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

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 typical case, a faculty career begins with appointment as a tenure-track assistant professor with a probationary period of up to 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, during which the faculty member is evaluated for tenure and promotion to associate professor. 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, to extend the tenure review period beyond six years for reasons related to the faculty member’s care-giving responsibilities as described in the pertinent sections of this chapter of the handbook, below, 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.

3.8 Faculty Review and Evaluation

3.8.1 Annual Review for All Faculty Members

Every tenure-track and tenured faculty member at the University of Tennessee 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 Faculty Handbook, the Manual for...
Faculty Evaluation, and departmental bylaws;
2. establish new objectives for the coming year, as appropriate, using clearly understood standards that are consistent with this Faculty Handbook, the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, 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.

The review processes is established in Board Policy, the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, and departmental bylaws.

3.8.2 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 UTK/UTIA/UTSI – specific performance rating scale and the scale provided in the Board of Trustees Policies Regarding Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure. That articulation is necessary for application of certain policies and procedures (for example the Cumulative Performance Review process):

- A faculty member who receives an Overall performance rating of falls short or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank is required to submit an improvement plan.
- For purposes of Cumulative Performance Review, and 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 evaluation 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 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.

A faculty member with an Overall 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 either falls short or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank must collaborate with the Department Head on an Annual Review Improvement Plan 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.

3.8.3 Annual Retention Review for Tenure-Track Faculty Members

In addition to (and at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville and the University of Tennessee Space Institute, coincident with) the annual performance and planning review described in Section 3.8.1, tenure-track faculty members receive an annual retention review. See Section 3.11.3.

3.8.4 Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review for Tenured Faculty Members (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 Appendix 9 of this handbook.

3.8.5 Cumulative Performance Review for Tenured Faculty Members

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

3.11 Tenure

Board of Trustees policy governs tenure at the University of Tennessee. 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, Knoxville, is acquired only by positive action of the Board of Trustees, 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 shall 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.
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.

No faculty member shall be appointed initially with tenure except by positive action of the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the president and after review by the tenured faculty and department head, dean, and chief academic officer.

3.11.3 Probationary Period

3.11.3.1 Length of the Probationary Period

A tenure-track faculty member must serve a probationary period prior to being considered for tenure. The probationary period at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, shall be no less than one and no more than seven academic years; however, for good cause, the president, upon the recommendation of the chancellor, may approve a probationary period of less than one academic year. If a faculty member has served in a tenure-track appointment at another institution, his or her total probationary service may extend beyond seven years. (For example, a person who has served five years elsewhere may be given a four-year probationary period at UTK. Except as provided below with respect to extensions for good cause, the probationary period at UTK will not exceed seven years.) The original appointment letter shall state the length of the faculty member’s probationary period and the academic year in which he or she must be considered for tenure if he or she has met the minimum eligibility requirements for consideration. The stipulation in the original appointment letter of the length of the probationary period and the year of mandatory tenure consideration does not guarantee retention until that time.

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.

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 tenure-granting unit, 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 appropriate. The stipulation in the original appointment letter of the length of the probationary period and the year of mandatory tenure consideration does not guarantee retention until that time.
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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 stand 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.

3.11.3.2 Suspension of Probationary Period

The chief academic officer shall 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 under the UT Knoxville Family Care Policy

In general, the chief academic officer will not approve suspension for work that advances the faculty member’s record in teaching, research, or service. Probationary faculty should not be encouraged to engage in administrative work. The chief academic officer shall give the faculty member written notice of the decision concerning suspension of the probationary period.

3.11.3.3 Notice of Non-renewal

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

1. 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;
2. 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
3. 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, the University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture, and the University of Tennessee Space Institute. Credit for prior service with another campus or institution shall not be considered in determining the required notice. Notice of non-renewal shall be effective upon personal delivery or upon mailing, postage prepaid, to the faculty member’s residential address of record at the university.

3.11.3.4 Annual Retention Review

An annual retention review of tenure-track faculty is conducted by the department head in consultation with the tenured faculty during the fall semester (and at The University of
Tennessee, Knoxville and the University of Tennessee Space Institute, 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, the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, his or her appointment, and departmental bylaws. More information about annual retention reviews and procedures for annual retention reviews is contained in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation.

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 shall hold 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 3.11.3.5, below. Departmental bylaws shall provide for specific criteria for annual retention reviews of faculty, consistent with the standards and procedures set forth in this section 3.11.3.4 3.11.3.5 and the Manual for Faculty Evaluation and any criteria established by the department’s college.

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. The department head requests this summary in writing from each tenure-track faculty member on behalf of the tenured faculty at least two weeks before it is needed for the review. The Faculty Activity Report submitted to the department head for the APR may serve as the summary required under this paragraph. Faculty members may be required or permitted to submit other materials in accordance with collegiate and/or departmental bylaws. The department head shall make the materials prepared and submitted in accordance with this paragraph 3.11.3.4(3) available to the tenured faculty in advance of the meeting on retention.
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(4). Review by the tenured faculty. The tenured faculty will review the summary submitted by the faculty member and solicit input from the faculty member’s mentor or mentoring committee. The tenured faculty will then construct a narrative in accord with § 3.11.3.4a(4) above. The review and narrative should specifically address (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 shall rely on and include documented and substantiated information available to the tenured faculty at the time of the review and shall 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 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 shall 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 shall 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 shall 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 shall 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 shall 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 shall 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 3.11.3.3 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.

3.11.3.5 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 (with the year to be determined in the department head’s sole discretion).

For the ETTR, the faculty member shall 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 shall will be prepared by the faculty member as a preliminary draft of the faculty member’s file in support of a tenure dossier) shall will contain: the faculty member’s Faculty Activity Reports for each previous APPR, computer-tabulated teaching evaluations, and 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.
3.11.3.6 Right to Appeal

The faculty member may appeal the outcome of the retention review or the ETTR under the general appeals procedures outlined in Chapter 3 of the Faculty 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.

3.11.4 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. It is the responsibility of departments and colleges to define professional excellence in terms of their respective disciplines. Recommendations and best practice guidelines are contained in the UTK Manual for Faculty Evaluation. The relative weights of these factors will vary according to the fit between the faculty member and the mission of the academic unit in which he or she is appointed.

More specifically, at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 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 needs of the university’s programs. Faculty at UTK 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.

An academic unit may also establish more specific criteria for tenure in that unit. After approval by the dean and campus chief academic officer, these criteria for tenure shall be published in the bylaws of the academic unit. The tenure criteria for a department shall include and be consistent with the criteria stated in this policy and any criteria established by the department’s college and campus.

3.11.5 Procedures for Consideration and Grant of Tenure

Procedures for consideration and grant of tenure are contained in Appendix A of the Board Policy on Tenure, and the specific implementation of those procedures at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, is contained in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation.

Each department, school, or college must adopt bylaws concerning tenure consideration consistent with the procedures outlined in the University’s tenure policies, this Faculty Handbook, all superseding bylaws, and any remaining requirements in the campus Manual for Faculty Evaluation. 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.)

A written summary of the tenured faculty’s deliberation, in addition to a formal record of the vote, is required to help the department head understand positive and negative considerations for tenure and must be kept on file in accordance with university policies. Departments must have ballots with space for written comments on strengths and weaknesses along with space for recording the vote.

The vote of the tenured faculty is advisory to the department head. After making an independent judgment on the tenure candidacy, the head shall submit his or her recommendation simultaneously to the dean and to the tenure candidate with a written summary of his or her judgment. If the head’s recommendation differs from the recommendation of the tenured faculty, the summary must explain the reasons for the differing judgment, and the head must provide a copy of the summary to the tenured faculty. Tenured faculty, individually or collectively, may forward a report supporting or opposing the granting of tenure to the next level of administration.

3.11.6 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.