each hiring unit's particular mission and to the mission of the university. These needs vary from unit-to-unit and from year-to-year. Units are expected to engage in strategic and long-term planning around the hiring of NTTF, including careful assessment of unit needs and the role these faculty will play in meeting immediate and long-term unit-level goals.

NTTF may hold any of several titles according to their primary academic responsibilities such as teaching, research, clinical, practice, and extension; or they may be designated as adjunct, visiting, or joint faculty as further specified in this chapter. NTTF include full-time and part-time faculty and may hold academic-year or twelve-month appointments. NTTF are appointed by the chief academic officer upon request from an academic unit. NTTF may serve on graduate committees, as program directors, supervise clinical experiences, or assume other responsibilities as are consistent with university, college, and departmental policies. All NTTF enjoy the same academic freedoms as tenured and tenure-track faculty.

The provision of clear guidelines and procedures around NTTF roles is necessary to maintain a university culture where everyone is valued. Colleges and departments are expected to provide clear guidelines and procedures around NTTF in their bylaws. It is recommended that colleges and departments incorporate NTTF into the academic life of the unit and recognize the expertise they bring to matters related to their primary job duties. The degree of such involvement and the roles NTTF take in unit-level governance may vary from unit-to-unit and is a unit-level decision. When possible, units are encouraged to provide NTTF opportunities to participate in departmental, college, and/or university governance on all issues related to their assigned responsibilities in accordance with departmental and college bylaws.

4.1 Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Titles and Ranks

4.1.1 Teaching Faculty

The primary responsibility of NTT teaching faculty is teaching. They generally are not expected to conduct research or perform public, institutional, or disciplinary service as a condition of their employment. However, research or service activities may be included as part of their effort depending on the needs of the department and the skills and desires of the faculty member.

Departments should have consistent criteria for deciding teaching assignments. Departments should consider the views of NTTF when making decisions that directly impact their role (e.g., for teaching schedules, teaching assignments, and other issues that impact quality of teaching and working conditions in various NTTF roles). The expected maximum teaching responsibility of a full-time faculty member engaged only in classroom teaching is 12 credit hours each semester. The precise teaching responsibility of an individual will be based on such things as class size and the number of examinations, papers, and other assignments that require grading and evaluation. In addition, the number of different courses taught and other appropriate

considerations will be used to determine teaching responsibility. Classroom teaching responsibility may be reduced by the department head for other justifiable reasons including, without limitation, student advising, active involvement in research and/or creative activities (with publications or other suitable outcomes), direction of graduate theses or dissertations, teaching non-credit courses or workshops, administrative duties, and institutional and/or public service.

Teaching faculty may be appointed under either the lecturer title series or the teaching professor title series:

- A. Lecturer Series: Faculty appointed to this title series hold a degree (or its professional equivalent) appropriate to their disciplines.
- Lecturer: Individuals holding this rank have shown promise for excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.
 - Senior lecturer: Individuals holding this rank have demonstrated excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.
 - Distinguished lecturer: Individuals holding this rank have demonstrated and maintained a consistent record of excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.
- B. Teaching Professor Series: Faculty appointed under this title series hold the terminal degree appropriate to their disciplines. The following ranks or titles may be assigned: teaching assistant professor, teaching associate professor, and teaching professor.
- Teaching assistant professor: Individuals holding this rank have shown promise for excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.
 - Teaching associate professor: Individuals holding this rank have demonstrated excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.
 - Teaching professor: Individuals holding this rank have demonstrated a consistent record of excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.
- C. Instructor: In addition, the instructor title is available for faculty members who are appointed through a search for a tenure-track faculty position but do not hold the appropriate terminal degree at the time of appointment.

Instructors are expected to have all qualifications listed for appointment as a tenure-track assistant professor, except for completion of the appropriate terminal degree. Upon certification that the requirements for the terminal degree have been completed, promotion to the rank of assistant professor will generally follow, at which time the tenure-track probationary period, typically six years, begins. Clear expectations for completion of the appropriate terminal degree shall be included in the letter of appointment. Instructors who do

not complete their degree requirements within 12 months of their appointment will be terminated.

4.1.2 Research Faculty

The primary responsibility of NTT research faculty is to conduct research. They generally are not expected to engage in teaching or perform public, institutional, or disciplinary service as a condition of their employment. However, teaching or service activities may be included as part of their effort, depending on the needs of the department and the skills and desires of the faculty member.

The following ranks or titles may be assigned to research faculty: research assistant professor, research associate professor, and research professor. Faculty appointed to this title series should have completed a doctoral degree or terminal degree appropriate to the field.

Research assistant professor: Individuals holding this rank have shown promise for excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.

Research associate professor: Individuals holding this rank have demonstrated excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.

Research professor: Individuals holding this rank have demonstrated and maintained a consistent record of excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.

4.1.3 Clinical Faculty

The primary responsibility of NTT clinical faculty is to provide instruction to students in a clinical setting and provide professional services to the hiring unit. Research or service activities may be included as part of their effort, depending on the needs of the department and the skills and desires of the faculty member.

The following ranks or titles may be assigned to clinical faculty: clinical instructor, clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, and clinical professor.

Clinical instructor: This rank is for those who have completed a degree appropriate to the field or who are licensed or certified to practice the profession where appropriate. Individuals holding this rank show promise in their ability to teach students in a clinical setting or in courses related to clinical practice.

Clinical assistant professor: This rank is for those who have completed a doctoral degree or terminal degree appropriate to the field and who are licensed or certified to practice the profession where appropriate. Individuals holding this rank have shown promise for excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.

Clinical associate professor: This rank is for those who have completed a doctoral degree or terminal degree appropriate to the field and who are licensed or certified to practice the

profession where appropriate. Individuals holding this rank have demonstrated excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.

Clinical professor: This rank is for those who have completed a doctoral degree or terminal degree appropriate to the field and who are licensed or certified to practice the profession where appropriate. Individuals holding this rank have demonstrated a consistent record of excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.

4.1.4 Faculty of Practice

NTTF of practice are typically appointed to meet instructional and research needs. Service activities may be included as part of their effort, depending on the needs of the department and the skills and desires of the faculty member. Appointment to the faculty of practice title series is for those who have achieved distinction in their chosen field of practice, and who bring to the university unique practical experiences and talents that will benefit students. Recommendations for faculty of practice appointments must contain a description of the appointee's professional experience, especially if it is to be used in lieu of typical academic credentials. The expectation is that those appointed to a faculty of practice position have professional experience in the field. Other faculty titles should be used for appointees without professional experience. The hiring unit must also complete an alternative credentialing request based on the courses the appointee will teach if they do not hold a terminal degree.

The following ranks or titles may be assigned to faculty of practice: assistant professor of practice, associate professor of practice, and professor of practice. Faculty appointed to this title series should hold the terminal degree in the field and/or have equivalent capabilities by virtue of professional experience, professional licensure, and/or certification.

Assistant professor of practice: Individuals holding this rank have shown promise for excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.

Associate professor of practice: Individuals holding this rank have demonstrated excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.

Professor of practice: Individuals holding this rank have demonstrated and maintained a consistent record of excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.

4.1.5 Extension Faculty

NTT extension faculty are appointed to meet outreach and engagement needs in UT Extension. The primary responsibility of NTT extension faculty is to conduct outreach and engagement assignments for UT Extension. They generally are not expected to conduct traditional academic research or engage in for-credit, classroom teaching as a condition of their employment. Extension faculty are expected to conduct externally funded work and to publish the results of that work. Faculty appointed to this title series should have completed a doctoral degree or terminal degree appropriate to the field.

The following ranks or titles may be assigned to NTT extension faculty: extension assistant professor, extension associate professor, and extension professor.

Extension assistant professor: Individuals holding this rank demonstrate an ability to initiate and implement outreach and engagement programs or projects, publish, and obtain external funding. They show promise for excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.

Extension associate professor: Individuals holding this rank have demonstrated continuous improvement and contribution in Extension and outreach education supported through grants and contracts over a period of years. Individuals holding this rank will have demonstrated excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.

Extension professor: Individuals holding this rank have a record of outstanding outreach and engagement impacts with a strong record of publications as well as support by grants and contracts over a period of years. Individuals holding this rank have demonstrated and maintained excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.

4.1.6 Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty provide intermittent service, compensated or volunteer, to a hiring unit, depending on need and mutual agreement regarding the terms of the service. The qualification “adjunct” is appropriate for faculty appointments of individuals whose career paths lie primarily in another position or employment. That is, the appointment is “adjunct” or ancillary to the career of the appointee and auxiliary to the faculty of the unit. Adjunct appointments, therefore, are necessarily part-time and temporary, although it is acknowledged that some appointees teach or provide service on a predictable, but intermittent or episodic basis.

Adjunct faculty originate from one of two sources. The first source is university staff exempt employees with appropriate expertise who, on occasion, provide instruction or participate in research. The second source is individuals external to the university who have special expertise useful for the accomplishment of the unit’s mission. Because an adjunct appointment is necessarily part-time, adjunct faculty do not participate in faculty governance in the unit in which the appointment is held.

Appointees should hold the terminal degree in the field and/or have equivalent capabilities by virtue of professional experience. Recommendations for adjunct faculty appointments must contain a description of the appointee’s professional experience, especially if it is to be used in lieu of typical academic credentials. The hiring unit must also complete an alternative credentialing request based on the courses the appointee will teach if they do not hold a terminal degree. Departments and colleges are expected to have processes in place to periodically review and consider for reappointment all adjunct faculty appointments, including for those who hold the title as a courtesy, those who have little to no service responsibilities, and those who have infrequent interactions with the unit.

The following ranks or titles may be assigned to adjunct faculty: adjunct assistant professor, adjunct associate professor, and adjunct professor. In addition, the “adjunct” qualifier can be

combined with other titles in this chapter, especially to designate part-time, temporary, and/or intermittent appointments.

Adjunct assistant professor: Individuals holding this rank have shown promise for excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.

Adjunct associate professor: Individuals holding this rank have demonstrated excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.

Adjunct professor: Individuals holding this rank have demonstrated and maintained a consistent record of excellence in areas of responsibility assigned to them.

Although uncompensated adjunct faculty members are not employees of the university of Tennessee, they are subject to certain university policies as a condition of receiving and retaining this honorary title.

4.1.7 Visiting Faculty

Visiting faculty carry out instructional and/or research responsibilities within an academic department. Professional credentials and/or the terminal degree required for the university's professorial ranks are also required for appointments as visiting faculty. Normally, the rank of appointment will be the professorial rank that the individual holds at their home institution; however, the standards of scholarship for holding visiting faculty rank will be the same as required for the university's own faculty. Visiting faculty do not participate in the governance of the department and are not subject to annual performance reviews. Typically, a visiting faculty appointment is made for a maximum of 12 months. The qualifier "visiting" can be combined with other titles in this chapter.

4.1.8 Joint and Intercampus Appointments

Joint faculty appointments typically involve participation in the teaching or research of two or more departments or research units within the university or under the terms of a Joint Faculty Agreement between the university and another entity, such as Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL). The primary department with which the faculty member is affiliated, through which all matters of promotion, salary, and review are processed, is the "home" department. On all matters, the home department should consult with the department head and faculty of the other unit. Where joint appointments involve equal time in two or more units or service primarily within an interdisciplinary program, it is the shared responsibility of the heads, deans, or other administrative officers to make appropriate recommendations; and in such cases, one of the two units should be designated as the home department. The initial appointment letter must specify the faculty member's home department, administrative reporting relationships, and the peer group(s) to be consulted in promotion recommendations. The university recognizes that as the shape of knowledge changes, new disciplinary and interdisciplinary needs may emerge which do not precisely correspond to existing administrative or departmental lines.

Joint faculty appointments may also be authorized for faculty members in one department who have expertise that qualifies them for participation in the work of another department on the

same or another campus, and when the department has need of their services. The nature and extent of such interdepartmental or intercampus NTT joint faculty appointments is determined by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department heads in consultation with appropriate faculty of the academic units involved, and the respective deans, vice chancellors, or other campus officers. In these cases, the following principles are observed:

- The appointment may be with or without salary in the cooperating or second department (i.e., the unit awarding the interdepartmental or intercampus joint faculty appointment); salary, if any, continues to be linked with the home department;
- The head of the home or primary department recommends the interdepartmental or intercampus joint faculty appointment to the head of the cooperating department, following informal discussion or negotiation;
- The joint faculty appointment is made by the cooperating department with approvals by the dean and chief academic officer;
- The specific joint faculty title in the cooperating department is determined by mutual agreement between the head and the faculty member, subject to approval by the dean and chief academic officer.

4.1.9 Emeritus or Emerita

Upon the recommendation of the department head and dean, faculty members who are at the rank of distinguished lecturer, research professor, clinical professor, professor of practice, or extension professor at the time of retirement may be awarded the title of emeritus or emerita by the chief academic officer on behalf of the chancellor.

4.2 Recruitment and Appointment

Units are expected to have formal descriptions of NTTF positions, including minimum job qualifications, educational and degree requirements, and substantive knowledge and experience required for position and rank. Such standards are necessary to ensure that NTTF will meet the performance expectations, curricular needs, and/or research objectives of the unit and that NTTF are assigned the appropriate rank when they are hired. Units are expected to establish processes for recruiting, searching for, and hiring NTTF, which may include interviews, presentations, and interactions with faculty, staff, and students. When possible, competitive search processes should be used to ensure the best talent can be identified and hired.

All appointments to NTTF positions, including part-time appointments, will be made in accordance with departmental and college bylaws and subject to the provisions of this handbook. Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, in each hiring unit a representative body of tenured, tenure-track, and/or NTTF will evaluate credentials and vote on full-time NTTF appointments in accordance with departmental and college bylaws. NTTF positions are filled as required to meet university needs and may occur at any time during the year.

An appointment letter from the chief academic officer will be issued to the NTTF, detailing rank, salary and related financial conditions, and duration of the appointment. A NTTF appointment may be, by its nature, funding-limited; the compensation amounts for the position may be funded through a grant, contract, or restricted donation, and it may automatically expire when funding lapses. In these situations, the appointment letter will also indicate if the appointment is contingent upon the continuation of funding from an external agency, as in the case, for example, of a grant or sponsored project. This appointment letter is accompanied by a statement of responsibilities and assigned workload (clearly stating the percentage of effort the faculty member is expected to devote to teaching, service, research, and/or other responsibilities), which is issued by the hiring unit. The statement of responsibility and assigned workload may be changed from time-to-time by the hiring unit as business needs require.

The faculty member's written acceptance of the letter of appointment, together with their successful completion of associated university employment forms and processes, completes the initial appointment. The employment of NTTF is governed by the terms of the appointment letter, the statement of responsibilities and assigned workload, applicable provisions of this handbook, and applicable provisions of university policies and procedures.

4.2.1 Workload

Full-time NTTF workload may consist of a combination of teaching, advising, research / scholarship / creative activity, and institutional and/or public service depending on the needs of the unit and the skills and desires of the faculty member. Because the individual mix of these responsibilities may vary over time, annual responsibilities are determined by the department head and faculty member, subject to review by the dean and chief academic officer, at the time of the Annual Performance and Planning Review (APPR). Clear workload statements are essential to ensuring a fair promotion review as they establish, along with departmental bylaws, expectations for what an individual needs to accomplish to be promoted. The university requires that each member of the faculty perform a reasonable and equitable amount of work each year.

4.2.2 Appointment Lengths

Generally, regular academic-year faculty are expected to be on campus a week before the beginning of fall semester classes through commencement in the spring. Generally, regular 12-month appointments run July 1 through June 30, although 12-month NTTF appointments can have other start and end dates.

Appointment lengths for NTTF on regular academic-year appointments vary according to rank. NTTF appointments at the rank of lecturer may be made for a term of up to three years. NTTF appointments at the ranks of senior lecturer, distinguished lecturer, clinical instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor may be made for a term of up to five years. Typically, a visiting faculty appointment may be made for a maximum of 12 months. Typically, as faculty are promoted to higher ranks, appointment lengths may increase and faculty may be recognized by a base salary adjustment. Colleges and departments are expected to develop policies around available appointment lengths.

4.2.3 Salaries

Salaries for NTTF members are set by department heads in consultation with the dean and are stated in their appointment letters. Faculty members who are reappointed may appeal salary determinations using procedures found in Chapter 5. Colleges and departments are expected to develop policies describing the process for salary increases.

4.2.4 Assignment of Initial Rank

Typically, initial NTTF appointments will be made at the entry level rank in a category. When appropriate, the department head may recommend to the dean and chief academic officer an initial appointment at a rank higher than the entry level rank for the NTTF title series. Specific qualifications for rank are determined by the department and/or college, subject to approval by the Office of the Provost. These qualifications should be made explicit in the unit's bylaws and consistently applied during promotion considerations, as well as when initial appointments are requested at ranks beyond the entry level.

4.3 Reappointment

Reappointment occurs when a faculty member receives another appointment for the position to which they were initially appointed without a break in service. NTTF may be reappointed by college and departmental administration in accordance with college and departmental bylaws. Reappointment decisions will include consideration of the faculty member's performance and the needs of the department. Reappointment should be discussed at the time of the Annual Performance and Planning Review (APPR). Reappointments may occur at any time during the current appointment, but the terms of service may not overlap. Hiring units are encouraged to provide as much advance notice of reappointment as possible.

Reappointment requires a new offer letter from the department or college, and a written acceptance from the candidate. Hiring units are expected to have clear processes and procedures in place to manage and standardize the reappointment process and to steward records. When reappointing a NTTF, hiring units issue a new letter detailing: (a) rank, (b) salary and related financial conditions, (c) duration, (d) responsibilities and assigned workload (clearly stating the percentage of effort the faculty member is expected to devote to teaching, service, research, and/or other responsibilities); and, if appropriate, (e) a statement indicating the appointment is supported by a grant, contract, restricted donation, etc., and is by its nature contingent upon funding.

When there are substantial changes to the scope of the faculty member's appointment (including but not limited to: changes in FTE that result in changes in benefits eligibility, a break in service, a change in title or benefits, or transfer to a different unit) a new appointment letter from the chief academic officer is required.

While written notice is not required, it is recommended that NTTF who will not be reappointed be provided written notice by the Dean or department head, as early as possible. Preferably, those on one-year appointments should be notified at least three months in advance of the appointment end date. Except for faculty whose salaries are funded in whole or part by grant-

dependent sources of revenue (as detailed in associated appointment letters), those holding appointments that are for multiple years should be informed preferably at least six months in advance of the appointment end date. Except in situations of termination for cause or as otherwise provided for in applicable policies and procedures, a NTTF appointment expires at the end of the term of the current appointment if the faculty member is not otherwise offered reappointment or a new appointment.

4.4 Annual Planning and Performance Review

With the exception of visiting NTTF, the performance of all full-time NTTF members who are not on leave will be evaluated annually according to the procedures found in Appendix A, with a written record of the evaluation maintained in the online faculty review system. The criteria for evaluating NTTF for purposes of review and consideration for reappointment must be accounted for in departmental bylaws. Colleges and departments are encouraged to also create processes for evaluating the performance of part-time NTTF.

The terms of the appointment letter, including percentages of effort faculty are expected to devote to various responsibilities, should be used to evaluate performance. As needed throughout their current appointment, faculty members will have the opportunity to discuss their responsibilities and request adjustments in their assigned workloads. This annually updated written record of responsibilities and assigned workload will become part of the faculty member's evaluation records.

APPRs include a fair and honest assessment of the faculty member's performance, and may be carried out by the department head, a designee, or a committee, as determined by the departmental bylaws and other applicable policies and procedures. Each review should include the following:

- Review accomplishments against specific objectives set at the previous APPR, consistent with this handbook and departmental bylaws;
- Establish appropriate objectives for the coming year, using clearly understood expectations that are consistent with this handbook and departmental bylaws;
- Provide the necessary support to achieve these objectives; and,
- Recognize and reward outstanding achievement.

4.4.1 Rating Scale to be Applied in Evaluating Faculty Performance

NTTF performance must be evaluated in a manner consistent with all applicable campus, college, and/or departmental policies, procedures, and bylaws, and must apply the following performance ratings:

- Far exceeds expectations for rank
- Exceeds expectations for rank
- Meets expectations for rank

- Falls short of meeting expectations for rank
- Falls far short of meeting expectations for rank

NTTF with an overall performance rating of meets, exceeds, or far exceeds expectations for rank are eligible for any merit pay or other performance-based salary increase that may be authorized under campus, college, and/or departmental rules or guidelines. NTTF receiving these ratings are also eligible for any across-the-board salary unless UT System guidelines specify otherwise.

NTTF with an overall rating of falls short of meeting expectations for rank are not eligible for any merit pay or other performance-based salary increase that may be authorized under campus, college, and/or departmental rules or guidelines, but are eligible for any across-the-board salary increase.

NTTF with an overall rating of falls far short of meeting expectations for rank are not eligible for any merit pay or other performance-based salary increase that may be authorized under campus, college, and/or departmental rules or guidelines, nor are they eligible for any across-the-board salary increase.

4.5 Promotion

The university is committed to supporting NTTF and investing in their professional growth. Colleges and departments are expected to identify and develop promotional pathways for full-time NTTF, provide opportunities for the development of long-term careers at the university, and recognize the exceptional and essential contributions these faculty make to the mission of the university. Annual performance reviews form the basis of a cumulative record that prepares NTTF for consideration for promotion. A more detailed description of the promotion process can be found in Appendix F.

4.5.1 Criteria

Criterion for promotion in rank is excellence in performing the primary responsibilities established in the initial appointment letter and statement of responsibilities and workload, as well as any changes made and recorded at the time of the annual performance and planning reviews. It is the responsibility of departments and colleges to define excellence in terms of their respective disciplines. The workload specified in the initial appointment letter, any reappointment letters, as well as any workload modifications made at the time of the faculty member's APPR, should be considered at the time of promotion. Promotion criteria are to be weighted in relation to the faculty member's assigned responsibilities.

Each college may establish a statement of criteria and expectations for rank, which elaborates on the general criteria found earlier in this chapter and is consistent with the mission of the college and the professional responsibilities normally carried out by NTTF members in the college. Each department shall establish more detailed criteria for promotion that are consistent with but may be more specific than the criteria stated in this handbook and any criteria established by the college and campus. Departmental criteria for promotion shall not be required if more specific criteria have been established by the applicable college, and the dean and chief academic officer have approved application of the college criteria in lieu of departmental criteria.

College criteria for promotion shall be effective upon approval by the chief academic officer and when published in the bylaws of the college. Departmental criteria for promotion shall be effective upon approval by the dean and chief academic officer and when published in the bylaws of the department.

4.5.2 Eligibility

After serving at the rank of lecturer or assistant professor, typically for a minimum of five years, a faculty member who has satisfied the criteria referenced in the preceding section, may apply for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer or associate professor, respectively. After serving at the rank of senior lecturer or associate professor, typically for a minimum of three to five years, a faculty member who has satisfied the criteria referenced in the preceding section, may apply for promotion to the rank of distinguished lecturer or professor, respectively.

4.5.3 Promotion Process

NTTF should consult with their department head before initiating promotion procedures. The final decision on whether or not to proceed rests with the faculty member. However, if denied promotion after completion of the process described in the next paragraphs, the faculty member remains at rank and must forgo at least one full promotion cycle before again initiating promotion procedures.

The NTTF promotion process begins when the candidate submits a dossier for consideration, which may include departmental solicitation of external letters assessing the record of scholarship and/or creative activity (if required by departmental bylaws). Review occurs in turn at the departmental, college, and campus levels; the candidate shall be notified in writing of the decision at each level, provided with a copy of the review at each level, and given the opportunity to submit a response. For colleges without departments, the review begins at the college level. Candidates denied promotion at the departmental level may appeal the decision to the college. Candidates denied promotion at the college level may appeal the decision to the chief academic officer.

Faculty committees review and make recommendations regarding promotion at each administrative level, in accordance with college and departmental bylaws. The composition of faculty promotion committees is defined in the unit's bylaws. Departmental faculty at or above the rank to which promotion is sought review these materials and vote on promotion. Colleges and departments are expected to appoint NTTF to these committees (when NTTF at or above the rank sought exist) and ensure that evaluations are independent at each level of review (i.e., someone who votes at the department level cannot vote at the college level). Recommendation for promotion to higher rank is based on departmental/college bylaws.

In the promotion review of NTTF, particular consideration should be given to performance in the main area of the candidate's job duties as set forth in the appointment paperwork and job description. Any changes to these duties in subsequent APPR or reappointment paperwork should also be considered. One or more statements of the candidate's job duties and

expectations, including percentage effort in each area, is a required part of a NTTF member's promotion package.

4.5.4 Contents of the Dossier

“Appendix: Evaluation and Promotion of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty” to this handbook specifies in detail the required contents of the dossier, which should not exceed 50 pages, excluding the cover sheet and the candidate's *curriculum vitae*.

4.5.5 Right of Candidate to Review File

The candidate has a right to review their file at any stage of the process. The candidate is to be informed of any additions made to their file after submitting it and be given an opportunity to review and respond to the addition at any stage of the process.

4.6 Appeals

NTTF may exercise the appeal procedures outlined in Chapter 5, except those applicable to the termination of tenured or tenure-track faculty appointments.

4.7 Termination

NTTF appointments may be terminated for adequate cause (as defined in Section 3.12 of this handbook) prior to the expiration of the appointment term. This process and other related conditions are detailed in Section 5.5.

4.8 Professional Development and Support

The university is committed to supporting NTTF and investing in their professional growth. Conditions necessary to perform assigned duties in a professional manner should be provided to NTTF members. Colleges and departments are encouraged to support the ongoing professional development of NTTF by, for example, allocating funds to support their professional development activities and encouraging them to participate in university, college and departmental events and workshops. It is recognized that the extent to which this is possible will vary from unit-to-unit. Departments are encouraged to make NTTF aware of campus resources that support their job responsibilities and recognize their participation in professional development activities during the APPR and promotion processes.

Recognition of the contributions NTTF make to the campus is an important part of creating and maintaining an inclusive campus culture. Colleges and departments are encouraged to include NTTF in faculty awards that relate to their job responsibilities. If the requirements for existing awards preclude NTTF from being nominated, departments and colleges are encouraged to create or modify appropriate awards to recognize excellence among NTTF.

CHAPTER FIVE: Faculty Rights of Appeal

5.1 Introduction

Faculty members are entitled to fair, impartial, and honest resolutions of problems that may arise in relation to employment. Accordingly, the following sections outline principles and procedures designed to promote fair resolutions within a reasonable time period. This chapter addresses formal appeals in the sections on general appeals and special appeals. In addition, informal grievances may be addressed through the ombudspersons. A faculty member must initiate a formal appeal under the general and special procedures outlined in this chapter within the time specified in this handbook, board, or university policy, or, at a maximum, one year of the date of the employment decision in question.

The rights of appeal described in this chapter apply to all tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty.¹³ Faculty members are encouraged to bring complaints or grievances to the lowest administrative level at which an adverse recommendation, decision, or action was taken. Every effort should be made to expeditiously resolve such matters informally, through conversation with the department head or dean, before submitting a formal appeal. In all cases, faculty members are entitled to notice regarding grounds on which administrative action has been taken.

5.1.1 General Appeals

Faculty members with grievances have three options for pursuing appeals, depending on the subject matter(s) of their appeal. They may (1) initiate an appeal through the administrative channel (Section 5.2); (2) request an appeal through the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee (Section 5.3); or (3) bring an appeal through the Tennessee Uniform Administrative Procedures Act (TUAPA) for certain matters (Section 5.4). Each of these options is described in the following sections. Faculty are encouraged to contact ombuds services for consultation, whether before initiating an appeal or any time during an appeal.

The appeals procedures through administrative channels and the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee are formal but not judicial processes. Faculty members have a right to consult an attorney, but attorneys are not to participate when following these appeal channels. Faculty members may have attorney representation and participation for hearings under the TUAPA; for conflicts arising between faculty and students, Hilltopics should be consulted.

5.1.2 Special Appeals

Special procedures are provided for cases involving (1) termination or suspension of a tenure-track faculty member for adequate cause prior to the expiration of his or her term of appointment or without the minimum advance notice specified for non-reappointment of the tenure track

¹³For procedures for terminating tenured faculty for adequate cause or tenure-track faculty before the end of the stipulated time of appointment, see Chapter 3 and the board's policy.

faculty (Chapter 3), or (2) allegations that the non-renewal of appointment of a tenure track faculty member constitutes a violation of academic freedom.

Concerns regarding administrative actions based on alleged sexual harassment or other forms of discrimination in violation of university policies are investigated either by The Office of Title IX or The Office of Investigations and Resolution. Contact either office for further guidance.

Reminder: You may have additional obligations as a “mandatory reporter” under the current Policy on Sexual Harassment, Sexual Assault, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking.¹⁴

A tenure-track faculty member may be suspended or dismissed before the end of the stipulated term of appointment or without the minimum advanced notice specified for termination of tenure-track faculty members only with the approval of the chief academic officer and only for adequate cause (Sections 3.11 and 3.12). The tenure-track faculty member may appeal this decision through the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee or may elect a TUAPA hearing. The university has the burden of proof. The faculty member must notify the chancellor of his or her intent to appeal within 10 days of receipt of notice of the university’s decision to dismiss or suspend.

Allegations that non-renewal of a tenure-track faculty member constituted a violation of academic freedom may be appealed through these administrative channels:

1. The chancellor must ask the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee to review the matter solely to determine whether the notice of non-renewal establishes a violation of academic freedom
2. The faculty member has the burden of proof that non-renewal was a violation of academic freedom
3. The faculty member may appear before the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee to present evidence and argument on his or her behalf
4. The committee should ask the department head, dean, and other appropriate witnesses to present evidence
5. The chancellor will decide who will present the argument for the university
6. The committee, after the hearing and considering the evidence presented, will make a recommendation to the chancellor, with a copy to the faculty member, within 21 days after the conclusion of its deliberations
7. The chancellor will consider the committee’s recommendation and inform the faculty member of his or her decision within 30 days.

¹⁴ <https://titleix.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/96/2023/08/77960398-Title-IX-Policy-2023-2024.pdf>

5.2 Appeals through the Administrative Channel

Any faculty member may initiate a written appeal with the administrative head of the relevant unit. If resolution of the problem is not achieved, the faculty member has the right to request review at successively higher administrative levels, up to the chancellor. When providing notice of a decision, each administrator shall inform the faculty member of available appeal procedures. Faculty members are entitled to notice regarding the grounds on which administrative action has been taken.

5.3 Appeals through the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee

5.3.1 Jurisdiction of the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee

The function of the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee is to gather evidence and make findings and to make recommendations to the chief academic officer for the disposition of cases within its jurisdiction. The Faculty Senate Appeals Committee does not replace the role of faculty and administrators in making employment-related decisions. Instead, it is guided by the aim of maximizing the protection of the principles of academic freedom, due process, and fairness. All matters before the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee are kept in strict confidence and subject to state open records laws and other legal requirements.

A faculty member requesting the Appeals Committee to consider his or her complaint must submit a written statement to the chair of the committee with a copy to the chief academic officer. The Appeals Committee, in consultation with the chief academic officer, will determine if it has jurisdiction over the complaint. The jurisdiction of the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee regarding promotion and tenure includes complaints regarding failure to follow the procedures contained in this handbook and in collegiate and departmental bylaws. The Faculty Senate Appeals Committee will not consider matters for which a special appeals procedure is provided. See Section 5.1.2.

The Appeals Committee is comprised of 18 tenured faculty members appointed to staggered three-year terms by the Faculty Senate Committee on Nominations and Appointments with the advice and consent of the faculty senate. At least one member of the committee must have legal expertise. The complete procedures for appeals through the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee are posted on the faculty senate web site.

Faculty making an appeal are encouraged to consult the faculty ombudsperson before bringing an appeal to the Appeals Committee. After receiving a request for an appeal review, the Appeals Committee will take one of four actions:

1. recommend mediation between the faculty member and the administrator whose action is the source of the faculty member's complaint by trained mediators, which might include faculty ombudspersons who have not been previously involved in the matter as a consultant or informal mediator;
2. take no action on the grounds that the appeal lacks merit for consideration or lies outside of the scope of the committee;

3. redirect the appeal through the administrative channel; or
4. initiate a review panel.

In the case of actions 2, 3, or 4, the chairperson will give written notice of that decision with explanation to the faculty member, the administrator(s) whose decision is being contested, and the chief academic officer.

5.3.2 Process for Appeals

Faculty member(s) have the right to initiate an appeal to the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee within one year of the administrative action that caused the complaint. The appeal must be submitted in writing and include a comprehensive statement of the complaint. After the chair of the Appeals Committee has consulted with the committee and the chief academic officer and they have determined that a complaint both lies within the jurisdiction of the committee and merits consideration, the committee chair will establish arrangements necessary to ensure a complete review of the complaint by a review panel.

Alternatively, when a faculty member initiated a complaint through the administrative process with a department head and/or dean that has not been resolved and the faculty member remains unsatisfied after a final decision of the dean, he or she may appeal to the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee. The appeal must be submitted in writing and include a comprehensive statement of the complaint after the faculty member has been given notice of the dean's decision and of his or her right to request consideration of the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee. The appeal will then be reviewed by the chair of the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee in consultation with the committee and the chief academic officer to determine that the complaint both lies within the jurisdiction of the committee and merits consideration. The committee chair will establish arrangements necessary to ensure a complete review of the complaint by a review panel.

The chairperson appoints a panel consisting of no fewer than three members of the committee and designates one of the three as chair of the panel. The chair of the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee provides written notification of the appointment of a review panel along with the names of the chair and the members to the faculty member, each administrator whose decision will be reviewed, and the chief academic officer. The written notification also includes a description of review procedures and a copy of the comprehensive statement of the complaint. Any objections to the membership of the review panel or the review procedures shall be made in writing to the chair of the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee, whose written decision to sustain or overrule the decision shall be final. If the objection is sustained, the chair will facilitate a resolution so that the review may proceed.

5.3.4 Hearing Results and Recommendations

At the conclusion of the review, the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee shares its findings and recommendations in writing with the faculty member, the administrator(s) involved in the appeal, and the chief academic officer. Before the final decision is made by the chief academic officer, the faculty member or the administrator(s) involved in the appeal may request

reconsideration of the complaint on the grounds that the review panel made a clearly erroneous finding of fact or that there has been newly discovered evidence which was previously unavailable. This request must be submitted in writing to the chief academic officer and to the chair of the Appeals Committee. The decision of the Appeals Committee whether and to what extent to reopen the hearing shall be final. The request for reconsideration must be made within 15 working days of the findings and recommendation of the Appeals Committee.

If the recommendations of the Appeals Committee are approved by the chief academic officer, the written final decision will be provided to the faculty member making the appeal, the administrator(s) involved in the appeal, and the Appeals Committee.

If the recommendations of the Appeals Committee are not approved by the chief academic officer, the chief academic officer will then meet with the Appeals Committee to exchange views and determine whether the case can be resolved in a mutually acceptable manner between the chief academic officer and the committee, in which case the committee will re-issue its recommendations to reflect that position. If the chief academic officer and the committee cannot resolve the case in a mutually agreeable manner, the chief academic officer will issue a final written decision which will be provided to the committee, the faculty member, and the administrators involved. The final written decision will include the reasons for not accepting the findings and recommendations of the Appeal Committee.

The faculty member may appeal the decision of the chief academic officer by notifying the chancellor in writing within 10 days of receipt of the written notice of the decision of the chief academic officer.

If the committee's review indicates that principles of due process, shared governance, and/or academic freedom as described in this handbook are not adequately addressed by existing university procedures, the Appeals Committee may request that the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee consider structural or systemic issues apart from the merits of the particular case that brought the issues to light.

5.4 Appeals through the Tennessee Uniform Administrative Procedures Act

A hearing under the Tennessee Uniform Administrative Procedures Act (TUAPA) is available to tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty members under the following circumstances:

- termination of a tenure-track faculty member's appointment before the stipulated term of appointment or without the minimum advance notice (Chapter 3) or for allegations of gross misconduct or reprehensible behavior; or
- termination of non-tenure-track faculty member's appointment before the stipulated term of appointment or for allegations of gross misconduct or reprehensible behavior.

Requests for a TUAPA hearing must be brought within 10 days of the employment action that is the subject of the hearing.

5.5 Termination of Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members Before The Stipulated Term of Employment

Termination of tenure-track faculty members before the stipulated term of appointment is under the same procedure as used for revocation of tenure and termination for tenured faculty members.

A non-tenure-track faculty member may be terminated for adequate cause (as defined in Sections 3.12.1 and 3.12.2 of this handbook) prior to the expiration of the appointment term. In the event that a department head recommends to the dean and chief academic officer that a non-tenure-track faculty member be terminated for cause, the department head and dean shall meet with the faculty member to present the reasons for the recommended termination and to permit the faculty member to respond. If, after this meeting, the dean concludes that adequate cause for the termination exists, he or she shall recommend termination to the chief academic officer. If the chief academic officer agrees with the termination decision, he or she shall inform the faculty member in writing. A non-tenure-track faculty member whose appointment has been terminated for adequate cause shall be notified of his or her right to a post-termination hearing under the Tennessee Uniform Administrative Procedures Act as described in Sections 3.12.2.7-B and 3.12.3.7-A of this handbook.

In the event of Extraordinary Circumstances (as defined in Board Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure § H.1.b. and in this handbook at Section 3.11.8.1-B), a non-tenure-track appointment may be terminated under the same circumstances, and following the same procedures, that are applicable to tenure-track faculty.

The university may, at any time, with or without notice, terminate the appointment of a non-tenure-track faculty member without cause upon payment of the remaining salary due during the appointment.

CHAPTER SIX: Benefits and Leaves of Absence

6.1 Introduction

The University of Tennessee provides a comprehensive program of benefits for faculty members and full-time non-tenure-track faculty members as set forth in UT System Policies and this handbook. The university administration works closely with state government officials and the Finance and Benefits Committee of the faculty senate to assess the needs of the faculty members and to provide programs that respond to those needs.

UT's policies governing benefits and leaves of absence are established in HR policies and may be amended from time to time. The following sections are intended as a general summary of the most important benefits and leaves of absence and are provided for information purposes and are not a promise that any particular benefit or leave request will be granted. In the event of any conflict or inconsistency between HR policies and this Handbook, HR policies will control.

Leaves of absence, extended periods of time spent away from campus for professional growth or personal reasons, are an important aspect of faculty development. Leaves of absence must be requested in writing by the faculty member and specifically approved by the department head, dean, and chief academic officer, and (when required) State officials. Leaves of absence are normally granted for not more than 24 months and are normally without university compensation.

Certain benefits and leaves of absence are available to both academic-year and 12-month faculty members. Other benefits and leaves are applicable only to academic-year faculty members. Twelve-month faculty members have certain leave benefits, which are not applicable to faculty members.

6.2 Benefits for all Faculty Members

6.2.1 Insurance Plans

The university, through the state of Tennessee, offers a group insurance program to all regular employees who work a minimum of 75% time. The program includes medical, life, and accidental death or dismemberment insurance. Other insurance plans are available for other needs to qualified individuals. Illness or injury sustained in the course of employment is covered by the State of Tennessee Worker's Compensation Program. The flexible benefits plan permits the university to exclude, from both federal income and Social Security taxes, premiums paid for group medical and dental insurance and university parking premiums deducted from the employee's paycheck for participating employees. In addition, the university offers optional dependent care and medical reimbursement accounts in the flexible benefits plan.

6.2.2 Educational Assistance

Faculty members may be eligible for maintenance fee (tuition) waiver under the provisions of UT System Policies and with the approval of the department head, dean, and chancellor.

Regular full-time faculty members are also eligible for a student maintenance fee (tuition) discount for their spouses and dependent children who have been admitted to the university as undergraduate students through standard admission procedures. Fee discounts do not apply to other student fees. Spouses and dependent children of regular part-time faculty members who have one (1) or more years of regular continuous service with the University of Tennessee working a minimum of 50 percent time shall receive a pro rata discount based on the percent of effort currently worked by the employee.

6.2.3 Retirement

The university offers five retirement programs and retirement counseling. Regular full-time faculty members must participate in a retirement program. Participation in retirement programs is optional for part-time faculty members. In addition, the university offers several optional tax deferred income plans.

6.2.4 Longevity Pay

The University of Tennessee seeks to reward regular faculty members and staff for their years of service with the university and state. Regular full-time employees and regular part-time employees working 82.05 percent time or more, who have completed 36 full-time equivalent (FTE) months of service at 82.05 percent time or more with UT, The State Board of Regents, or any other agency of the state of Tennessee are eligible to participate in the longevity pay plan.

6.3 Faculty Leave

6.3.1 Faculty Development Leave

Full-time tenured faculty members 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) are eligible to apply for faculty development leave, which is awarded on the merits of a specific proposal for professional development. The award is an investment by the university in the expectation that the leave will enhance the faculty member's ability to contribute to the objectives of the university and to student development. The improvements sought during a professional leave should benefit the work of the faculty member, department, college, and university. Only professional leave proposals that meet this criterion will be accepted and approved by the university.

The purposes for which professional leave may be granted include:

- research on significant problems and issues;
- important creative or descriptive work in any means of expression;
- post-doctoral study at another institution; or
- other approved projects, including innovations in teaching and learning;

Eligible full-time faculty members may be granted professional leave for either (a) one-half the faculty member's annual appointment period at full-base salary, or (b) the full annual appointment period at one-half-base salary. Complete information regarding this policy is found on the Office of the Provost's website.

6.3.2 Family and Medical Leave

As detailed in HR0338, the university provides for family and medical leave (FML), as appropriate, for childbirth, adoption, foster care placement of a child, serious illness of a spouse, child or parent, or the employee's own serious illness. The leave may extend up to a maximum of twelve (12) work weeks of paid or unpaid leave during the twelve (12) month period beginning on the date the family and medical leave first begins. During this period, 12-month faculty members may use any or all accrued annual leave, or accrued sick leave if applicable, instead of taking leave without pay. This leave will be granted if it qualifies as family and medical leave on request by the employee or on determination by the university. Family and medical leave forms are available from the campus/unit human resource office.

Nine-month faculty members should also review Section 6.4.2 – Family Care.

6.3.3 Parental Leave

As detailed in HR0339, the university provides for six weeks of paid parental leave to eligible employees for childbirth and adoption. This benefit is available to regular, active employees as defined in HR0105, assigned to work at least 75% time, and employed for at least twelve consecutive months prior to the start of the requested leave. This leave runs concurrently with the 12 weeks provided by FML. For more information about parental leave, contact the Office of Human Resources or Faculty Affairs.

Nine-month faculty members should also review Section 6.4.2 – Family Care.

6.3.4 Court Leave

Court leave is granted to employees to appear as a witness in state, federal, or local court or to serve on jury duty upon presentation of an official summons, subpoena, or notice to that effect. UT System Policy HR0315.

6.3.5 Military Leave for Short Tours of Active Duty

Regular employees of the university who receive orders to report for training or active duty in the service of the state of Tennessee or of the United States shall be entitled to military leave with pay for up to fifteen working days per calendar year. It is expected that faculty members employed on an academic-year basis will perform their military training during periods when classes are not in session. Refer to UT System Policy HR0370.

6.3.6 Military Leave for Extended Tours of Active Duty

Regular employees of the university in the National Guard or reserves who receive orders to report for extended active duty in the United States armed forces will be granted leave of absence without pay (for military reason) after the employee has received military leave with pay for 15 working days in any one calendar year.

6.3.7 Educational Leave

Educational leave for regular university employees must be requested in writing and in advance by the chief administrator and the chief HR officer of the employee's budgetary unit. Such approval must specify the length of the leave, which normally should not exceed two (2) years. Each request for leave will be evaluated on its own merits, and university approval will depend upon the evidence provided as to the enhancement of the employee's value to the university resulting from the leave. Any approved leave extending beyond the current fiscal year is subject to budgetary constraints and/or funding availability. UT System Policy HR0355.

6.3.8 Personal Leave

The university grants leave with or without pay to full-time faculty members on regular appointments for a variety of reasons. A regular employee may request leave without pay for personal reasons by making a request in writing to his or her supervisor and department head. Personal leave is approved or disapproved on an individual basis and predicated on departmental needs and requirements. UT System Policy HR0355.

6.3.9 Funeral Leave

Funeral leave is described in UT System Policy HR0340.

6.3.10 Fringe Benefits for Faculty Members on Leave

Eligible employees on approved leave of absence without pay (except FML) are eligible to maintain membership for up to 12 months in the basic group/HMO/POS plan to which they belong at the time the leave begins but will be responsible for both employee and employer portions of the premium. Generally, the period of approved leave of absence without pay does not qualify as creditable service for retirement, and contributions are not made by the university during the leave period. UT System Policies HR0335, HR0338, and HR0355.

6.3.11 Outside Compensation for Faculty Members on Leave

Policies regarding outside compensation through consulting are covered in Chapter 7 of this handbook and are applicable to faculty members on full-pay while pursuing a professional development leave.

6.3.12 Holidays

The university recognizes holidays as listed on the following human resources link:

<https://hr.tennessee.edu/benefits/holiday-schedule/>.

6.4 Additional Benefits and Leave for Nine-Month Faculty Members

6.4.1 Sick Leave

Nine-month faculty members do not earn and accrue sick leave. However, the university grants leave with or without pay to full-time faculty members on regular academic-year appointments as required by illness, injury, or medical treatment. The amount of such leave varies with the circumstances of the individual case. Factors considered in making the determination are (a) length of service, (b) necessity of replacement, (c) quality of past service, and (d) potential future with the university.

6.4.2 Family Care

In addition to family medical leave, certain 9-month faculty members may be eligible for certain additional benefits such as modifying service requirements and extending the tenure-track probationary status. Detailed information is available on the intranet site hosted by the Office of the Provost.

6.4.3 Annual Leave

Faculty members employed on regular full-time academic-year appointments do not accrue annual leave. However, academic-year faculty members are not required to be on campus during any semester for which they have no university assignments. Such periods begin when all reports have been made following the preceding semester's commencement and extend to a reasonable period prior to the beginning of the semester following the semester without assigned duties. A reasonable period must include sufficient time to participate in scheduled faculty meetings, perform committee work, advise, and other activity necessary for the satisfactory resumption of the work of the department in that semester.

6.4.4 Semester Banking

Semester banking is available to faculty members who hold regular full-time academic-year appointments. Permission may be granted to substitute summer terms of teaching, or to bank such terms, toward extended periods of release from regular duties during other terms. Acceptable practice also allows faculty members to teach (without additional compensation) larger than normal teaching loads during semesters of the academic year in order to bank these for released time in subsequent semesters. The need of many faculty members upon occasion to devote large uninterrupted amounts of time to a single research or creative project without teaching or committee work and to spend time periodically in personal renewal and development is fundamental to every good university. This arrangement is subject to the following conditions:

- courses must be banked before leave is taken;
- the needs of the department or program will be a major consideration in evaluation of requests to bank courses;
- the financial and educational resources of the department or unit must not be jeopardized by banking arrangements;
- credit for banked courses will not result in additional pay at termination of employment.

6.5 Leave for 12-Month Faculty Members

6.5.1 Vacations and Annual Leave

The university recognizes the importance of rest and recreation and encourages faculty vacations. Faculty members must arrange the length and timing of vacation periods with the department head or dean and must provide information on how they may be contacted during periods of absence. UT System Policy HR0305. Faculty members employed on regular full-time twelve-month appointments earn annual leave at the rate of two (2) working days per month [twenty-four (24) working days of annual leave per year]. A maximum of forty-two (42) days of accumulated annual leave may be carried forward from one calendar year to the next. At the end of a calendar year, annual leave days in excess of forty-two (42) will be credited to sick leave. Faculty members on regular part-time 12-month appointments receive a prorated amount of annual leave based on the percentage of full-time employment.

6.5.2 Sick Leave

Sick leave is earned at the rate of one (1) working day per month by regular full-time 12-month faculty members. Regular part time faculty members on 12-month appointments earn sick leave on a pro rata basis. Sick leave is described in UT System Policy HR0380.

6.6 Records of Leave

Official leave records are maintained through IRIS, the university financial and human resources information system, for all regular full-time and part-time employees other than faculty members employed on academic-year appointments. Deans, and department heads are charged with ensuring that these records are accurate on a current basis.

Any full-time employee of any agency, office, or department of the state who is employed by another state agency (including the University of Tennessee) without a break in service shall have his or her annual and sick leave transferred. Moreover, when such a former employee who has one (1) full year of state employment in good standing returns to full-time service with one of these employers, he or she shall be credited with all sick leave to which he or she was entitled at the time of termination. The most recent employing authority shall be responsible for certifying eligibility for this sick leave credit to the re-employing agency, college, or university. Employees who come to the university from state agencies, colleges, or universities should be strongly encouraged to take their accumulated annual leave prior to being placed on the rolls of the university, unless there is an immediate and urgent need for their services.

Furthermore, any full-time teacher employed by a local school board in Tennessee, who leaves the employment of that board and becomes an employee of UT, shall have his or her sick leave transferred upon request. The former employee of a local school board must have begun university employment after July 1, 1965, to be eligible for this transfer of sick leave.

CHAPTER SEVEN: Compensated Outside Services

7.1 Introduction

Full-time faculty members appointed to The University of Tennessee agree to devote themselves to UT's mission of teaching, research, and public service. Fulfillment of these responsibilities demands a full-time, 100% commitment to normal university duties, including remaining current in the discipline to which the faculty member is appointed. For many faculty members, an important part of keeping up-to-date lies outside the classroom, laboratory, and library: it involves testing one's academic skills and abilities by applying them to real-world problems. The university encourages the faculty to engage in consulting and other related outside services which are associated with an individual faculty member's appointment and which develop his/her professional expertise. By these means, many faculty members improve their disciplinary skills; they serve educational institutions and professional organizations, business, industry, and government; and they bring positive recognition to the university.

University-wide policies governing compensated outside activities by faculty require each campus to establish procedures to ensure that professional development of the faculty is encouraged and, at the same time, ensure that faculty meet their regular university responsibilities in a timely and effective manner. The following guidelines represent a compilation of the university-wide policies and implementing guidelines specifically applicable to faculty governed by this handbook.

7.2 General Principles

- A. Full-time faculty members appointed to The University of Tennessee must devote themselves to the university's mission of teaching, research, and public service. Fulfillment of these responsibilities demands a full-time commitment to normal university duties, including remaining current in the discipline to which the faculty member is appointed.
- B. While compensated outside activities may be valuable for both faculty and the university, the primary responsibility of a faculty member is to fulfill the teaching, research/scholarship/creative achievement, and service commitments of her/his full-time appointment to the university. Faculty members have a responsibility not to undertake external activities that substantially burden or interfere with commitments to the university. A full-time appointment includes an obligation to maintain a meaningful presence on behalf of the university in the performance of responsibilities. This obligation means being accessible on campus to students, staff, and colleagues. Compensated outside activities must not result in a conflict of interest or a conflict of commitment with respect to the faculty member's university duties.
- C. As outside compensated activities are not part of the full-time commitments of a faculty member, they cannot be substituted for commitments of a faculty member to teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service within the university. Correspondingly, the annual review of the performance of a faculty member is based only on her/his regular responsibilities and duties as part of her/his full-time commitments to the university, which

are negotiated annually and must be consistent with the Handbook and applicable bylaws. The primary responsibility for assessing the value of compensated outside activities rests in the academic departments and their bylaws.

- D. College and/or departmental bylaws may define the nature and allowable time commitments of appropriate compensated outside activities for a faculty member in the unit beyond these guidelines. Administrative officers such as deans or department heads who believe that a faculty member has engaged in compensated outside activities in a manner inconsistent with these guidelines or applicable bylaws, may initiate appropriate action. In such cases, a faculty member has the right to the appeals processes described in Chapter 5 of this Handbook.
- E. These policy guidelines primarily concern long-term or continuing/recurring short-term arrangements between faculty members and clients. These guidelines do not apply to activities such as:
 - Occasional, short-term activities (which are typically not compensated except for modest honoraria), which include but are not limited to, publication and/or editing of research/scholarship/creative activity, participation in symposia, accreditation visits, research paper presentations, professional licensing board examination questions, exhibitions, recitals, or extra-service pay.
 - Compensated activities conducted in the summer by faculty who serve in an academic-year appointment.
 - Faculty compensation through grants and contracts. See Fiscal Policy on Sponsored Grants and Contracts.
- F. These guidelines shall be construed to be consistent with the university's policies regarding conflict of interest, ownership of commercial ventures, intellectual property, and provisions of this handbook regarding academic freedom as stated in Chapter 2.

7.3 Specific Guidelines

- A. During the conduct of compensated outside activities, faculty members must not make any use of the name of The University of Tennessee or of any of its constituent institutions (e.g., campuses or institutes) for any purpose other than professional identification; nor may she/he claim any university or institutional responsibility for the conduct or outcome of such activities.
- B. Should a faculty member wish to pursue compensated outside activities, the faculty member and her/his department head must agree about the faculty development benefits that will be gained by the planned activities, as part of the annual review process. If after the review, a faculty member has an opportunity to pursue a new compensated outside activity or if any significant changes to an agreed plan from the last annual review occur, the faculty member must report the situation to her/his department head and develop a new or revised plan with the head's concurrence.
- C. Academic year faculty members are expected to perform university-related activities for an academic year. Thus, academic-year faculty members should limit their total compensated outside services to no more than twenty percent (20%) over their total (100%) university

effort during a given academic year, exclusive of non-academic-year course schedules (summer session, mini-term, etc.) but including grants of released-time. The department head and dean may restrict compensated outside service effort to less than 20% (e.g., if a faculty member's performance of assigned university duties does not meet expectations, as found in the annual evaluation).

- D. Nine-month faculty employed full-time on the university payroll during the summer months (e.g., summer school teaching, work on grants and contracts), must ensure that their annual compensated outside service activity is no more than 20% over their total (100%) university effort per academic year. For part-time summer employment, the limit of compensated outside services during the time of employment will be established by written agreement between the department head and the faculty member.
- E. Twelve-month faculty and staff members are expected to perform university-related activities for a twelve-month year. Thus, faculty members on twelve-month appointment are covered by the same policies and procedures which apply to administrative or professional employees of the university. However, to provide equitable treatment of academic-year and twelve-month faculty, the latter should normally limit their aggregated compensated outside services to no more than an additional twenty percent (20%) over their total (100%) university effort – including accrued annual leave taken and grants of released time – during a given calendar year, upon approval of the department head and dean. The department head and dean may restrict a faculty member's compensated outside service effort to less than 20% (e.g., if a faculty member's performance of assigned university duties does not meet expectations, as found in the annual evaluation).
- F. While conducting compensated outside activities, no unauthorized activity is permitted involving significant direct expense to UT or significant use of university facilities, equipment, or services unless procedures and fee schedules have been established. Faculty and staff wishing to use university resources to conduct compensated outside activities must have an official written UT agreement specifying the nature of work to be performed; the kind of equipment, supplies, material, or services to be used; the extent of the use; and the amount to be paid to the university. The amount may not be less than the university's cost or a fair market value. A written agreement must be approved in advance by the appropriate department head, dean, and chief business officer.
- G. Noncompliance with this policy for compensated outside activities may be considered as a negative factor during annual reviews, promotion and tenure decisions, salary determinations, and requests for released-time, and other institutional support (e.g., a faculty member's compensated outside activities may be limited if his/her performance of assigned activities is less-than-meets-expectations). Serious and/or continuing noncompliance also may result in other sanctions (e.g., reduction in allowable compensated outside activities, salary reduction, restitution for cost of equipment, termination for adequate cause).

CHAPTER EIGHT: Revision of the Faculty Handbook

8.0 Board of Trustees Policy

The Board of Trustees Policy on Faculty Handbook revisions (BT0007), adopted in 1992, and any subsequent amendments, governs the revision of faculty handbooks. The following sections are intended as a general summary of those provisions. In the event of any conflict or inconsistency between the board's policy and this handbook, the board's policy will control.

The faculty senate and the chancellor accept the provisions of this handbook. All have responsibility for revision.

8.1 Faculty Handbook Review

The Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee may initiate a proposed revision to this handbook after consultation with the chancellor. Each recommendation of the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee will be presented to the Faculty Senate Executive Council in the form of a resolution briefly outlining the reason(s) for the proposed revision and specifying the precise change(s) to be made. With the acceptance of the Faculty Senate Executive Council, the resolution will be presented for consideration and action at the next meeting of the faculty senate. Adoption of the resolution by the faculty senate constitutes a recommendation of the faculty senate to the chancellor for revision of this handbook.

8.2 Revision of Titles and Editorial, Technical, and Housekeeping Changes

The secretary of the faculty senate, with concurrence of the Faculty Affairs Committee, and the chancellor, may make recommendations on editorial, technical, and other housekeeping changes, including changes to titles of administrative offices, academic units, or other positions or units named in the Handbook, following appropriate action on these title changes by the chief academic officer for the system, the university president, or the University of Tennessee Board of Trustees. The chancellor shall submit these recommendations to the chief academic officer for the system, who will forward them, with his or her recommendation, to appropriate vice presidents, the General Counsel, and the president. Final approval lies with the president.

8.3 Faculty Handbook Revisions

The Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee will periodically review the provisions set forth in this Handbook. The committee is responsible for recommending changes, which should have input from the chancellor and administrative staff including deans, for consideration by the Faculty Senate Executive Council and final consideration by the full faculty senate.

Major revisions to the Handbook may result from certain actions, including:

- adoption of new or amendment of existing policies of the Board of Trustees;
- recommendation brought by the chancellor to the Faculty Senate Executive Council, after review by the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee; or

- recommendation brought by any senate committee to the Faculty Senate Executive Council after review by the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee.

Recommendations of the faculty senate for revision of this handbook will be presented to the chancellor, who will submit their recommendations concerning the proposed revision to the chief academic officer for the system. The chief academic officer for the system will submit his or her recommendation to appropriate vice presidents, the general counsel, and the president.

If the proposed revision involves a substantive change in policy matters outlined in the Board Policy on Faculty Handbook Revisions (BT0007), the president, in consultation with the vice presidents and the general counsel, will present his or her recommendation concerning the proposed revision to the board, or appropriate committee of the board. Final approval of all other proposed revisions of the handbook lies with the president, in consultation with the vice presidents and the general counsel.

APPENDIX A: Procedures for Annual Performance and Planning Review

A. Preparation for the APPR: The department head manages the process of annual review of tenured and tenure-track faculty in a timely way to ensure compliance with all deadlines for submission of the review forms to the dean and chief academic officer. Colleges may establish their own calendars for the APPR process as long as they do not conflict with this handbook or the Faculty Evaluation Calendar, as published by the chief academic officer. In the event of a conflict, this handbook or the Faculty Evaluation Calendar governs.

1. Adequate Notice to Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Members: The department head will inform the departmental faculty of the schedule for the reviews, any materials that should be prepared and submitted for the reviews, and schedule the annual review conference with each tenured and tenure-track faculty member at least two weeks in advance of the date of the conference to allow faculty adequate notice to prepare the required materials.
2. Documents Prepared by the Faculty Member: The faculty member prepares and submits the following documents in advance of the conference with the department head:
 - a. summary of the past year's plans and goals developed at the previous year's annual review;
 - b. standardized faculty activity report, downloaded from the university's faculty activity reporting system, delineating activities in teaching, research / scholarship / creative activity, and service for the evaluation period;
 - c. list of specific plans and goals for the upcoming year;
 - d. current *curriculum vitae*; and
 - e. any additional documentation requested by the department head or required by departmental or collegiate bylaws that evidences the faculty member's activities during the evaluation period, which may include information supporting accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service.

Collegiate or departmental bylaws may require that less extensive additional documentation be submitted by a tenured faculty member in "good standing," which means that the faculty member: received an overall rating in the-most recent APPR indicating that performance meets, exceeds, or far exceeds expectations for rank; and is not undergoing EPPR as described in Section 3.8.5 of this handbook.

3. The Department Head's Evaluation: The faculty member and the department head have a scheduled conference to (a) discuss the faculty member's (i) goals for the previous year and (ii) accomplishments during the evaluation period, and (b) to formulate goals for the faculty member for the coming year.

The department head documents his or her review of each faculty member on the faculty review system, with attachments, as necessary.

The department head's evaluation will rely on and include only documented and substantiated information available to the department head at the time of the review and will not be based on rumor or speculation. The review will be based on procedures and standards set forth in this handbook and all applicable bylaws.

- a. Assigning ratings for the faculty member's performance: The department head indicates on the online Faculty Review System whether the performance of the faculty member for the entire evaluation period far exceeds expectations for rank, exceeds expectations for rank, meets expectations for rank, falls short of meeting expectations for rank, or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank, based on previously established objectives for that faculty member and departmental bylaws (including the department's criteria for the various ratings at the different ranks). The head assigns a rating for each category of effort and also assigns a rating for the faculty member's overall performance. The overall rating is not necessarily an average of the ratings for each category;
- b. Progress and Performance Narrative: The department head writes a narrative describing and discussing the faculty member's progress on the previous year's goals; the performance of the faculty member in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service during the evaluation period;
- c. Exception to the requirement for a Progress and Performance Narrative: The department head may, but is not required to, write a Progress and Performance Narrative for a faculty member in any year in which the faculty member is in "good standing", unless (i) the faculty member requests that the department head write a Progress and Performance Narrative in that year or (ii) it has been three years since the department head has written a Progress and Performance Narrative for that faculty member.
- d. Department head's signature: Upon completing the APPR for an individual faculty member, the department head signs the review, at which point it is transmitted to the faculty member for his or her review.
- e. Faculty member's review of the APPR and right to submit a written response: The faculty member shall be allowed 14 days from the date of receipt of notice that the department head has signed the APPR to review the APPR and submit any written response. The response should be uploaded to the Faculty Review System, where it will be accessible to the department head, the dean, and the chief academic officer. If the faculty member fails to upload a response within 14 days, she or he relinquishes the right to respond.
- f. Faculty member's signature: The faculty member signs the APPR. The faculty member's signature indicates that he or she has read the review, but the signature does not necessarily imply agreement with the Progress and Performance Narrative, performance evaluation, or other contents.

4. The Dean's Review of the APPR

a. Reviewing and signing the APPR: The dean or the dean's proxy reviews the APPRs submitted by each department head and signs them in the Faculty Review System, indicating either concurrence with or dissent from the department head's rating of each faculty member.

b. Dissent from the department head's rating: In cases where the dean does not concur with the department head's rating, the dean:

(1) assigns a different rating, indicating whether the performance of the faculty member far exceeds expectations for rank, exceeds expectations for rank, meets expectations for rank, falls short of meeting expectations for rank, or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank, based on previously established objectives for that faculty member and departmental bylaws (including the department's criteria for the various ratings at the different ranks), and

(2) prepares a written rationale summarizing the reasons for his or her dissent from the department head's rating. The dean's rating and rationale is recorded in the Faculty Review System, where it is available to the faculty member, the department head, and the chief academic officer.

c. Faculty member's and department head's right to respond: The faculty member and the department head each shall be allowed 14 days from the date of receipt of notice of the dean's final rating and rationale to submit a written response. Any responses should be uploaded to the Faculty Review System, where they will be accessible to all participants in the APPR. If no response is received after 14 days from the date of receipt of the dean's rating and rationale, the faculty member and department head relinquish the right to respond.

5. Chief Academic Officer's Review of the APPR: The chief academic officer or the chief academic officer's proxy reviews the APPR, indicates a final decision on the rating to be assigned to the faculty member (far exceeds expectations for rank, exceeds expectations for rank, meets expectations for rank, falls short of meeting expectations for rank, or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank) and signs the APPRs in the Faculty Review System.

In cases where the chief academic officer does not concur with the rating given by the dean, the chief academic officer (a) assigns a different rating, indicating whether the performance of the faculty member far exceeds expectations for rank, exceeds expectations for rank, meets expectations for rank, falls short of meeting expectations for rank, or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank, based on previously established objectives for that faculty member and departmental bylaws (including the department's criteria for the various ratings at the different ranks), and (b) prepares a narrative summarizing the reasons for his or her dissent from the dean's rating. The faculty member, the dean, and the department head have access to the chief academic officer's rating and rationale through the Online Faculty Review System.

6. Fully Executed APPR and Faculty Member's Right to Appeal: The chief academic officer's signature signals that the APPR is fully executed. Any required APPR Improvement Plan or EPPR are subsequent to the fully executed review. For rules governing the APPR Improvement Plan, see Appendix A. The faculty member's right to appeal the final APPR rating is described in Section 3.8.3 of this handbook. Any appeals run concurrently with required APPR Improvement Plans or EPPR.

APPENDIX B: Procedures for APPR Improvement Plan

- A. Development of Improvement Plan: Faculty members who receive notice from the chief academic officer that they have received a rating of “falls short of meeting expectations for rank” on the Annual Performance and Planning Review (APPR) must develop an APPR Improvement Plan unless the rating triggers an EPPR.

Within 30 days of receipt of the fully executed APPR, (as described in Section 3.8.2.2 of this handbook) the faculty member must submit the plan to the department head. The faculty member has the responsibility for developing a written response for each area needing attention, including the goals and benchmarks for improvement and the resources, if any, to be allocated for this purpose.

- B. Administrative Review of the Improvement Plan: The department head will review each APPR Improvement Plan developed and submitted by a faculty member. The department head must approve the plan before forwarding it to the dean for review. The dean will either approve the plan or return it to the department with recommended modifications. Once approved, the dean must forward it to the chief academic officer for review. The chief academic officer will either approve the plan or return it to the college or department with recommended modifications. Once a plan to support the faculty member in returning to satisfactory performance has been accepted, the chief academic officer will notify the dean, department head, and faculty member of the plan’s approval.
- C. Following up on Improvement Plan: The department head has primary responsibility for monitoring the progress of the faculty member in accordance with standards and procedures established in departmental bylaws.
1. Periodic Progress reports: To permit the department head to monitor the progress of the faculty member, the faculty member should submit to the department head periodic updates on progress on the goals and benchmarks established in the improvement plan, in the form and at the times requested by the department head.
 2. Subsequent APPRs: The first annual review following a review rating indicating that the faculty member’s performance falls short of expectations shall include a report that clearly describes progress in any area(s) that fall short of expectations. The faculty member and the department head are responsible for reviewing the goals and benchmarks for improvement at the subsequent APPRs, until the faculty member returns to good standing.

APPENDIX C-1: UTK Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review (PPPR)

A. Purpose of Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review

In its Policies on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure (Board Policy BT0006), the Board of Trustees has recognized and affirmed the importance of tenure in protecting academic freedom and thus promoting the university's principal mission of discovery and dissemination of knowledge through teaching, research, and service. The Board has also recognized its fiduciary responsibility to students, parents, and all citizens of Tennessee to ensure that faculty members effectively serve the needs of students and the university throughout their careers. In order to affirm the importance of tenure and carry out its fiduciary responsibilities, the Board revised BT0006 and established mandatory periodic comprehensive performance reviews for eligible tenured faculty. In compliance with this requirement, UTK, with the approval of the President and the Board, has established the following procedures under which each eligible tenured faculty member shall receive a comprehensive performance review no less often than every six years.

B. Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review (PPPR) Period

Except as otherwise provided in these procedures, each tenured faculty member must undergo some form of comprehensive performance review no less often than every six years. The PPPR shall not substitute for the Annual Performance and Planning Review in the year a faculty member is scheduled for PPPR.

The post-tenure review period begins at the granting of tenure, and a faculty member's PPPR will occur no less often than every six years thereafter unless one of the following circumstances results in a different timetable:

1. Suspension of post-tenure review period: A faculty member's post-tenure review period is suspended during any year in which the faculty member is granted a leave of absence or a modified duties assignment under UTK's Family Care Policy.
2. Restarting of post-tenure review period due to alternative comprehensive review: A comprehensive review of a faculty member's performance restarts the faculty member's PPPR period under the following circumstances:
 - a. If a tenured faculty member undergoes a successful promotion review or a promotion is in progress during the year scheduled for PPPR, the promotion review fulfills the PPPR requirement and the PPPR period is modified to require PPPR six years after the promotion review.
 - b. If a tenured faculty member undergoes an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR) and is either rated as meeting expectations or successfully completes the terms of the EPPR improvement plan, the EPPR process fulfills the PPPR requirement.

3. Start of the PPPR period upon conclusion of an administrative appointment: Full time administrators and faculty members with a majority administrative appointment (including, but not limited to, deans, associate deans, directors, and department heads, or as determined by the chief academic officer) are not subject to PPPR; faculty members holding a less-than-majority administrative appointment (as determined by the chief academic officer) are subject to PPPR regarding their faculty duties based on expectations consistent with their faculty duty allocation. When a full-time or majority-time administrator leaves his or her administrative position to assume a tenured faculty position, the faculty member's initial PPPR shall occur within six years after leaving the administrative position.

A faculty member's scheduled PPPR may be waived if the faculty member submits a written and binding commitment to retire no later than one year after the year in which the PPPR was scheduled.

A faculty member's scheduled PPPR may be otherwise deferred or modified only for good cause, as determined and approved by the chief academic officer.

C. Annual Schedule for Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review

All post-tenure reviews will be conducted and completed during the spring semester according to the following schedule:

1. The chief academic officer, in consultation with the dean of each college, shall appoint all PPPR Committees as set forth in Section D below no later than December 1 prior to the spring semester in which the review will occur.
2. The chief academic officer shall provide each PPPR Committee and the faculty member under review with the materials designated in Section F below no later than January 15.
3. Each PPPR Committee shall submit its report required by Section H below no later than March 31.
4. Extensions of these deadlines will be granted only for good cause approved by the chief academic officer.

D. Composition of Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review Committee

All post-tenure reviews will be conducted by a committee established for the sole purpose of post-tenure review. Each PPPR Committee will include three (3) members, appointed by the chief academic officer, who will avoid choosing PPPR Committee members with obvious or apparent conflicts of interest. Faculty members who hold administrative appointments, as determined by the chief academic officer, are not eligible to serve.

In addition to these general principles of inclusion, the composition of the PPPR Committee must meet the following requirements:

- Each PPPR Committee member must be a tenured full-time faculty member who is at the same or higher academic rank, and whose locus of tenure is at the same campus, as the faculty member being reviewed.
- One, and only one, PPPR Committee member must hold an appointment in the same department as the faculty member being reviewed, unless there is no such faculty member eligible to serve.
- The committee chair will be appointed by the chief academic officer from among the members of the committee who are not from the same department as the faculty member being reviewed.

The chief academic officer will also be responsible for establishing a university-wide pool of faculty members to serve on PPPR committees. The pool will be constituted in the following manner:

- Each college dean will provide nominees to the chief academic officer, according to the following considerations:
- In colleges with departments, the dean will nominate individuals who are eligible to serve on a PPPR committee of any colleague from the same department who is scheduled to be reviewed in that academic year. The total number of nominees put forward by the dean will be determined by the number of faculty from unique departments who are scheduled for review in that academic year. For example, if there are 20 faculty members in 14 unique departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, the dean of the college will submit 14 nominees, one from each of the unique departments. A college with departments must nominate at least one faculty member even if no faculty from that college are scheduled to undergo PPPR in a given year.
- In colleges without departments, each dean will nominate one faculty member for the university-wide pool.
- Each college will determine the process whereby nominees are selected and recommended to the chief academic officer
- Nominees will serve for a minimum of one year, and they may serve for up to three years, as recommended by the deans.
- At his or her discretion, the chief academic officer may ask deans to provide additional nominees or replacements for those nominated.

E. Written Charge to the PPPR Committee

In consultation with the dean of the college of the faculty member under review, the chief academic officer will appoint and provide a written charge to the committee. The charge will include the following elements:

1. Purpose of PPPR, as described in Section A above.
2. Scope of PPPR, as described in Section F below.
3. Process of PPPR as described in Section G below.
4. Materials to be reviewed in PPPR, as described in Section E below; the chief academic officer will emphasize that only in rare circumstances, and where expertise to evaluate the faculty member's scholarly output cannot otherwise be obtained, will the committee request external letters of assessment.
5. Obligation to provide a fair and objective review.
6. Obligation to keep confidential the committee's deliberations and findings.
7. Any other instructions that the chief academic officer deems necessary to carry out the review.

F. Materials to be Reviewed by Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review Committee

The PPPR Committee must review the following documents:

1. APPR materials: Annual review materials for each year since the last comprehensive review or for the last six years in cases where this is the first review, including the following:
 - a. APPR summary rating forms from the UTK online faculty review system (supplied by the chief academic officer);
 - b. Any and all evaluation narratives written by department head during the PPPR period (supplied by the chief academic officer);
 - c. Any and all responses by the faculty member, dean, and chief academic officer for each APPR (supplied by the chief academic officer);
 - d. End of course surveys for the PPPR period (supplied by the department head);
 - e. Any peer evaluation of teaching for the PPPR period (supplied by the department head).
2. Department and college performance expectations for faculty according to rank, as published in the bylaws of the relevant unit(s) (supplied by the department head);
3. A current *curriculum vitae* (supplied by the faculty member);

4. A narrative, not to exceed two pages, prepared by the faculty member describing the faculty member's milestone achievements and accomplishments for the review period as well as goals for the next review period (supplied by the faculty member);
5. If this is not the first PPPR, a copy of the narrative submitted as a part of the faculty member's previous PPPR (supplied by the faculty member);
6. External reviews only when deemed necessary by the PPPR Committee or the chief academic officer.

G. Criteria for Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review

The post-tenure review process must assess the faculty member's continuing professional growth and productivity in the areas of teaching, research (including scholarly, creative and artistic work), service, and/or clinical care pertinent to his or her faculty responsibilities.

The criteria for assessing the faculty member's performance must be consistent with established expectations of the department, school/college, and campus and provide sufficient flexibility to consider changes over time in the faculty member's academic responsibilities and/or the department's expectations.

The expectations for faculty performance may differ by campus, college, department, and even within a department or program. Those expectations may be commonly held standards in the discipline or sub-discipline, and should be published in the unit's bylaws. In addition, they may be stated explicitly in the faculty member's past annual performance reviews, work assignments, goals, or other planning tools (however identified). They may also be found in college bylaws, this handbook, and in other generally applicable policies and procedures (for example, fiscal, human resources, safety, research, or information technology policies and procedures).

H. Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review Committee's Conclusions and Report

The PPPR Committee is charged to assess the faculty member's performance during the review period and to conclude whether the faculty member's performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank. The PPPR Committee's voting must be conducted by anonymous ballots. All conclusions and recommendations shall be adopted upon the vote of a simple majority of the PPPR Committee. No member of the PPPR Committee may abstain or recuse himself or herself from voting. Based on the judgment of its members, the PPPR Committee must conclude that the faculty member's performance either:

- satisfies the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank, or
- does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank.

The committee must report its conclusions and recommendations in writing using a standard format prepared by the chief academic officer, including:

- an enumeration of the anonymously cast vote;
- the reasons supporting the committee's conclusion;

- a record of the grounds for any dissenting vote, as those grounds were expressed in the committee's deliberations;
- identification of any incongruences observed between the faculty member's performance and his or her annual evaluations,
- a statement of any additional concerns identified or actions recommended;
- if appropriate, an identification of areas of extraordinary contribution or performance; and
- a summary of the time spent by the PPPR committee in conducting the PPPR.

The detailed PPPR Committee report shall be provided to the faculty member, department head, dean, and chief academic officer

I. Review of the PPPR Committee Report by the Dean and Chief Academic Officer

Upon receipt of the report, the faculty member under review and the department heads have fourteen (14) calendar days to provide the dean with a written response to the PPPR Committee report.

The dean will consider the PPPR Committee Report, together with any written responses from the faculty member or department head and either accept or reject the Committee's determination that the faculty member's performance satisfies or does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank.

If the PPPR Committee report is not unanimous, or if the dean does not accept the PPPR Committee's determination, the dean shall provide supporting reasons for the dean's determination. The dean's determination should be forwarded to the chief academic officer within fourteen (14) calendar days of the end of the faculty member / department head response period, with a copy to the faculty member and the department head.

Upon receipt of the dean's recommendation, the faculty member has fourteen (14) calendar days to provide the chief academic officer with a written response to the dean's determination.

The chief academic officer shall accept or reject the dean's determination with a copy to the faculty member and the dean. If the chief academic officer's decision differs from the determinations of the Committee or the dean, then notice of the decision shall also include supporting reasons for the decision.

J. Further Actions

If, as a result of PPPR, the chief academic officer concludes that the faculty member's performance has not satisfied the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and rank, an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR) will be initiated, as detailed in Board Policy BT0006-Appendix E, as included in Chapter 3 of this handbook. The triggering of EPPR will run concurrently with any appeal undertaken by the faculty member, as described in section IX, below.

If, upon review of the PPPR report, the chief academic officer believes that deficiencies exist in the departmental annual performance review process (including failure of department heads to conduct rigorous annual performance reviews) or observes incongruences between the PPPR performance review and rankings assigned through the annual performance review process, the chief academic officer must develop a process for addressing the issues. Any such process developed by the chief academic officer will have no bearing on the requirement that an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review be initiated for a faculty member who has not satisfied expectations for rank.

All documents related to the PPPR process will be maintained by the Office of the Provost and made available to the UT System upon request.

K. Appeal

The faculty member under review may appeal the chief academic officer's determination regarding the outcome of PPPR within thirty (30) calendar days of notification of that outcome. The procedure for appeal is described in Chapter 5 of this handbook, except that the administrative appeal is to the Chancellor, a final decision on the appeal shall be made within ninety (90) days of the faculty member's appeal, and the final decision of the Chancellor on an appeal shall not be appealable to the President.

L. Annual Report to the Board of Trustees

The chief academic officer shall prepare an annual assessment report of campus post-tenure review processes, procedures, and outcomes for submission by the Chancellor to the Board of Trustees, through the President. The report shall include a description of any deficiencies identified in departmental annual performance review processes and the plan for addressing the issues.

The annual report will also include a summary of the time and resources devoted to the post-tenure reviews conducted during the year. A public version of the report that protects individual identities will be made available to all faculty.

APPENDIX C-2: UTIA Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review (PPPR)

A. Introduction

In its Policies on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure (Board Policy BT0006), the Board of Trustees has recognized and affirmed the importance of tenure in protecting academic freedom and thus promoting the university's principal mission of discovery and dissemination of knowledge through teaching, research, and service. The Board has also recognized its fiduciary responsibility to students, parents, and all citizens of Tennessee to ensure that faculty members effectively serve the needs of students and the university throughout their careers. To implement these principles, the University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture (UTIA), with the approval of the President and the Board, has established these procedures under which every tenured faculty member shall receive a comprehensive performance review no less often than every six years.

B. Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review (PPPR) Period

Except as otherwise provided in these procedures, each tenured faculty member must undergo some form of comprehensive performance review no less often than every six years. The PPPR shall not substitute for the Annual Performance and Planning Review in the year a faculty member is scheduled for PPPR.

The post-tenure review period begins at the granting of tenure, and a faculty member's PPPR will occur no less often than every six years thereafter unless one of the following circumstances results in a different timetable:

1. Suspension of PPPR period: A faculty member's PPPR period is suspended during any year in which the faculty member is granted a leave of absence or a modified duties assignment, such as a temporary assignment that differs from the primary, regular appointment.
2. Restarting of PPPR period due to alternative comprehensive review: A comprehensive review of a faculty member's performance restarts the faculty member's PPPR period under the following circumstances:
 - a. If a tenured faculty member undergoes a successful promotion review or a promotion is in progress during the year scheduled for PPPR, the promotion review fulfills the PTR requirement, and the PPPR period is modified to require PPPR six years after the promotion review. Since promotions are effective July 1 of each year, the next PPPR review must be conducted beginning with the review period that is initiated 5.5 years after the promotion (e.g., promotion on July 1, 2019, results in a PPPR beginning in December 2024 and completed in March 2025).

b. If a tenured faculty member undergoes an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR) and is either rated as meeting expectations or successfully completes the terms of the EPPR improvement plan, the EPPR process fulfills the PPPR requirement.

3. Start of the PPPR period upon conclusion of an administrative appointment: Full-time administrators and faculty members with a majority administrative appointment (more than 50 percent, as determined by the chief academic officer) are not subject to PPPR; faculty members holding a less- than-majority administrative appointment (50 percent or less, as determined by the chief academic officer) are subject to PPPR regarding their faculty duties based on expectations consistent with their faculty duty allocation. When a full-time or majority-time administrator leaves his or her administrative position to assume a tenured faculty position, the faculty member's initial PPPR shall occur within six years after leaving the administrative post.

A faculty member's scheduled PPPR may be waived if the faculty member submits a written and binding commitment to retire no later than one year after the year in which the PPPR was scheduled.

A faculty member's scheduled PPPR may be otherwise deferred or modified only for good cause approved by the chief academic officer.

C. Annual Schedule for Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review

All post tenure reviews will be conducted and completed during the spring semester according to the following schedule:

1. The chief academic officer shall appoint all PPPR Committees as set forth in Section D. below no later than December 1 prior to the spring semester in which the review will occur.
2. Each PPPR Committee shall be provided with the materials required by Section F. below no later than December 31.
3. Each PPPR Committee shall submit its report required by Section H. below no later than March 31.
4. Extensions of these deadlines will be granted only for good cause approved by the chief academic officer.

D. Composition of PPPR Committee

All post tenure reviews will be conducted by a committee established for the sole purpose of PPPR. Each PPPR committee shall include three members, appointed by the chief academic officer after consultation with the faculty member under review and her or his department head. The chief academic officer shall avoid choosing PPPR committee members who have an obvious or apparent conflict of interest. Faculty members who hold administrative appointments at 50 percent or greater, as determined by the chief academic officer, are not eligible to serve. In

addition to these general principles of inclusion, the composition of the PTR Committee must meet the following requirements:

- Each PPPR committee member must be a tenured, full-time faculty member who is at the same or higher academic rank and whose locus of tenure is at the same campus as the faculty member being reviewed
- One, and only one, PPPR committee member must hold an appointment in the same department as the faculty member being reviewed, unless there is no such faculty member eligible to serve.
- The committee chair will be chosen by the chief academic officer from among the members of the committee who are not from the same department as the faculty member being reviewed.
- The three-member PPPR committee for a given faculty member under review is selected from a standing pool of UTIA faculty of professorial rank serving a three-year term selected by the deans and appointed by the chief academic officer. The pool shall include at least one member from each department. The PPPR committee will include one departmental representative and balanced representation of the responsibilities (e.g., teaching, research, Extension, clinical practice) associated with the faculty member's appointment. For example, a faculty member with a majority research appointment will have at least one PPPR committee member appointed who also has a majority research appointment.

E. Written Charge to the PPPR Committee

The chief academic officer will provide a written charge to members of PPPR committees. The charge will include the following elements:

1. Purpose of PPPR, as described in Section A above;
2. Scope of PPPR, as described in Section F below;
3. Process of PPPR, as described in Section G below;
4. Materials to be reviewed in PPPR, as described in Section E below; the chief academic officer will emphasize that only in rare circumstances, and where expertise to evaluate the faculty member's scholarly output cannot otherwise be obtained, will the committee request external letters of assessment.
5. Obligation to provide a fair and objective review;
6. Obligation to keep confidential the committee's deliberations and findings; and
7. Any other instructions that the chief academic officer deems necessary to carry out the review.

These elements will be discussed with the pool of faculty members serving on PPPR committees to promote consistency and clarity of the charge, the responsibilities, and the outcomes of the reviews.

Meetings of the PPPR committees shall follow Robert's Rules of Order. The chair is responsible for organizing and running the meetings. The chair shall ensure committee members have access to all pertinent review documents and will liaise with the chief academic officer, including transmitting committee findings in writing.

F. Materials to be Reviewed by PPPR Committee

The PPPR committees must review the following documents:

1. APPR materials: Annual review materials for each year since the last comprehensive review or for the last six years in cases where this is the first review, including the following (supplied by the department head):
 - a. APPR summary rating forms from the online faculty review system and the Faculty Annual Report (supplied by the chief academic officer);
 - b. Any and all evaluation narratives written by the department head during the PPPR period (supplied by the chief academic officer);
 - c. Any and all responses by the faculty member, deans, and chief academic officer for each APPR (supplied by the chief academic officer);
 - d. Any end of course survey forms for the PPPR period (supplied by the department head); and
 - e. Any peer evaluation of teaching for the PPPR period (supplied by the department head).
2. Department and college performance criteria for faculty according to rank, as published in the bylaws of the respective units (supplied by the department head);
3. A current *curriculum vitae* (supplied by the faculty member);
4. A narrative, not to exceed two pages of 12-point text, prepared by the faculty member describing the faculty member's milestone achievements and accomplishments since the last review as well as goals for the next review period (supplied by the faculty member);
5. If this is not the first PPPR, a copy of the narrative submitted as a part of the faculty member's previous PPPR (to be supplied by the faculty member);
6. External reviews only when deemed necessary by the PPPR committee, a supervising dean, or when requested by the faculty member undergoing PPPR.

- a. Letters from no more than three external reviewers may be considered by the PPPR committee;
 - b. Requests for external letters by faculty undergoing PPPR must be made in writing to the committee chair at the time their materials are submitted to the PPPR committee;
 - c. The chief academic officer, or their designee, shall request the external reviews, in conformity with the following requirements:
 - (1) One reviewer will be chosen from a list provided by the faculty member undergoing PPPR;
 - (2) One or more reviewers will be chosen from a list provided by the tenured faculty in the department of the faculty member undergoing PPPR;
 - (3) Reviewers shall be selected in the same manner as described in Appendix E – Assembly of the Tenure and/or Promotion Dossier.
7. Each member of the PPPR committees will record the time devoted to the review process.

G. Criteria for Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review

The post tenure review process must assess the faculty member's continuing professional growth and productivity in the areas of teaching, research (including scholarly, creative, and artistic work), service, and/or clinical care pertinent to his or her faculty responsibilities.

The criteria for assessing the faculty member's performance must be consistent with established expectations of the department, school/college, and campus and provide sufficient flexibility to consider changes in academic responsibilities and/or expectations.

The expectations for faculty performance may differ by college, department, and even among subdisciplines within a department or program. Those expectations may be commonly held standards in the discipline or subdiscipline. Those expectations may be stated explicitly in the faculty member's own past annual performance reviews, work assignments, goals or other planning tools (however identified), as well as department or college bylaws, this handbook, this policy, and in other generally applicable policies and procedures (for example, fiscal, human resources, safety, research, or information technology policies and procedures).

H. PPPR Committee's Conclusions and Report

The PPPR committee is charged to assess the faculty member's performance during the review period and to conclude whether the faculty member's performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank. The PPPR committee voting must be conducted by anonymous ballots. Voting is to be done in person as part of a committee's deliberations; neither proxies or in absentia votes are allowed. All conclusions and

recommendations shall be adopted upon the vote of a simple majority of the PPPR committee. No member of the PPPR committee may abstain or recuse himself or herself from voting. Based on the judgment of its members, the PPPR committee must conclude that the faculty member's performance either:

1. satisfies the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank, or
2. does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank.

The committee must report its conclusions and recommendations in writing using a standard format prepared by the chief academic officer, including:

- an enumeration of the anonymously cast vote,
- the reasons supporting the committee's conclusion,
- a record of the grounds for any dissenting vote, as those grounds were expressed in the committee's deliberations,
- identification of any incongruences observed between the faculty member's performance and his or her annual evaluations,
- a statement of any additional concerns identified or actions recommended,
- if applicable, an identification of areas of extraordinary contribution and/or performance, and
- a summary of the time spent by the PPPR committee in conducting the report and developing the report and recommendation.

I. Review of the PPPR Committee Report by Academic Administrators

The detailed PPPR committee report shall be provided to the faculty member, department head, appropriate deans, Senior Vice Chancellor (or designee), and chief academic officer. The department head will write a response indicating support or dissent with the PPPR committee report and send it to the faculty member, appropriate deans, and the chief academic officer. Following the receipt of the department head letter, the appropriate deans will write a response indicating support or dissent with the PPPR committee report and the department head, and send it to the faculty member, the department head, and the chief academic officer.

Upon receipt of the report and each subsequent response by department heads and deans, faculty members, department heads, and deans must have the opportunity to provide a written response to the PPPR committee report. The chief academic officer shall either accept or reject the PPPR committee determination that the faculty member's performance satisfies or does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank after considering the responses of the department head and the dean(s). If the PPPR committee report is not unanimous, the chief academic officer shall provide the supporting reasons for his or her determination. If the chief academic officer does not concur in a determination, then he or she shall provide the supporting reasons for the non-concurrence. The chief academic officer's determination – and any written responses of the faculty member, department head/chair, and the dean – will be maintained with the PPPR committee report in the chief academic officer's office and submitted electronically to the University of Tennessee Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success, with copies provided to the dean(s) and the department head.

J. Further Actions

If, as a result of PPPR, the chief academic officer concludes that the faculty member's performance has not satisfied the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and rank, a PPPR improvement plan must be developed. A peer review committee to develop the improvement plan will be appointed as specified in Section 3 of Board Policy BT0006-Appendix E. This committee will be provided the review materials submitted as outlined in Section V above and the results of the PPPR Review as outlined in Section VII above. This peer review committee will be charged with the development of an improvement plan, following the procedures and timeline as detailed in Board Policy BT0006-Appendix E, as included in Chapter 3 of this handbook.

If, as a result of PPPR, the chief academic officer concludes that deficiencies exist in the departmental annual performance review process (including failure of department heads to conduct rigorous annual performance reviews) or other incongruences are observed between the PPPR performance review and rankings assigned through the annual performance review process, the chief academic officer must develop a process for addressing the issues. Any such process developed by the chief academic officer will have no bearing on the requirement that a PPPR improvement plan be developed for a faculty member who has not satisfied expectations for rank.

All documents related to the PPPR process will be submitted electronically to the University of Tennessee Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success.

K. Appeal

The faculty member under review may appeal the chief academic officer's determination regarding the outcome of PPPR within thirty days of notification of that outcome. The procedure for appeal is described in Chapter 5 of this handbook, except that a final decision on the appeal shall be made within ninety days of the faculty member's appeal, and the final decision of the Chancellor on an appeal shall not be appealable to the President.

L. Annual Report to the Board of Trustees

The chief academic officer shall prepare an annual assessment report of campus PPPR processes, procedures, and outcomes for submission by the Chancellor to the Board of Trustees, through the President, no later than June 1 of each year. The report shall include a description of any deficiencies identified in departmental annual performance review processes and the plan for addressing the issues.

The annual report will also include a summary of the time and resources devoted to PPPR conducted during the year. A public version of the report will be produced that protects individual identities of PPPR results. The public version will be made available to all faculty.

APPENDIX D: Procedures for Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR)

A. Objectives of the Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR)

The EPPR policy and procedures provide a thorough, fair, and transparent process for:

- coordinating peer evaluation of a tenured faculty member's performance for the five years immediately preceding EPPR;
- facilitating cooperation between a tenured faculty member and administrators in identifying effective strategies to assist the faculty member in meeting the expectations for the relevant discipline and academic rank; and
- distinguishing those unusual situations in which (despite efforts to facilitate improvement) the faculty member's performance fails to satisfy expectations for the discipline and academic rank, and which may lead to disciplinary action, up to and including proceedings to consider termination of tenure.

B. Review by the Chief Academic Officer To Determine Whether EPPR is Warranted

Irrespective of other campus processes or practices through which an annual performance review is finalized, the chief academic officer must review any annual performance evaluation that would result in EPPR.

- If the chief academic officer overrules the performance rating and determines that EPPR is not warranted, the faculty member may choose to proceed with EPPR.
- If the chief academic officer determines that an EPPR is warranted, the chief academic officer should meet promptly with the faculty member to explain the decision and review the EPPR process. The chief academic officer must also provide written notice of this decision (copied to the department head, dean, and faculty senate president) that an EPPR will be conducted.

C. Appointment of the Peer Review Committee

Within 45 days of the written notice that an EPPR will be conducted, the chief academic officer (or designee) must appoint the peer review committee in the manner described below and meet with the committee to review its charge.

Every member of the peer review committee must be tenured; hold the same or higher academic rank as the faculty member undergoing review; and have some familiarity with the relevant performance expectations for faculty in that discipline and academic rank. In the unusual event that an appropriate peer review committee cannot be assembled using these criteria, the chief

academic officer must provide to the faculty member a written explanation for the deviation from the prescribed criteria.

Consistent with the criteria for service stated above, the chief academic officer (or designee) must appoint the peer review committee using the following nomination process:

- the dean nominates one faculty member to serve both as chair and as a voting member of the peer review committee; when a faculty member has a split appointment across colleges, the dean of the college in which the faculty member holds a majority appointment (that is, the faculty member's tenure unit) will provide the nomination;
- the department head or chair nominates three faculty members who meet the criteria above, from whom one committee member is appointed;
- the faculty member undergoing review nominates three faculty members who meet the criteria above, from whom one committee member is appointed;
- the faculty senate president nominates three faculty members who meet the criteria above, from whom one committee member is appointed; and
- the college promotion and tenure committee or the intercollegiate promotion and tenure committee for the colleges without departments nominates three actively serving members who meet the criteria above, from whom one committee member is appointed.

To ensure diverse perspectives among members of the peer review committee, the chief academic officer should solicit nominations from faculty serving in different roles. When feasible, nominations to the peer review committee should include:

- faculty members whose tenure lies in the same department as the faculty member undergoing review, or, in a small department, faculty members who hold tenure in the same college as the faculty member undergoing review;
- at least one faculty member whose tenure resides in a different department than the faculty member undergoing review; and
- at least one faculty member who currently serves (or who served during the most recent cycle) on a college promotion and tenure review committee or an intercollegiate promotion and tenure committee.

D. Collection of Records for Review by the Peer Review Committee

The chief academic officer (or designee) must collect the following records with respect to the faculty member under review:

- all annual performance reviews for the past five annual performance review cycles, including materials submitted by the faculty member (or an administrator) or developed as part of the evaluation process;
- written performance expectations, which may have been established in the past five annual performance reviews, in department or college bylaws, in this handbook, or in Board of Trustees, fiscal, human resources, research, safety, or information technology policies or procedures; and
- any work assignments, goals, or other plans (however identified) that were described in previous performance evaluations during the review period.

The faculty member undergoing review may submit additional written materials relevant to the review period for the committee's consideration. Such materials must be submitted to the chief academic officer (or designee) for distribution to the committee. The peer review committee may also request that the chief academic officer (or designee) collect and provide additional written materials. Reasonable requests for relevant records will be honored when permitted by law and university policy.

E. Conclusions and Recommendations by the Peer Review Committee

The peer review committee is charged to review the available performance information and to conclude (based on that information) whether or not performance during the review period has satisfied the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank. This review should be completed (and written report completed) within 75 days from the chief academic officer's charge to the peer review committee.

Interviews: The peer review committee may conduct a reasonable number of interviews in person or electronically. If the committee chooses to conduct interviews, both the faculty member undergoing review and the administrator who assigned the negative rating(s) must be given the opportunity to be interviewed. All interviews must be conducted separately. Unavailability of the faculty member or administrator for an interview does not constitute grounds for an extension of time to complete the EPPR.

Voting: Voting must be conducted by anonymous ballots. No member of the committee may abstain or recuse him/herself from voting. All conclusions and recommendations are adopted upon the vote of a simple majority, except a recommendation that the Chancellor initiate tenure termination proceedings, which requires the support of at least four members of the peer review committee.

1. Conclusions Regarding Performance and Recommended Action(s)

All conclusions and recommendations of the peer review committee must be made in writing, with copies to all parties (faculty member, department head, dean(s), and chief academic officer). Minority reports may be attached. While the committee is not permitted to share written materials directly with the faculty senate, the faculty member under review remains free to do so.

Based on the judgment of its members, the peer review committee must conclude either:

- a. that the performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank; or
- b. that the performance does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank. In such a case, the committee must recommend either:

- (1) that an EPPR improvement plan be developed and implemented; or

- (2) by a vote of at least four committee members, that the Chancellor should initiate proceedings to consider termination of tenure based on Adequate Cause (Unsatisfactory Performance in Teaching, Research, or Service) as defined in Chapter 3 of this handbook and section III.J. of the Board of Trustees Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure and the procedures detailed in BT0006-Appendix B or BT0006-C.

2. Review and Responses to the Peer Review Committee's Report

The committee's written conclusions and recommendations must be distributed to the faculty member, department head, and dean(s) for simultaneous review, who must submit any written responses to the chief academic officer within 14 days.

3. Conclusions and Recommendations of the Chief Academic Officer

The chief academic officer will review the committee's report and all timely written responses and will make an independent evaluation of the faculty member's performance. Within 28 days of the distribution of the peer review committee's report (14 days for review and comment by others and 14 days for independent review by the chief academic officer), the chief academic officer must provide to the Chancellor copies of the committee's report, all timely responses to the report, and any additional conclusions or recommendations based on the chief academic officer's independent review of the material. The entire report, including any materials added by the faculty member, department head, dean(s), and chief academic officer, must be copied to the faculty member, peer review committee, department head, and dean(s).

F. Review and Action by the Chancellor

The Chancellor will make an independent evaluation of the faculty member's performance and must provide to the faculty member (copied to the department head, dean(s), chief academic officer, and members of the peer review committee) a written explanation of the rationale for any conclusions, decisions, or further actions to be taken.

If the Chancellor concludes that the performance under review has satisfied the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank, the EPPR process is concluded. In doing so,

the Chancellor may overrule previous performance ratings and may adjust the faculty member's salary to reflect any across-the-board raises.

If the Chancellor concludes that the performance under review does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank, the Chancellor may take further action as deemed appropriate. For example (without limitation):

- The Chancellor may require that an EPPR improvement plan be implemented for a period of up to 18 months, as further described below.
- The Chancellor may propose disciplinary action, up to and including proceedings to consider tenure termination based on Adequate Cause (Unsatisfactory Performance in Teaching, Research, or Service) as defined in Chapter 3 of this handbook and section III.J. of the Board of Trustees Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure and the procedures detailed in in BT0006-Appendix B or BT0006-Appendix C.

G. Development and Implementation of an Improvement Plan (When Applicable)

1. Written Notice to All Parties

If the Chancellor concludes that an EPPR improvement plan should be developed, the Chancellor must promptly instruct the chief academic officer to develop and implement an improvement plan using the process detailed below. The chief academic officer must promptly notify in writing the faculty member under review that the Chancellor has determined that an EPPR improvement plan must be implemented (with copies to the department head, dean(s), and peer review committee). Only one improvement plan may be offered to a faculty member during a given EPPR process; however, the EPPR process may be implemented more than once during a faculty member's career. An EPPR improvement plan may extend no more than 18 months from the time it is implemented by the chief academic officer.

2. Development of the EPPR Improvement Plan

The department head is responsible for drafting the EPPR improvement plan in close collaboration with the peer review committee, dean(s), and chief academic officer. In drafting the improvement plan, the department head should attempt to address any written concerns raised by the faculty member during the relevant annual review cycles.

Within 30 days of notice that an improvement plan must be developed, the department head is expected to produce a plan supported by the dean(s), chief academic officer, and a majority of the peer review committee. Once such an improvement plan is developed, the chief academic officer shall forward the proposed plan to the faculty member.

If the department head fails to produce within 30 days an improvement plan supported by the chief academic officer, dean(s), and majority of the peer review committee, then the committee must assume responsibility for drafting an improvement plan. In such a case, the committee must complete the plan within 14 additional days. Upon approval by a

majority of the peer review committee, the proposed plan must be provided to the dean(s) and chief academic officer for review and approval.

In either case, the chief academic officer must ensure that an improvement plan acceptable to the chief academic officer, dean(s), and majority of the peer review committee is developed and must send the proposed plan to the faculty member for review and response. The faculty member under review must be given one opportunity to review and respond to the proposed improvement plan (within 14 days). The peer review committee must review and consider the faculty member's response, including any modifications requested by the faculty member (within another 14 days). In its discretion, the peer review committee may revise the proposed plan after considering the faculty member's response. The committee must then forward the proposed improvement plan to the chief academic officer for review and implementation (with copies to the dean(s), department head, and faculty member).

3. Committee Review after an EPPR Improvement Plan

At the end of the time allotted for the EPPR improvement plan, the peer review committee must reconvene to review performance under the plan, and to determine whether or not such performance (in the context of the EPPR review period) has satisfied expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank. The peer review committee must vote anonymously and provide a written report of its conclusions and recommendations, including majority and minority reports (if applicable), to the faculty member, department head, and dean(s), who may respond in writing within 14 days.

The chief academic officer must review the committee's report and any timely written responses and must independently evaluate performance under the improvement plan. The chief academic officer must then submit the reconvened committee's report, all written responses, and his/her own conclusions and recommendations to the Chancellor, with copies to the faculty member, peer review committee, department head, and dean(s).

4. Chancellor's Review and Action after an EPPR Improvement Plan

The Chancellor will make an independent evaluation of the performance under the EPPR improvement plan (in the context of the EPPR review period) and must provide to the faculty member (copied to the department head, dean(s), chief academic officer, and members of the peer review committee) a written explanation of the rationale for any conclusions, decisions, or further actions to be taken.

H. Timeline for Conducting the EPPR

All EPPR deadlines are counted in calendar days rather than business days, except when the last day of the time period falls during a holiday or administrative closure lasting five business days or longer (such as the administrative closure between fall and spring semesters or an extended weather-related closure).

The following table summarizes key events in the EPPR process that have deadlines.

Event Begins	Days	Event Ends
Written notice from the chief academic officer that EPPR is warranted	45	Chief academic officer charges the peer review committee
Chief academic officer charges the peer review committee	75	Committee report is distributed for review by the faculty member, department head, and dean
Committee report is distributed for review by the faculty member, department head, and dean	14	Faculty member, department head, and dean submit written responses to the chief academic officer
Chief academic officer reviews timely responses to the report and makes an independent evaluation	14	Chief academic officer submits to the Chancellor the committee's report, all timely responses, and any additional conclusions and recommendations based on the chief academic officer's independent evaluation
If the Chancellor requires implementation of an EPPR improvement plan, the chief academic officer provides written notice to all parties	30	Department head submits to the chief academic officer a proposed improvement plan supported by the dean, chief academic officer, and a majority of the peer review committee
If the department head fails to produce an improvement plan supported by the dean, chief academic officer, and a majority of the committee, then the peer review committee assumes responsibility for drafting a plan	14	Peer review committee submits the proposed improvement plan to the dean and chief academic officer for review and approval
Upon approval by the chief academic officer, the proposed improvement plan is sent to the faculty member for review	14	Faculty member submits to the peer review committee any written response (including any requested modifications to the improvement plan)
Peer review committee considers the faculty member's response and may revise the proposed improvement plan	14	Peer review committee submits the proposed improvement plan to the chief academic officer for review and approval
Chief academic officer reviews the proposed plan, responds to the committee as needed, and approves a final improvement plan	14	Chief academic officer sends the approved plan to the faculty member and others for implementation

On a case-by-case basis, the chief academic officer (or designee) may approve a written request from the peer review committee for an extension of time to complete the initial review. Only one extension may be granted to the peer review committee during a single EPPR, and the chief academic officer (or designee) will determine the length of the extension.

Concurrent Appeals or Grievances: While appeal of an APPR rating (or other procedure) may overlap in time with the five-year review period, the EPPR is purposefully different from the annual performance review process. To the extent provided under this handbook or other campus policies or practices, the faculty member may choose to initiate or maintain an appeal of the most recent APPR rating while EPPR is underway. Any appeal or other process must be conducted without interference or influence from the EPPR, and vice versa. Faculty leaders should take care to ensure the integrity of all procedures by confirming that no person serves in multiple proceedings related to the same faculty member. Except as may be required by law (for example, under regulatory requirements or a judicial order) any such appeal, grievance, or other university process must proceed simultaneously with the EPPR and must have no impact on the timing or procedures described in this policy.

APPENDIX E: Assembly of the Tenure and/or Promotion Dossier

The dossier includes the information and documentation-as listed and in the order as given below. Any dossiers which do not conform to this order or which contain inaccuracies will be returned to the department or college for correction. For a description of the required materials, please see section 3.11.6.1.A in this handbook.

Each major section of the dossier is described in detail below:

- A. Candidate packet;
- B. Letters from external evaluators; and
- C. Reports of votes and narrative recommendations at each stage of review.

A. Candidate Packet: The material in this section provides summary information for the review committees and administrative reviewers, arranged in the order given.

1. Cover sheet and Educational and employment history: records the basic data of the candidate's employment and eligibility for review and a list of their educational and academic employment history.
2. Early consideration, suspension, extension and other memos: If tenure review comes earlier or later than that specified in the faculty member's letter of appointment (or for promotion after fewer than the typical number of years in rank), approval must have been granted by the department head, dean, and chief academic officer, as stipulated in section 3.11.4 of this handbook. Copies of all relevant approval memos must be included in this section.
3. Statement of responsibilities: The department head, in consultation with the faculty member, shall prepare a statement of the candidate's responsibilities. It is recommended that the statement be composed within the first six months of employment and updated annually. The statement should describe the areas of responsibility assigned to the faculty member in regard to the criteria used in promotion and tenure reviews.
4. Department and college statements of criteria and expectations: Each department and college must include a description of the criteria used to appoint and evaluate faculty in these respective units as outlined in Sections 2.2, 3.1, and 3.8 of this handbook.
5. Certification of Competence to Communicate in English: The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees requires that certification of competence to communicate in English shall accompany the tenure and promotion dossier.
6. Teaching Ability and Effectiveness: The material in this section documents the candidate's teaching ability and effectiveness. This section contains the following statements and information arranged in the order given.

a. Required statements, information, and reports:

(1) Candidate's Statement / Self-Assessment: The statement describes the candidate's teaching philosophy and practices and reflects on teaching ability and effectiveness;

(2) Scheduled Classes Taught: A list of courses taught at UTK for each term or semester (including summer term). Include the following information:

- enrollment,
- percent effort for co-taught classes,
- identify honors courses,
- identify clinical assignments or other forms of direct student supervision, if appropriate, and
- list advising responsibilities.

(3) Quantitative end-of-course student surveys: A concise tabulation of results of end-of-course student surveys or documented evaluation of candidate's programs, activities, and skills.

(4) Narrative end-of-course student survey materials: If a summary of student comments from end-of-course student surveys is included, the summary should be broadly representative of all the student comments received. These comments should be compiled by the department head from standard end-of-course student surveys.

(5) Peer review of teaching reports: Peer review of teaching reports and any other faculty input concerning 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 clinical or field assignments or advising. Internal letters about teaching effectiveness should be included in this section.

b. Optional indicators of quality, as appropriate:

- statements from administrators that attest to the candidate's teaching and advising effectiveness,
- other documentation of evidence of teaching and advising effectiveness (e.g., performance of students in subsequent courses, tangible results, and benefits),
- honors and awards received for teaching,
- a list of supervised graduate dissertations (or equivalent) required for graduate degrees with types of degrees and years granted,
- membership on graduate degree candidates' committees,
- a list of supervised undergraduate honor theses or research,
- evidence of international or intercultural instructional activities.

7. Research / scholarship / creative activity: The material in this section documents the candidate's achievements in research/scholarship/creative activity (according to the terms of the candidate's appointment). This section contains the following statements and information arranged in the order given.

a. Required statements, information, and reports:

(1) Candidate's statement: The statement describes the candidate's research/scholarship/creative achievement approach and/or agenda.

(2) List of scholarly publications: Publications should be listed in standard bibliographic form, preferably with the earliest date first. Citations should include beginning and ending page numbers or total number of pages, where appropriate. For multiple-authored works, the contribution of the candidate should be clearly indicated (e.g., principal author, supervised person who authored the work, etc.). Publications should be grouped in the following categories and in the order given:

- Articles published in refereed journals,
- Books,
- Scholarly and/or creative activity published through a refereed electronic venue,
- Contributions to edited volumes,
- Papers published in refereed conference proceedings,
- Papers or extended abstracts published in conference proceedings (refereed on the basis of abstract),
- Articles published in popular press,
- Articles appearing in in-house organs,
- Research reports submitted to sponsors,
- Articles published in non-refereed journals,
- Manuscripts accepted for publication (include letters of acceptance at the end of this section C), and
- Manuscripts submitted for publication (include where and when submitted).

(3) Creative activity: This section should document exhibitions, installations, productions, or publications of original works of architecture, dance, design, electronic media, film, journalism, landscape architecture, literature, music, theatre, and visual art. Performance of original dance, literary, musical visual arts, or theatrical works, or works from traditional and contemporary repertoires of the performing arts should be chronicled with critiques.

(4) Projects, grants, commissions, and contracts (date, title, agency, amount): These should be grouped in the following categories and in the order given:

- Completed;
- Funded and in progress;
- Under review.

(5) Papers presented at technical and professional meetings (meeting and paper titles, listed chronologically in standard bibliographic form): including an indication of whether the candidate was the presenter, whether the paper was refereed, and whether the paper was invited.

(6) Record of participation in, and description of, seminars and workshops (short description of activity, with titles, dates, sponsor, etc.): including an indication of role in seminar or workshop, e.g., student, invited participant, etc.

(7) Record of invitations to conduct workshops, master classes, seminars, etc. at other institutions.

b. Optional indicators of quality:

(1) Other evidence of research or creative accomplishments (patents, new product development, international and intercultural expertise or experience, new art forms, new computer software programs developed, notable citations and / or reviews of creative work or scholarship, etc.);

(2) Honors or awards for research/scholarship/creative achievement;

(3) Grants and contracts for instruction or for training programs, with an indication of the candidate's role in preparing and administering the grants and contracts.

8. Institutional, Disciplinary, and/or Professional Service: The material in this section documents the candidate's achievement in institutional, disciplinary, and/or professional service. This section contains the following statements and information arranged in the order given.

a. Required statements, information, and reports:

(1) Candidate's statement: The statement will describe the candidate's achievement in institutional, disciplinary, and/or professional service. The candidate provides a summary of his/her service record arranged according to the following categories.

(2) Institutional service:

- Record of committee work at department, college, and university levels,
- Participation in university-wide governance bodies and related activities,
- Record of contributions to the university's programs, at home and abroad.

(3) Disciplinary service: Record of membership and active participation in professional and learned societies related to his or her academic discipline (e.g., offices held, committee work, journal refereeing, and other responsibilities).

(4) Professional service

- Service to public and private organizations or institutions in which the candidate uses his/her professional expertise;
- Service to governmental agencies at the international, federal, state, and local levels;
- Service to industry, e.g., training, workshops, consulting;
- Participation in community affairs as a representative of the university.

b. Optional indicators of quality: Honors or awards for service activity within the institution, discipline, and/or profession.

9. Annual Performance and Retention Review Materials

a. For Tenure **and/or** Tenure and Promotion: All Retention Review materials and Annual Performance and Planning Review (APPR) materials completed during the probationary period, including, but not limited to, the following documents:

- Retention Review Report Form,
- Faculty narrative from retention review,
- Retention narrative from any and all administrative levels,
- Candidate's responses to any and all retention review narratives,
- Dissenting statements from faculty,
- APPR form,
- APPR narratives from any and all administrative levels, and
- Candidate's responses to any APPR narratives.

b. For Promotion **Only**: All materials from Annual Performance and Planning Reviews (APPR) completed since the last promotion, including, but not limited to, the following documents:

- APPR Form;
- APPR narratives from any and all administrative levels;
- Candidate's responses to any APPR narrative.

10. *Curriculum vitae*

11. Candidate Signature Statement: This section provides a statement, signed by the candidate, attesting that the candidate has reviewed sections listed above for accuracy and completeness.

B. External Letters of Assessment: This section contains letters from external evaluators and must contain the following items:

1. Sample of letter sent to external evaluators: The head provides a sample of the letter that was sent to the external evaluators soliciting their assessments of the candidate's achievements in research / scholarship / creative activity.
2. Log of communications with external evaluators: The log documents the dates on which each external letter was requested, received, and entered into the dossier. The log also indicates whether the evaluator was recommended by the candidate or the department. All requests should be entered in the log regardless of whether a response was obtained.
3. Method of selection of external evaluators: The head attaches a description of the procedure used for selecting external evaluators, together with a brief biographical

statement identifying those who have written the assessments, including evidence demonstrating the evaluator's qualifications and standing in his/her discipline.

4. External letters of assessment: The dossier will typically include no fewer than five letters from external evaluators. In the event that a dossier has fewer than five letters from external evaluators, the department head must discuss the reasons with the dean and/or chief academic officer. The dean or the chief academic officer may ask the department head to solicit additional letters in order to meet the typical required minimum number of external assessments.
- C. Evaluative Recommendations, Reports, and Statements. This section includes the APPRs, retention reviews (as appropriate), and all evaluative statements by peer committees and administrators.
1. Departmental Review Committee report
 - a. Departmental review committee narrative;
 - b. Any minority report from the departmental review committee;
 - c. Any candidate response to the departmental review committee's and/or minority report.
 2. Department Head's recommendation
 - a. Department head's recommendation;
 - b. Any dissenting statement from members of the departmental review committee;
 - c. Any candidate response to the department head's recommendation, or any dissenting statement from members of the departmental review committee.
 3. College or Intercollegiate Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation
 - a. College or Intercollegiate Promotion and Tenure committee narrative;
 - b. Any minority report from the College or Intercollegiate Promotion and Tenure committee;
 - c. Any candidate response to the College or Intercollegiate Promotion and Tenure committee report.
 4. Dean's Recommendation
 - a. Dean's recommendation;
 - b. Any candidate response to the dean's recommendation.
 5. Chief Academic Officer's Recommendation
 - a. Chief academic officer's recommendation;
 - b. Any candidate response to the chief academic officer's recommendation.
 6. Chancellor's Recommendation
- D. Materials *not* to be included in the dossier: The dossier should *not* contain the following items unless unusual circumstances prevail and the materials are necessary for making an assessment and recommendation. (This judgment shall be made by the dean.):

1. Evaluative statements written by the candidate, other than the required statements at the head of each factual section of the dossier;
2. Statements about a candidate's personal life unless they are germane to the quality of the candidate's work;
3. Letters of appreciation or thanks except when they include an explanation of the contribution made to teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, or service;
4. Course syllabi, outlines, and other course materials; course evaluation forms.

APPENDIX F: Evaluation and Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty

A. Annual Performance and Planning Review (APPR) of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF)

Section 4.4 of this handbook addresses procedures for conducting the APPR for NTTF.

1. APPR timetable: All NTTF are evaluated annually on their performance during the previous calendar year. The one-year period is referred to as the “Evaluation Period.” Deadlines for submission of APPRs are set by the chief academic officer and published annually in the Faculty Evaluation Calendar.
2. Limitations on communications during APPR: The annual review process exists to provide fair, objective, and constructive feedback and relevant support to faculty members. As a means of preserving the integrity of the process, until the APPR has been fully executed by the chief academic officer, neither the faculty member under review nor any administrator managing or conducting the review is permitted to communicate substantive information about the review with others involved in the review process, especially those charged with making a recommendation at subsequent stages of review, without the consent of all others involved in the review process. For example, a department head shall not communicate with a dean about the substance of a faculty member’s review except through the transmission of the APPR materials. Nothing in this paragraph is intended to prohibit a faculty member under review from (a) consulting with his or her mentor regarding the substance or process of the review, (b) consulting with a university ombudsperson, (c) consulting with representatives of the Office of Investigation and Resolution, or (d) pursuing possible rights of appeal available under Chapter 5 of this handbook.
3. Procedure for APPR for non-tenure-track faculty
 - a. Preparation for the APPR: The department head or designee manages the process of annual review of non-tenure-track faculty in a timely way to ensure compliance with all deadlines for submission of the review forms to the dean and chief academic officer. Colleges may establish their own calendars for the NTT APPR process as long as they do not conflict with this handbook or the Faculty Evaluation Calendar, as published by the chief academic officer. In the event of a conflict, this handbook or the Faculty Evaluation Calendar governs.
 - (1) Adequate Notice to NTTF: The department head or designee will inform the departmental NTTF of the schedule for the reviews, any materials that should be prepared and submitted for the reviews, and schedule the annual review conference with each NTTF member at least two weeks in advance of the date of the conference to allow faculty adequate notice to prepare the required materials.
 - (2) Documents prepared by the faculty member: The faculty member prepares and submits the following documents in advance of the conference with the department head or designee:

(a) a summary of the past year's work and accomplishments as stipulated in the current letter of appointment and further developed in the previous year's annual review;

(b) any additional work or professional activities that have provided a benefit to the university;

(c) a list of specific plans and goals for the upcoming year;

(d) a current *curriculum vitae*;

(e) any documentation requested by the department head or required by departmental or collegiate bylaws that evidences the faculty member's activities during the evaluation period, which may include documentation of accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, service, or other area of performance as stipulated in the current appointment letter.

b. The Department Head's Evaluation

The department head or designee will conduct a scheduled conference with the faculty member (a) to discuss the faculty member's goals and accomplishments during the evaluation period, with primary focus on accomplishments in the areas of effort enumerated in the faculty member's most recent departmental appointment letter or the previous year's APPR documents and, at the faculty member's discretion, address any other work which has benefited the university; (b) formulate goals for the coming year; (c) formulate an updated assignment of effort for the coming year, consistent with the faculty member's assigned responsibilities and goals. The department head or designee documents the APPR on the online Faculty Review System, with attachments, as necessary. The department head or designee's review must rely on and include only documented and substantiated information available at the time of the review; it should not be based on rumor or speculation. The review will be based on procedures and standards set forth in this handbook and all applicable bylaws.

(1) Assigning ratings for the faculty member's performance: The department head or designee indicates on the online Faculty Review System whether the performance of the faculty member for the entire evaluation period far exceeds expectations for rank, exceeds expectations for rank, meets expectations for rank, falls short of meeting expectations for rank, or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank, based on previously established objectives for that faculty member, departmental bylaws, and the current appointment letter.

(2) Performance and goals-setting narrative: The department head or designee writes a narrative that (a) describes and discusses the faculty member's progress on attaining the previous year's goals and the faculty member's performance in the areas of effort stipulated in the current appointment letter, and (b) records the faculty member's assignment for the coming year.

(3) Exception to the requirement for a narrative: For faculty members who hold multi-year appointments, the department head or designee may, but is not required to, write a narrative for a faculty member in any year in which the faculty member meets expectations, unless (i) the faculty member requests that the department head write a narrative in that year, or (ii) it has been three years since the department head has written a narrative for that faculty member, or (iii) the faculty member is up for reappointment.

(4) Department head or designee's signature: Upon completing the APPR, the department head or designee signs the review, at which point it is transmitted to the faculty member for his or her review.

(5) Faculty member's review of the APPR and the right to submit a written response: The faculty member shall be allowed 14 days from the date of receipt of notice that the department head or designee has signed the APPR to review the APPR and submit any written response. The response should be uploaded to the Faculty Review System, where it will be accessible to the department head, the dean, and the chief academic officer. If the faculty member fails to upload a response within 14 days, she or he relinquishes the right to respond.

(6) Faculty member's signature: The faculty member signs the APPR. The faculty member's signature indicates that he or she has read the review, but the signature does not necessarily imply agreement with the performance and goals-setting narrative, performance evaluation, or other contents.

c. Dean's review of the APPR

(1) Reviewing and signing the APPR: The dean or the dean's proxy reviews the APPRs submitted by each department head or designee and signs them in the Faculty Review System, indicating either concurrence with or dissent from the department head's rating of each faculty member.

(2) Dissent from the department head or designee's rating: In cases where the dean does not concur with the department head or designee's rating, the dean (i) assigns a different rating, indicating whether the performance of the faculty member far exceeds expectations for rank, exceeds expectations for rank, meets expectations for rank, falls short of meeting expectations for rank, or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank, based on previously established objectives for that faculty member, departmental bylaws, and the current appointment letter; and (ii) prepares a written rationale summarizing the reasons for his or her dissent from the department head or designee's rating. The dean's rating and rationale is recorded in the Faculty Review System, where it is available to the faculty member, the department head or designee, and the chief academic officer.

(3) Faculty member's and department head or designee's right to respond: The faculty member and the department head or designee each shall be allowed 14 days from the date of receipt of notice of the dean's final rating and rationale to submit a written response. Any responses should be uploaded to the Faculty Review System, where they will be accessible to all participants in the APPR. If no response is received after 14 days

from the date of receipt of the dean's rating and rationale, the faculty member and department head or designee relinquish the right to respond.

d. Chief academic officer's review of the APPR

The chief academic officer or the chief academic officer's proxy reviews the APPR, indicates a final decision on the rating to be assigned to the faculty member (far exceeds expectations for rank, exceeds expectations for rank, meets expectations for rank, falls short of meeting expectations for rank, or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank) and signs the APPRs in the Faculty Review System. In cases where the chief academic officer does not concur with the rating given by the dean, the chief academic officer (a) assigns a different rating, indicating whether the performance of the faculty member far exceeds expectations for rank, exceeds expectations for rank, meets expectations for rank, falls short of meeting expectations for rank, or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank, based on previously established objectives for that faculty member, departmental bylaws, and the current appointment letter; and (b) prepares a narrative summarizing the reasons for his or her dissent from the dean's rating. The faculty member, the dean, and the department head or designee have access to the chief academic officer's rating and rationale through the Online Faculty Review System.

e. Fully executed APPR and faculty member's right to appeal: The chief academic officer's signature signals that the APPR is fully executed. The faculty member's right to appeal the final APPR rating is described in chapter 5 of this handbook.

B. Promotion Process for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

1. Criteria for Promotion: The criteria for promotion to a rank are the same as those given in Section 4.1 of this handbook. APPRs form the basis of a cumulative record that prepares NTTF for promotion. The criterion for promotion of NTTF is excellence in performing the primary responsibilities established in the initial appointment document and recorded in the annual performance and planning reviews. (Section 4.5.2).
2. Timing: NTTF members are eligible for promotion to senior lecturer/associate professor (depending upon initial classification) typically after a minimum of five years of regular (full-time) service at the rank of lecturer/assistant professor. A senior lecturer/associate professor is eligible for promotion to distinguished lecturer/professor typically after three to five years of regular (full-time) service at the rank of senior lecturer/professor. The faculty member and department head or designee should discuss promotion as part of the APPR process, well in advance of the suggested dates for submission of the application for promotion, in order to give the candidate sufficient time to gather the required materials and assemble the dossier. The final decision to apply for promotion rests with the faculty member.
3. Review Period: The review period for promotion covers the last five years of performance or the entire time since the last promotion review.

4. Process for Promotion: Effective evaluation of a candidate's qualifications and professional contributions requires the academic judgment of the candidate's colleagues and responsible administrators. When the faculty member's position is in a department within a college, there are three levels of review: the department or other unit level, headed by the faculty member's immediate supervisor; the dean of the college in which that unit sits; and the chief academic officer. In the process description below, the department head is understood to refer to the supervisor of the unit in which the faculty member is appointed.
- a. Faculty Review: The promotion process begins when a dossier is submitted for consideration for promotion. Consistent with Section 4.5 of this handbook, a departmentally designated group of faculty (the review committee) will review and evaluate promotion applications in accordance with departmental and college bylaws. Typically, faculty members (both NTT and TT) who hold higher rank than the candidate are eligible to be members of this group, unless otherwise specified by college or departmental bylaws. The departmentally designated review committee will review the application and record a vote in favor of or against promotion by majority vote (unless some other voting mechanism is established by college or departmental bylaws). The vote of the departmentally designated review committee is advisory to the department head or designee.
 - b. Department Head's Review: After making an independent judgment on the promotion application, the department head either inserts a positive written recommendation in the dossier and advances it to the next level of review, or notifies the candidate in writing that the department declines to recommend promotion.
 - c. Appealing Departmental Non-Recommendations: Candidates not recommended for promotion by their departments may appeal that decision to the next level. If a candidate chooses not to appeal, the application is considered to be withdrawn and the promotion process ends. (See section h below.)
 - d. College Level Review and Recommendation: The dean may establish a college-wide committee for review and recommendation regarding promotion of non-tenure-track faculty. The recommendation of any college-wide committee is advisory to the dean. After making an independent judgment on the promotion application, the dean will either insert a positive written recommendation in the dossier and advance it to the next level of review, or notify the candidate in writing that the college declines to recommend promotion. Candidates not recommended for promotion by their colleges may appeal that decision to the chief academic officer. If a candidate chooses not to appeal, the application is considered to be withdrawn, and the promotion process ends. (See section h below.)
 - e. Campus Level Review and Final Promotion Decision: The chief academic officer reviews recommendations forwarded by the dean and serves as the final decision maker regarding promotion. The chief academic officer will notify successful and unsuccessful candidates in writing of the decision regarding promotion. Candidates not recommended

for promotion by the chief academic officer have all rights of appeal, as specified in chapter 5 of this handbook.

f. Notification of Candidates during the Process: Candidates will be notified upon completion of review at each level (department, college, campus). 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.

g. Candidate's Right to Respond: A candidate has a right to submit a written response to each level of review, whether the recommendation is positive or negative. The candidate must submit any response within ten working days of notification. The response will be inserted in the dossier.

h. Appealing Negative Reviews: A promotion application that is not approved will be forwarded to the next level of review only if the candidate submits a written appeal to the next level within ten working days of the date of the written notification of a negative promotion decision. The appeal must make an explicit request for further review of the application and give reasons for that request.

i. Reapplication in Case of Non-promotion: Candidates not recommended for promotion by the chief academic officer must wait one academic year before re-applying.

5. Assembly of the Promotion Dossier: Dossiers are typically limited to 50 pages, not including the *curriculum vitae* and a cover sheet, which records the decisions at the various levels of review. Candidates for promotion will work with their department heads or designees to assemble a dossier in support of promotion according to the guidelines listed below. This dossier must describe the responsibilities assigned to the candidate and must include an appropriate subset of the following materials:

a. Items to be supplied by the candidate:

(1) A cover letter that describes the candidate's principal assignment and any secondary assignments over the course of the evaluation period. The letter should provide a brief overview of the candidate's achievements in each of the relevant areas of effort (teaching, research/service/creative activity, service). A more extensive description of achievements should be provided in the candidate's statement, which comes at the beginning of each of the areas of effort.

(2) A complete, up-to-date *curriculum vitae*.

(3) Documentation of the candidate's achievements in each of the performance areas, as assigned in the appointment letter, and, when applicable, modified in APPR documents, arranged in the order given under 5, below.

b. Items to be supplied by the department head:

(1) A description of the candidate's responsibilities.

(2) A copy of applicable appointment letter and any subsequent modifications to the appointment letter for the review period including assigned percentage of effort distribution in each area of effort (teaching, research/scholarship/ creative activity, service).

(3) Documentation of department and/or college's investments in the faculty member's professional development and/or service activities including conference and workshop travel support, course-load reductions, etc.

(4) Copies of all evaluations during the review period.

c. Documentation of excellence in assigned performance areas: Candidates for promotion must include in their promotion dossiers appropriate documentation of their achievements during the review period in their assigned performance areas only. The documentation must be compiled in the order given below.

d. Candidates for promotion with assigned responsibilities in teaching must provide the following, as applicable:

(1) Candidate's statement: The statement describes the candidate's teaching philosophy and practices, reflects on teaching ability and effectiveness, and includes the percentage of effort assigned to this category;

(2) Scheduled classes taught: A list of courses taught at UTK for each term or semester (including summer term). Include the following information: enrollment; percent effort for co-taught classes; identify honors courses; identify clinical assignments or other forms of direct student supervision, if appropriate.

(3) Quantitative end-of-course student surveys: A concise tabulation of results of end-of-course student surveys; candidates may provide a contextualization and interpretation of these data according to best practices for survey data analysis.

(4) Peer review of teaching reports: At least two formal peer review of teaching reports for promotion to the senior or associate ranks and one for promotion to the distinguished or professor ranks; and any other faculty input concerning 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 clinical or field assignments or advising. Internal letters about teaching effectiveness should be included in this section.

e. Optional indicators of excellence:

(1) Narrative end-of-course student survey materials: If a summary of student comments from end-of-course student surveys is included, the summary should be broadly representative of all the student comments received. These comments should be compiled by the department head from standard end-of-course student surveys;

(2) other evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., performance of students in subsequent courses, tangible results, and benefits of the candidate's work with students, samples of student-work);

(3) list of professional development activities related to teaching, advising, mentoring, including, but not limited to, the following examples:

(a) A record of participation in, and description of, teaching seminars and workshops (short description of activity with titles, dates, sponsor, etc.), including indication of role, e.g., student, invited participant, etc.;

(b) A list of papers presented at technical and professional meetings on education (meeting and paper titles, listed chronologically in standard bibliographic form) and indication of whether the candidate was the presenter, whether the paper was refereed, and whether the paper was invited;

(c) List of projects, grants, commissions, and contracts (date, title, agency, amount) relating to teaching;

(4) a description of advising or mentoring efforts and achievements, including service on student honors, thesis, or dissertation committees and supervision of student research;

(5) honors and awards received for teaching, advising, and mentoring;

(6) representative syllabus;

(7) evidence of course or curricular development work in assigned courses;

(8) evidence of pedagogical innovation in assigned courses;

(9) sample assignments, presentations slides, or course materials that demonstrate excellence in teaching the assigned courses.

f. Candidates with assigned responsibilities in Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity must provide the following, as applicable:

(1) Candidate's statement: The statement describes the candidate's research/scholarship/creative achievement approach and/or agenda and includes the percentage of effort assigned to this category;

(2) List of scholarly publications: Publications should be listed in standard bibliographic form, preferably with the earliest date first. Citations should include beginning and ending page numbers or total number of pages, where appropriate. For multiple-authored works, the contribution of the candidate should be clearly indicated (e.g., principal author, supervised person who authored the work, etc.). Publications should be grouped in the following categories and in the order given:

- Articles published in refereed journals;
- Books;
- Scholarly and/or creative activity published through a refereed electronic venue;
- Contributions to edited volumes;
- Papers published in refereed conference proceedings;
- Papers or extended abstracts published in conference proceedings (refereed on the basis of abstract);
- Articles published in popular press;
- Articles appearing in in-house organs;
- Research reports submitted to sponsors;
- Articles published in non-refereed journals;
- Manuscripts accepted for publication (include letters of acceptance at the end of this section);
- Manuscripts submitted for publication (include where and when submitted).

g. Creative activity: This section should document exhibitions, installations, productions, or publications of original works of architecture, dance, design, electronic media, film, journalism, landscape architecture, literature, music, theatre, and visual art. Performance of original dance, literary, musical visual arts, or theatrical works, or works from traditional and contemporary repertoires of the performing arts should be chronicled with critiques.

(1) Projects, grants, commissions, and contracts (date, title, agency, amount): These should be grouped in the following categories and in the order given:

- Completed;
- Funded and in progress;
- Under review.

(2) Papers presented at technical and professional meetings (meeting and paper titles, listed chronologically in standard bibliographic form); indication of whether the candidate was the presenter, whether the paper was refereed, and whether the paper was invited;

(3) Record of participation in, and description of, seminars and workshops (short description of activity, with titles, dates, sponsor, etc.); indication of role in seminar or workshop, e.g., student, invited participant, etc.; and

(4) Record of invitations to conduct workshops, master classes, seminars, etc. at other institutions.

(5) Optional indicators of excellence:

(a) other evidence of research or creative accomplishments (patents, new product development, international and intercultural expertise or experience, new art forms, new

computer software programs developed, notable citations and / or reviews of creative work or scholarship, etc.);

(b) honors or awards for research/scholarship/creative achievement;

(c) grants and contracts for instruction or for training programs, with an indication of the candidate's role in preparing and administering the grants and contracts; and

(d) list of professional development activities related to research/scholarship/creative achievement.

h. Candidates with assigned responsibilities in service must provide the following, as applicable:

(1) Candidate's statement: The statement describes the candidate's achievements in institutional, disciplinary, and/or professional service, and includes the percentage of effort assigned to this category.

(2) Service activities: The candidate provides a summary of his/her service record arranged according to the following categories:

(3) Institutional Service:

- Service to the department, including mentoring or coordinating GTAs for large-enrolling, multi-section classes, or other course coordination;
- Records of committee work and/or leadership at department, college, and university levels;
- Accounts of participation in university-wide governance bodies and related activities;
- Records of contributions to the university's programs, at home and abroad, to enhance equal opportunity, cultural diversity, and international and intercultural awareness.

(4) Disciplinary Service:

- Records of membership and/or leadership, and active participation in professional and learned societies related to the academic discipline (e.g., offices held, committee work, journal refereeing, and other responsibilities);
- A list of honors or awards for service activity within the academic discipline.

(5) Professional Service

- Records of service to public and private organizations or institutions in which the candidate uses their professional expertise;
- Accounts of service to governmental agencies at the international, federal, state, and local levels;
- Accounts of service to industry, e.g., training, workshops, consulting;
- Participation in community affairs as a representative of the university.

(6) Optional indicators of excellence: Honors or awards for service activity within the institution, discipline, and/or profession

- i. Documentation of excellence outside of assigned performance areas: NTTF whose appointments are entirely in one area may include optional indicators in non-assigned areas if that work can be shown to contribute to excellence in the assigned area.