

**RESOLUTION FROM THE FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
OF THE FACULTY SENATE
PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION AT A MEETING OF THE
FACULTY SENATE TO BE HELD ON
April 8, 2013**

WHEREAS, under Article III, Section 2.G. of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate “is responsible for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Faculty Handbook* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*,” and for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*,” and

WHEREAS, there is currently no formal procedure in place to periodically review and reward outstanding performance by professors; and

WHEREAS, the University would like to be able to reward senior faculty who hold the rank of professor for outstanding performance and provide them with an incentive to continue their high levels of achievement; and

WHEREAS, the ability to provide such a reward should aid the University in retaining our best senior faculty by helping to make their salaries competitive with those offered by our peer, target, and aspirational groups as identified in the University’s strategic plan; and

WHEREAS, under Section 8.3 of the *Faculty Handbook*, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee “is responsible for recommending changes, which should have input from the chancellor, the vice president, and their administrative staff including deans for consideration by the Faculty Senate Executive Council and final consideration by the full Faculty Senate;” and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed —and sought (i) input from the chancellors of UTK and UTIA and (ii) consideration by the Faculty Senate Executive Council on— the various sections of the *Faculty Handbook* and the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* related to this issue; now, therefore it is

RESOLVED, that the language in the *Faculty Handbook* and the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* be changed as follows to implement a performance incentive plan for professors:

New language = underlined
Deleted language = ~~strikethrough~~

Changes to the Faculty Handbook:

3.0 BOARD OF TRUSTEES POLICY

The Board of Trustees *Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure*, adopted in 1998, and all subsequent amendments, govern appointment, evaluation, promotion, tenure, and review for all tenure-track and tenured faculty members. The following sections are intended as a general

summary of those areas. In the event of any conflict or inconsistency between board policy and this handbook, board policy will control.

This chapter concerns the academic status of tenure-track and tenured faculty. In the normal case, a faculty career begins with appointment as a tenure-track assistant professor for a period of up to six years, during which the faculty member is evaluated for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Faculty may apply to extend the tenure review period beyond six years for reasons related to the faculty member's care-giving responsibilities as described in Chapter 6.41 and the *Knoxville Family Care Policy*. Requests for extensions should be made prior to the final year of review. Tenured associate professors may be promoted to ~~full~~-professor after at least five years at the rank of associate. All faculty members are expected to achieve a sufficient level of accomplishment in teaching, research / scholarship / creative activity, and service to merit promotion to ~~full~~-professor. Throughout this career path, all faculty members have annual reviews and appropriate reviews for promotion and tenure.

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 or director 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.

3.9.1 Performance Incentive Plan for Professors

This plan establishes a review procedure to provide a salary increment to eligible professors who have demonstrated consistently outstanding performance in at least two of the three evaluation categories: Teaching, Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity, and Service. The purpose is to reward senior faculty who hold the rank of professor for outstanding performance and to provide an incentive to continue their high levels of achievement as well as to aid in the retention of senior faculty by making their salaries more competitive with peer, target and aspirational groups. This plan is not intended to be an entitlement available to all professors who have served the required minimum time in rank. Any salary increment is to be awarded only after thorough and substantive review. Eligibility and the review procedure are detailed in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*.

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 five years in rank before promotion to ~~full~~-professor. Exceptions to this policy require approval by the chief academic officer.

Changes to the Manual for Faculty Evaluation

III.A.4.b. Associate professors serve at least five years in rank before promotion to ~~full~~ professor. Exceptions to this policy require approval by the chief academic officer.

PART VII – Performance Incentive Plan for Professors

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

The University of Tennessee’s Performance Incentive Plan for Professors is designed to recognize and reward faculty members who hold the rank of professor and whose performance has been consistently outstanding since their promotion to this rank or since their last review under this plan. The plan will provide a salary increment to eligible professors who have demonstrated consistently outstanding performance in at least two of the three evaluation categories of “Teaching,” “Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity,” and “Service” during the current seven-year review period.

The Performance Incentive Plan for Professors aims to reward senior faculty who hold the rank of professor for outstanding performance; to provide them with an incentive to continue their high levels of achievement; and to aid retention of our best senior faculty by making their salaries more competitive with those offered by our peer, target, and aspirational groups. This plan is not intended to be an entitlement available to all professors who have served the required minimum time in rank. Any salary increments are to be awarded only after thorough and substantive review.

Implementation and continuation of this plan are contingent upon availability of funding. Any raises awarded through this plan will be a percentage of nine-month base salary (that is, exclusive of any administrative or other salary supplements).

B. ELIGIBILITY Eligibility for consideration of a salary increment under the Performance Incentive Plan for Professors shall be subject to the following minimum criteria:

1. A regular, full-time faculty member appointed at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, to the rank of professor will be eligible typically for a performance incentive review during the seventh year of creditable service since appointment to that rank and every seventh year or creditable service thereafter.
2. Administrators below the level of associate deans (e.g., department heads and school directors) who also hold the title of professor are eligible for consideration under this plan.
3. A professor who has received a raise that was not a result of an allotment from the regular, annual merit pool (i.e., a raise outside of the regular annual review process) since promotion to current rank or since the last review under this plan typically will be eligible during the seventh year of creditable service after the raise took effect.
4. A faculty member is not required to be considered for review under this plan and may wait longer than seven years to request such a review. In no case, however, will the

dossier cover more than the seven years of creditable service immediately prior to the date of application.

5. A faculty member whose application for a salary increment under this plan is denied by the chief academic officer may not resubmit an application until the beginning of the second year following the denial.

C. REVIEW PROCEDURE Professors who wish to be considered for review under this plan will notify the department head during the academic year prior to the review. Faculty members should be prepared to show that their record of accomplishments for the review period has been consistently outstanding, as specified in the plan and according to all applicable criteria. At the beginning of the academic year in which a review will occur, the department head and the college dean will review the list of all faculty members eligible for review in order to assure that all eligible faculty members are given appropriate consideration.

1. **The Review Period.** The period of review will comprise the previous seven years of creditable service to The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Professional activity and accomplishments older than seven years will not be included in the review.
2. **Levels of Review:**
 - a. **For faculty members,** the review process has three sequential levels. Evaluative statements assessing the professor's case for salary increment are provided at the department, college, and campus levels. The departmental review consists of a review by the department head (as stipulated in Section 3 below). The college review will include a peer review by a college committee and a review by the dean (Section 4). The chief academic officer will perform the campus review (Section 5).
 - b. **For department heads and school directors,** there are two sequential levels, with no departmental review. To avoid conflict of interest, department heads and school directors may be recommended for consideration under this plan only with approval of the supervising dean.
3. **Department procedures.** Each department will create criteria for judging whether a faculty member has met departmental expectations for being awarded a salary increment. Departmental criteria must be made known to prospective and current faculty members through inclusion in the unit's bylaws, should reflect the organizational arrangements of each department, and be consistent with the bylaws of the college and applicable policies in the *Faculty Handbook*.
 - a. **The department head's review.** The department head conducts a review of the professor's case for salary increase. The review is to be based on an evaluation of materials in the dossier. The department head prepares a letter that addresses the professor's performance during the previous seven years. The department head's letter must be made available to the professor.
 - b. **Right of the faculty member to respond.** The faculty member may prepare a written response to the department head's recommendation. The faculty member's response becomes part of the dossier and must be available to the department head, the college review committee, the dean, and the chief academic officer.

4. **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 but not limited to criteria for performance at the professor rank as set forth in departmental and collegiate bylaws and the *Faculty Handbook*. Colleges may create additional criteria for the salary increment award. Such criteria should be made known to prospective and current faculty members through inclusion in the unit's bylaws, should reflect the organizational arrangements of each college, and should be consistent with applicable policies in the *Faculty Handbook*.
 - a. **The college review committee.** Colleges may choose to use their promotion review committees to review dossiers submitted under this plan. If a college wishes to create a separate committee to review applications under this plan, it must establish a mechanism in its bylaws for forming a committee to review all dossiers submitted under this plan.
 - i. The review committee shall consist of professors only. If a college chooses to use its promotion review committee to review dossiers submitted under this plan then the dean will appoint replacement faculty at the professor rank for any associate professors on the college promotion review committee.
 - ii. 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.
 - iii. The college review committee shall prepare a summary of its recommendation for each professor 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.
 - iv. A college with a small number of departments or a college not organized into departments may follow the same procedure that has been established for promotion and tenure.
 - b. **The dean's review.** The dean of the college shall prepare a letter providing an independent recommendation based on his or her review and evaluation of the materials in the dossier. The dean's letter becomes part of the dossier.
5. **University Review.** Review at the campus level will involve similar but less detailed evaluations and, in addition, will provide an essential campus-wide perspective.
 - a. **Review by the chief academic officer.** The chief academic officer shall review each dossier and prepare a letter providing an independent recommendation based on his or her review and evaluation of the materials in the dossier. The chief academic officer's letter becomes part of the dossier. The chief academic officer reports his or her recommendation to the chancellor, whose decision is final.
6. **Right of Appeal:** Eligible faculty members who undergo review have a right to appeal the final decision, as stipulated in Chapter 5 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

D. DOSSIER

1. **Materials required:** The particular materials required for adequate review of a faculty member's activities in teaching, research/creative achievement/scholarship, and service at the departmental, collegiate, and university levels may vary with the academic discipline. However, the dossier for the Performance Incentive Plan for Professors will include at least the following items:

- a. The *curriculum vitae*. A complete and up-to-date *curriculum vitae*;
- b. Statement of contributions. A statement of no more than two pages summarizing significant contributions and highlighting outstanding accomplishments during the last seven years;
- c. Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity: A comprehensive listing of all accomplishments in this category for the last seven years;
- d. Teaching:
 - i. A table listing courses taught and SAIS results for those courses;
 - ii. At least one peer review of teaching;
 - iii. Where applicable, evidence of graduate teaching, mentoring, and supervision of master's and Ph.D. students.
- e. Service: A comprehensive listing of all accomplishments in this category for the last seven years;
- f. Faculty Annual Reviews. In collaboration with the department head the applicant will assemble copies of annual reviews for the last seven years, including all narrative evaluations.