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Purpose of Workshop

I. Review Board policy
II. Review and discuss criteria
III. Review procedures
   a. Preparation
   b. Dossier assembly
   c. Evaluation workflow
I. Policy—Board of Trustees

- “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.”

  - “Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibilities, and Tenure” (emphasis added)

  - [http://policy.tennessee.edu/bot_policy/bt0006/](http://policy.tennessee.edu/bot_policy/bt0006/)
II. Criteria—Board of Trustees

“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, research, and service including the faculty member's ability to interact appropriately with colleagues and students. 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.”
“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.”

§ 3.11.4
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. § 3.11.4
Criteria—The Drill Down

- College of Engineering Criteria
- College of Arts & Sciences Criteria
- Take away—Criteria vary from college to college and from unit to unit. Since the burden of proof is on the faculty member, the burden of knowing what constitutes proof is as well.
Criteria—Keywords & Phrases

- Excellence in contributions
- Substantial contributions
- Independence from mentors
- Evidence that excellence will continue
- Recognition from the discipline
- Ranking among peers
- Meeting the department’s needs
Criteria—Sample letter to external reviewers

- a frank appraisal of:
  - (1) his/her research abilities and creative achievements, including papers given at scholarly meetings;
  - (2) the quality of his/her publications or other creative work;
  - (3) his/her reputation or standing in the field;
  - (4) his/her potential for further growth and achievement;
  - (5) and whether he/she would be ranked among the most capable and promising scholars in his/her area.

- It would also be particularly helpful to us in our deliberations if you could rate Dr. ______________'s contributions in comparison with others you have known at the same stage of professional development.
III. Procedure—Timing to Tenure

- **Length of probationary period established by appointment letter**—uniform period of 7 years, with review occurring no later than year 6

- **Early consideration**
  - Requires approval at all levels
  - Begins with request from department head to dean

- **Extensions**
  - Requires official action as a result of faculty and family care policy, procedural error, or other issues
Timing—Associate to Full

- Typically, five years should pass between promotion to associate and promotion to full professor.
- With sufficient justification and consultation with department head, interval can be shortened.
- Review process focuses primarily on work completed since promotion to associate professor.
Procedure: Preparation

1. Acquaint yourself with dossier requirements early, but no later than enhanced retention review (4th) year
   - Provost’s Website

2. Schedule peer evaluation of teaching
   - First evaluation should be in 3rd semester
   - Second evaluation no later than spring semester before tenure year
Procedure: Preparation

3. Begin draft of candidate statements on teaching and scholarship.

4. Meet with supervisor in spring before tenure year to discuss list of external reviewers.
Interlude—Rules on External Letters

- Reviewers must be able to give objective, “arms-length” assessment of candidate’s scholarly or creative output.
- Must be above the rank of the person being reviewed.
- Should be prominent in field and from peer institution.
- Department Head must ask request letters from at least eight scholars.
- No more than half of those asked can come from candidate’s list.
- Dossier must have five letters.
- Department head’s responsibility to make sure that the requirements are met.
5. **Dossier assembly: Candidate**
   - Section A: Education & Employment History, Responsibilities, Criteria Statements, English certification
   - Section B: Evidence of Excellence in Teaching
   - Section C: Evidence of Excellence in Scholarship
   - Section D: Evidence of Excellence in Service
   - Section E. Candidate Signature

Each section is begun with a statement and continued with a list of appropriate documents
Procedure—Preparation

6. Dossier assembly—Department Head
   – Section F: External reviewers
   – Section G: Evaluative Documents
     • Retention Reviews (forms and narratives)
     • Annual Reviews (forms and narratives)
     • Tenure and Promotion evaluations

Although the candidate is expected to provide reliable information, the department head is responsible for seeing that the dossier is presented in good form, as required by the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*
Digression

- Can I read the letters from the external reviewers?
  - Yes – because Tennessee has an open records law

- Should I read the letters from external reviewers?
  - No – unless you are considering a response to any part of the process, leave the letters be
Procedure: Flow of Evaluation

Departmental review committee (November)

Department head (December)

Dissenting statements

Candidate notified and has two weeks to respond
Procedure: Flow of Evaluation

College Promotion and Tenure Committee (January)

Dean (February)

Candidate notified and has two weeks to respond
Procedure: Flow of Evaluation

1. Provost (Late April)
2. Candidate notified and has two weeks to respond
3. Chancellor (May)
4. Vice President for Academic Affairs (Mid May)
5. Board of Trustees (Last week of June)
Questions?