

KEY: BLACK = EXISTING LANGUAGE
RED = NEW LANGUAGE
GREEN = LANGUAGE TAKEN DIRECTLY FROM MFE
BLUE: LANGAUGE TAKEN DIRECTLY FROM BT0006
CORRECTIONS SINCE APRIL SENATE MEETING

3.5 Joint Faculty and Intercampus Appointments

Joint Faculty appointments typically involve participation in the teaching and 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). Joint appointments with the Agricultural Experiment Station, the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources, and the Agricultural Extension Service 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 does 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 Intercampus academic appointments may also be ~~are sometimes~~ authorized when it appears that a faculty member in one department at one campus has expertise that qualifies him or her for participation in the work of a another department on the same or another campus, and when the other department has need of his or her services. The ~~definition~~ nature and extent of such interdepartmental or intercampus participation joint faculty appointments are is determined by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the heads, directors, or chairpersons 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 is normally 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); ~~tenure and salary~~ continues to be linked with the base or home department;
2. The head of the base department recommends the interdepartmental or intercampus Joint Faculty appointment to the head of the cooperating department, following informal discussion or negotiation;
3. The Joint Faculty appointment is made by the cooperating department with approvals by the dean, chief academic officer, and chancellor; and
4. 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.**

...

3.8 Faculty Review and Evaluation

3.8.1 Annual **Performance and Planning Review (APPR)** for All Faculty Members

~~Policies adopted by The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees~~ **Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure (BT0006)** require 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 ~~Section 3.8.1 of the *Faculty Handbook*, this manual, BT0006, this handbook, and collegiate or departmental~~ **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 ~~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~~ **the APPR** 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 *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 ~~handbook *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~~ **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 UTK/UTIA/UTSI – specific performance rating scale and the scale provided in the Board of Trustees Policies ~~Regarding~~ **Governing** Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure. 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 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 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.

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 Annual Review Improvement Plan, unless the performance rating triggers Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review. The Annual Review 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. (See section 3.8.5, below.)

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. (See section 3.8.5, below.)

3.8.1.2 Timetable for APPR

Each faculty member at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, ~~and the University of Tennessee Space Institute~~ 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 ~~such~~ 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 ~~or the University of Tennessee Space Institute~~, the **APPR Annual Review** side of the Faculty Annual Review Report attached at Appendix A to this manual (the “Annual Review Form”)

will be completed ~~at and transmitted from the faculty member's department~~ 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 ~~Annual Review Form~~ APPR will be completed in the spring semester of each academic year, as set forth in the Faculty Evaluation Calendar.

3.8.3 3.8.1.3 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~~ APPR described in Section 3.8.1, tenure-track faculty members receive an annual retention review. See ~~below~~, Section 3.11.3.

3.8.2 Procedures for the APPR

The department head manages the APPR process ~~of annual review of~~ 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 the appropriate appendix of this handbook.

3.8.2.1 No Ex Parte Communications During APPR Annual Review Process

The annual review process exists to provide fair, ~~and objective~~, and constructive feedback and relevant support to faculty members ~~on a regular and constructive basis~~. Accordingly, ~~the procedures for the annual review are designed to create and preserve specific lines of communication between faculty and administrators~~. As a means of preserving ~~this~~ the integrity of the process, until the APPR has been fully executed by the chief academic officer, ~~Annual Review Form has been returned to the faculty member by the Chief Academic Officer in accordance with Part II.B.9.~~, 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. ~~employed by the University, whether participating in or outside the review process, except as specified in the Faculty Handbook or this manual or as agreed between the faculty member and the department head~~. 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 ~~the Annual Review Form~~. 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, as provided for in the "BEST PRACTICES FOR FACULTY TO FACULTY MENTORING" in the ~~Resources Manual~~; (b) consulting with a University ombudsperson, (c) consulting with representatives of the Office of Equity and Diversity, or (d) pursuing possible rights of appeal available under Chapter 5 of ~~this handbook~~. ~~the Faculty 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" ~~or "falls far 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~~ Annual Review Form (as described in ~~Part II.B.9 of this manual~~). The faculty member has the responsibility of developing a written response for each area needing attention in the APPR ~~Annual Review Form~~,

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 the appropriate appendix to this handbook.

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 the appropriate appendix to this handbook. 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.

...

3.11.4 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, and the University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture 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 and UTIA 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 ~~Collegiate bylaws may also include~~ 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.

~~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.~~

Deans ~~shall~~ **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 ~~shall~~ **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.

3.11.5 Procedures for Consideration and Grant of Tenure

~~The University's procedures~~ Procedures for consideration and grant of tenure are contained in Appendix A of the *Board Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure*. ~~Policy on, and the specific Implementation of those procedures at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, is contained in this handbook~~ 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 **handbook** *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.

3.11.5.1 University Promotion and Tenure Review Procedures

A. Required review materials. Although the particular 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. ~~However, these materials must include the following items:~~

- 1) **Summary sheet.** ~~which summarizes the votes and recommendations in the case; A standard form is provided by the office of the chief academic officer to record basic data of the candidate's employment, eligibility for tenure and/or promotion review, and a summary of required votes and administrative recommendations.~~
- 2) **The dossier.** The dossier is ~~organized around~~ 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 **university campus** levels. ~~The dossier will contain factual information of the sort that appears in the curriculum vitae as well as evaluative information such as peer evaluations of teaching; statements, reports, summaries and recommendations generated by the peer committees and administrators involved in the review process, and summaries of teaching evaluations. A description of the materials required for each section and the order of their assembly is given in the appropriate appendix 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 (as applicable);
 - 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. ~~The department head assembles and prepares the portions of the dossier. 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 not containing evidence of self-assessment and peer reviews evaluations, in addition to student satisfaction summaries, evaluations, and the applicant's self-assessment of instructional practices will not be considered for promotion and 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. **Faculty member's review and signature statement.** Each faculty member shall sign a statement certifying that he/she has reviewed ~~these parts~~ **sections a through d** of the dossier ~~review~~ for accuracy and completeness ~~the factual and evaluative information contained in his or her dossier~~ 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 may be added by administrators only. See 3.11.5.1.A5) below; The faculty member External letters of assessment will be made available upon written request from the candidate.**
- f. **External letters of assessment.** ~~The department head manages the process of obtaining required external 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 who have conducted an assessment~~ **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 ~~institutions or aspirational peer institutions, in particular, from faculty employed at AAU 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 ~~must be able to furnish an objective evaluation of the candidate's work and~~ may not be former advisors, post-doctoral supervisors, or 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. ~~A reviewer's appearance on an academic panel or roundtable with the candidate or attendance at a symposium or conference with a candidate, taken alone, does not constitute a relationship with the candidate that could reduce objectivity.~~ 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), ~~Provost~~ **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 designate ~~should~~ 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:**

- i. The department head or designate, in consultation with departmental faculty, assembles a list of potential external evaluators;
 - ii. The department head or designate requests the names of potential evaluators from the candidate;
 - iii. The department head or designate also requests names of individuals the candidate wants excluded and the reasons for the exclusions;
 - iv. The department head or designate will normally solicit 8-10 letters. No more than half of the letters solicited ~~should~~ **may** come from the list suggested by the candidate;
 - v. The department head or designate 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;
 - vi. 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, ~~the date on which the letter was received,~~ **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 designate. All requests should be entered regardless of whether a response was obtained;
 - vii. The dossier will ~~normally~~ **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;**
 - viii. All letters solicited and received must be included in the dossier unless the ~~Office of Academic Affairs~~ **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 designate 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.

g. **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 ~~Faculty Annual Review Forms~~ Annual Performance and Planning Review (APPR) evaluative materials ~~from annual reviews~~ since the most recent promotion or tenure action will ~~normally~~ typically be included.
 - (2) For candidates for tenure only or for tenure and promotion, in addition to the APPR materials listed above, the ~~Annual Retention Review Forms~~ for materials from annual retention reviews during the probationary period ~~shall~~ will be included in the dossier
- 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* ~~is also forwarded with~~ 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 ~~through~~ by the department head or other administrator ~~or independently~~, 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 shall have the opportunity to reconsider their recommendation. The candidate for tenure and/or promotion shall 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 sections a through d, above; reviews and certifies that the information in a through d is complete and accurate by signing the statement that constitutes section e; and provides the department head with a list of potential external reviewers and those to be excluded from review.
- 2) **Department head:** The department head provides the material for sections f and g; 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.
- 3) **Dean:** Each collegiate dean shall ensure that faculty members in his or her college are informed about the dossier's ~~manner in which dossiers are prepared and the appropriate~~ required content and standard form ~~of dossiers~~.
- 4) **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. **Distribution of the dossier:** At least one set of review materials must be available for review in the department and the college. Materials forwarded to the chief academic officer for university campus review consist of the original and two copies of the dossier and two copies of the

curriculum vitae. Other documentation will be requested as needed by the chief academic officer. Instructions for the preparation of the dossier **can be found in the appropriate appendix to this handbook**, and sample forms are given in Appendix of this manual.

D. Levels of 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.

~~It is incumbent that consultation~~ **Consultation** among different levels of review levels, by committees and academic administrators, 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**. ~~For most academic units the~~

E. 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 university**. Each stage of review produces an **evaluative statement or recommendation** ~~Evaluative statements~~ assessing the candidate's case for tenure and/or promotion. **The statements and any responses become part of the dossier**. ~~shall be provided at the department, college, and university levels as described in Part III of this manual.~~

- 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 ~~of the university~~ will develop and state in ~~departmental~~ bylaws detailed review procedures, supplemental to and ~~consonant~~ **consistent** with general university procedures, ~~as guidelines for promotion and tenure~~. 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 ~~wish to~~ 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. ~~departments must have~~ Ballots ~~with~~ 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 ~~summarize~~ 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 and present a written recommendation and vote 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. ~~(On the organization and contents of the tenure and promotion dossier, see Part IV of this manual.)~~
- 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. ~~the Faculty 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 ~~or a college not organized into 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) **University Campus Review.** Review at the university campus level will involve similar but less detailed evaluations and, in addition, will provide an essential campus-wide perspective. University Campus-level review is based on criteria for

promotion and/or tenure as set forth in departmental and collegiate bylaws and **this handbook** ~~the *Faculty Handbook*~~.

- a. **Review of by the chief academic officer.** The chief academic officer shall 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.
 - (1) **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.
 - b. **Review by the chancellor:** ~~The chief academic officer reports his or her recommendation to the chancellor or vice president, who forwards it with a recommendation to the president of the university. The president forwards the recommendations of the campus to The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees.~~ 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. 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.