



FACULTY SENATE

A204 GEB October 9th, 2018 4:00 PM

Recording available: <https://mediaserver.uthsc.edu/uthscms/Catalog/catalogs/tflorence-2018>

Present: Kristen Bettin, Bill Callahan III, Shawna Clark, Beth Choby, MaryAnn Clark, Dawson Colvert, Terry Cooper, Martin Donaldson, Ioannis Dragatsis, Tammam ElAbiad, Meiyun Fan, Lori Gonzalez, David Hamilton, Peg Hartig, Carrie Harvey, Penny Head, Michael Herr II, Uzoma Ibeguogu, Vinay Jain, Robert Jean, Vickie Jones, Vijay Joshi, James W. Kennedy, Santosh Kumar, Roberto Lachica, Mack Land, Jennifer Langford, Chris Ledbetter, Sam Li, Carol Likens, Sharon Little, Tao Lowe, Nawajes Mandal, Jillian McCarthy Maeder, Tracy McClinton, Elisha McCoy, Megan Mulligan, Dayna Myers, Frank Park, James Pledger II, Laura Reed, Phyllis Richey, Nadeem Shafi, Christina Spivey, Wen Lin Sun, Fridtjof Thomas, Kirtikumar Upadhyay, Wes Williamson, and Thad Wilson

Absent: Shiva Bohn, Jami Brown, George Cook, Ricketta Clark, Wanda Claro-Woodruff, Cathy Crill, William Dabbs, Alicia Diaz-Thomas, Molly Erickson, Peter Fischer, Amado Freier, Bruce Hamilton, Lekha George, Oscar Grandas, Kenneth Hohmeier, Colin Howden, Jerry Jones Jr., Rajesh Kabra, Rafal Kedzierski, Csaba Kovessy, Ramesh Krishnan, Aneel Kumar, Sajeesh Kumar, Roberto Levi-D'Ancona, Morgan Lisner, Mike McDonald, Myra Meekins, Linda Moses-Simmons, Edwards Park, Debendra Pattanaik, Jeff Phebus, Ranjit Philip, Fruz Pourmotabbed, R.K. Rao, Shaun Rowe, Cindy Russell, Duane Schafer, Reese Scroggs, Jackie Sharp, Anthony Sheyn, Richard Smith, Helmut Steinburg, Michelle Surbrook, Jeffery Towbin, Kwame Torgbe, , Jason Vanatta, Gregory Vidal, Regan Williams, and Yanhui Zhang.

Meeting called to order at 1600 hours CST.

A. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of the September 11, 2018 meeting were approved unanimously

B. Announcements

1. President-Elect remarks – President-Elect presided over the meeting.
2. Committee Reports – none.
2. New Taskforce on UTHSC Non-tenure track positions - Meeting 10:30 a.m. Room 230 Library, Wednesday, October 9, 2018.

C. Guest Speaker – Mr. Tony Ferrara, Vice Chancellor of Finances

1. Presentation on the State of the UTHSC Budget available on the Mediasite recording.
2. Questions –
 - Statistical support for the Research office did not make it into the budget this year and further clarification was requested. Answer: Statistical support is being allocated through a different channel within the Research office.
 - Commercial Appeal posted faculty salaries again and inquiry was made as to whether the salaries were representative of the 2018-2019 academic year. Answer: Yes.
 - Market value faculty adjustment “placeholder” for results of the Faculty Salary Survey. Dean’s raised concerns that salaries are below the market, therefore the “placeholder” input to address the issue.

*Please see PowerPoint available on Blackboard for full details.

D. New Business

1. Voting on Campus Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Review:

Concern raised that the evaluation process for faculty and administrators is not equitable. Stated that faculty undergo more intensive reviews and stricter repercussions if goals and standards are not met. Discussed need for developing more rigorous guidelines for Chairs and Deans who do not perform adequately on their performance reviews to make the process more equitable among faculty and administrators. Senate members and faculty were encouraged to continue evaluating administrators on the Upward Evaluation.

Action taken:

- Voted on the template for Campus Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Review. Results: Total of 37 responses (33 in-person and 4 online) - 85% voted in favor 12% abstain, and 3% voted against. See Appendix A.
- ##### 2. Voting on Templates for Early Tenure Review Process

Action taken: Voted on the Early Tenure Request Process Added to the Faculty Handbook. Results: Total of 43 responses (39 in-person and 4 online) - 95% voted in favor, 3% voted against, and 3% abstained. See Appendix B.

- Old Business – None.
- Next full Faculty Senate meeting: November 12, 2018 from 4-5 p.m. in GEB A204.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 1652 hours CST.

Respectfully submitted,

Jami E. Flick, MS, OTR/L

Faculty Senate Secretary

TEMPLATE

CAMPUS PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC POST-TENURE PERFORMANCE REVIEW

I. Introduction

In its Policies on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure (Board Policy BT0006), the Board of Trustees has recognized and affirmed the importance of tenure in protecting academic freedom and thus promoting the University's principal mission of discovery and dissemination of truth through teaching, research, and service. The Board has also recognized its fiduciary responsibility to students, parents, and all citizens of Tennessee to ensure that faculty members effectively serve the needs of students and the University throughout their careers. To implement these principles, [The University of Tennessee Health Science Center \(UTHSC\)](#), with the approval of the President and the Board, has established these procedures under which every tenured faculty member shall receive a comprehensive performance review no less often than every six (6) years.

II. Post-Tenure Review ("PTR") Period

Except as otherwise provided in these procedures, each tenured faculty member must undergo ~~some form of~~ comprehensive performance review as described below no less often than every six (6) years. The PTR shall not substitute for the Annual Performance and Planning Review in the year a faculty member is scheduled for PTR.

The chief academic officer shall develop, and submit to the dean of each college for ~~approval~~ review, an initial plan for staggering post-tenure reviews to avoid excessive administrative burden at any given time. The initial staggering plan may be revised ~~with by~~ the ~~approval of the~~ chief academic officer if later developments require changes in order to avoid excessive administrative burden. Selection of faculty members to undergo review in any given year shall be determined during the first six (6) years by an annual random selection procedure to be conducted by the chief academic officer with participation of the Faculty Senate in order to select each year an approximately equal number of faculty members meeting the criteria for undergoing PTR.

The post-tenure review period begins at the granting of tenure, and, except as otherwise provided by the staggering plan, a faculty member's PTR will occur no less often than every six (6) years thereafter unless one of the following circumstances results in a different timetable:

1. Suspension of post-tenure review period – A faculty member's post-tenure review period is suspended during any year in which the faculty member is granted a leave of absence or a modified duties assignment.
2. Restarting of post-tenure review period due to alternative comprehensive review – A comprehensive review of a faculty member's performance restarts the faculty member's PTR period under the following circumstances:
 - a. If a tenured faculty member undergoes a successful promotion review or a promotion is in progress during the year scheduled for PTR, the promotion review fulfills the PTR requirement and the PTR period is modified to require PTR six (6) years after the promotion review.

- b. If a tenured faculty member undergoes an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR) (generally triggered by annual performance review rating(s)) and is either rated as meeting expectations or successfully completes the terms of the EPPR improvement plan, the EPPR process fulfills the PTR requirement and the PTR cycle is modified to begin with the date of the EPPR committee's report.
3. Start of the PTR period upon conclusion of an administrative appointment – Full time administrators and faculty members with a majority administrative appointment (more than 50%) are not subject to PTR; faculty members holding a less than majority administrative appointment (50% or less) are subject to PTR regarding their faculty duties based on expectations consistent with their faculty duty allocation. When a full-time or majority-time administrator leaves his or her administrative position to assume a tenured faculty position, the faculty member's initial PTR shall occur within six (6) years after leaving the administrative post.
4. Exception of the scheduled PTR for retirement - A faculty member who has made a binding commitment to retire within the next twelve (12) months and whose retirement date has been accepted by UTHSC will be exempted from a PTR if the PTR is scheduled in the year during which their retirement is to take place. Should the faculty member's retirement be renegotiated with the approval of UTHSC, the faculty member's originally scheduled PTR will take place during the next cycle of PTR reviews.
5. A faculty member's scheduled PTR may be otherwise deferred or modified only for good cause approved by the chief academic officer.

III. Annual Schedule for Post-Tenure Review

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

1. The chief academic officer shall appoint all PTR Committees as set forth in Section IV below no later than mid-August.
2. Each PTR Committee shall be provided with the materials required by Section V below no later than September 1.
- ~~2.~~3. When external reviews are necessary, identification of the evaluator should take no more than fourteen (14) days and there should be no more than four (4) weeks between the request to the evaluator and the evaluator's decision.
4. Each PTR Committee shall submit its report required by Section VII below no later than March 1. Section XI provides a timeline for conducting the PTR, indicating the steps in the process, typical timing of each step, as well as additional timelines if external review materials are required or if a PTR improvement plan is required.

IV. Appointment and Composition of Post-Tenure Review Committee

A. Appointment of the PTR Committee

All post-tenure reviews must be conducted by a committee established for the sole purpose of post-tenure review. Each PTR Committee shall include three (3) members, appointed by the chief academic officer in the following manner:

1. In the case of departments with formally recognized divisions, the division serves as the organizing unit.
2. The faculty member under review nominates three (3) committee members: one (1) from within division/department and two (2) from outside division/department. The department chair, in consultation with the division chief and dean, nominates six (6), two (2) from within the division/department and four (4) from outside the division/department (either in the college or outside the college).
3. The faculty member can ask that one (1) of the nominees from the chair's list be removed.
4. Nominations will be forwarded to the chief academic officer for selection.
5. One (1) of the three (3) committee members must be from the faculty member's list of nominees.
6. To prevent conflict of interest in decision-making due to factors of kinship among employees, no faculty members who are relatives as defined in the HR0115: Employment of Relatives policy will be placed on the PTR Committee of the faculty member under review.

B. Composition of the PTR Committee

The composition of the PTR Committee must meet the following requirements:

1. Each PTR Committee member must be a tenured full-time faculty member who is at the same or higher academic rank, and whose locus of tenure is at ~~the same campus~~ UTHSC, as the faculty member being reviewed.
2. Committee members shall have sufficient expertise in the field of and/or similarity of activities to those of the faculty member whose progress is being evaluated.
3. For faculty members undergoing PTR who are in departments without recognized divisions, one (1), and only one (1), PTR Committee member must hold an appointment in the same department as the faculty member being reviewed, unless there is no such faculty member eligible to serve, in which case the choice defaults to the college. For faculty members undergoing PTR who are in departments organized into recognized divisions, one (1), and only one (1), PTR Committee member must hold an appointment in the same division as the faculty member being reviewed, unless there is no such faculty member eligible to serve, in which case the choice defaults to the department; provided that no other PTR Committee members may hold an appointment in the same division.
4. At least one (1) PTR Committee member must hold an appointment in a different ~~division or~~ division/department from the faculty member being reviewed, but from the same college. For purposes of PTR Committee membership, College of Medicine basic science and clinical departments are considered as different colleges.
5. The final PTR Committee member may hold an appointment in a different college from the faculty member being reviewed or, if in the same college, must hold an appointment in a different department from the faculty member being reviewed.

The chief academic officer, working with the University of Tennessee Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success, will provide instructions, guidelines, and best practices to members of PTR Committees.

Members of the PTR Committee will select their committee's chair. The chair of the PTR Committee will (1) ensure adherence to the timeline for the PTR Committee's work; (2) draft the initial report of the PTR Committee, using a standardized template; (3) edit, distribute, revise and obtain Committee approval of the PTR Committee's report; and (4) serve as the official communicator of the PTR Committee with the chief academic officer. In the event that an external review is deemed necessary or requested, the chair of the PTR Committee will be responsible for managing this process.

V. Materials to be Reviewed by Post-Tenure Review Committee

A. Materials to be Reviewed by the PTR Committee

The PTR Committee must review:

1. annual review materials (including the division chief's and/or department chair's evaluation(s) and rating(s) of the faculty member's performance, and student and any peer evaluation of teaching) for each year of the last six (6) years or since the last PTR review (to be supplied by the division chief and/or department chair);
2. the faculty member's current CV; a narrative, not to exceed two (2) pages, prepared by the faculty member describing the faculty member's milestone achievements and accomplishments for each of the last six (6) years or since the last PTR review as well as goals for the next PTR review period; and (if there has been a previous PTR) a copy of the narrative submitted as a part of the faculty member's previous PTR (each to be supplied by the faculty member); and
- ~~1-3.~~ external reviews when deemed necessary by the PTR Committee or the chief academic officer, or when requested by the faculty member undergoing PTR.

B. Procedures and Approvals for External Reviews

External review may be requested by any member of the PTR Committee, chief academic officer or by the faculty member undergoing PTR. Typically, an external review is requested when sufficient expertise is lacking among the members of the PTR Committee to make an appropriate judgment as to whether the performance of the faculty member undergoing PTR satisfies the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank. In the rare instance that external reviews are deemed necessary or requested, the following procedures will apply.

Qualifications of external evaluators include the following:

1. External evaluators are individuals who are not employed by or affiliated with UTHSC or UTHSC's affiliated institutions.
2. External evaluators should be distinguished individuals in the faculty member's field who are in a position to provide an assessment of the faculty member's continued professional growth and productivity based on the materials provided in V.A. (above).
3. External evaluators must themselves hold tenure if offered at their institution or the equivalent if tenure is not offered.
4. External evaluators must be at or above the faculty member's current rank (or equivalent).
5. External evaluators should not hold any conflict of interest, as defined in the National Institutes of Health (NIH) definition of conflict of interest, or who would be in any professional or personal relationship with the faculty member that could reduce objectivity. In cases where conflict of interest is raised, the chief academic officer will make the final determination as to the external evaluator's appropriateness.
6. Whenever possible, external evaluators should be individuals (a) at UTHSC's comparable or aspirational peer institutions or (b) from an outside institution similar to UTHSC (e.g., academic health science center or research-intensive institution).

External evaluators are to be identified by mutual agreement of the faculty member undergoing PTR and the chair of the PTR Committee. The faculty member and chair of the PTR Committee independently identify three (3) prospective external evaluators and exchange their lists with each other. Within five (5) days the faculty member and PTR Committee chair should agree on a priority ranking of three (3) evaluators, allowing for options in obtaining an external review if the top ranked evaluator is unable to participate in the appropriate time frame (four [4] weeks). If the faculty member and PTR Committee chair cannot agree, within five (5) days, upon receiving the reasoning for/against each potential evaluator, the

chief academic officer will decide the disposition of the issue by selecting one (1) of the six (6) prospective external evaluators from the identified lists.

The chair of the PTR Committee solicits the external review, using the following guidance. A standard form letter must be used for all external review requests.

1. Materials to be sent to external evaluators:
 - a. Required materials submitted by the division chief (if relevant) and/or department chair
 - b. Required materials submitted by the faculty member
 - c. UTHSC Faculty Handbook statements about PTR and, if available/developed, college and (if present) departmental bylaws about PTR
2. General information to provide to external evaluators in the request for evaluation:
 - a. Faculty member's name
 - b. Description of the PTR process
 - c. The external evaluator will be asked to review the materials submitted (see item #1 above) and conclude that the faculty member's performance (a) satisfies the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and rank or (b) does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member's discipline, rank, effort distribution, and expectations listed in the annual reviews provided. The external evaluator will also be asked to provide a one-paragraph explanation of his or her conclusion.
 - d. Request for evaluator to state the nature of any association with the faculty member
 - e. Request for the evaluator's letter to be submitted on institutional letterhead with the evaluator's signature that includes rank as well as tenure status
 - f. Date when the letter must be received
 - g. Thank you
3. External reviews should be addressed to the PTR Committee chair who requested the review.
4. Letters should be submitted via email.
5. Any letters solicited and received must be included in the PTR Committee's report.

VI. Criteria for Post-Tenure Review

The post-tenure review process should ensure the faculty member has demonstrated continued professional growth and productivity in the areas of teaching, research (including ~~scholarly~~, creative and ~~artistic work~~ other scholarly activities), service, and/or clinical care pertinent to his or her faculty responsibilities. The criteria for assessing the faculty member's performance must be consistent with established expectations of the division, department, and school/college, ~~and campus~~ and provide sufficient flexibility to consider changes in academic responsibilities and/or expectations. The expectations for faculty performance may differ by ~~campus~~, college, department, and even among sub-disciplines within a department or program. Those expectations may be commonly-held standards in the discipline or sub-discipline. Those expectations may be stated explicitly in the faculty member's own six (6) past annual performance reviews, work assignments, goals or other planning tools (however identified), as well as department or college bylaws, the ~~campus~~-UTHSC faculty handbook, this policy, and in other generally-applicable policies and procedures (for example, fiscal, human resources, safety, research, or information technology policies and procedures).

VII. Post-Tenure Review Committee's Conclusions and Report

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

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

The PTR Committee must conclude for the annual reviews either:

- That the faculty member's six (6) annual performance reviews satisfy the expectations of being reasonable, fair, accurate and high quality.
- That the faculty member's six (6) annual performance reviews do not satisfy the expectations of being reasonable, fair, accurate and high quality.

The committee must report its conclusions, the supporting reasons for the conclusions, and recommendations in writing using a standard format prepared by the chief academic officer, including (1) an enumeration of the anonymously cast vote, (2) the supporting reasons for its conclusion, (3) a dissenting explanation for any conclusion that is not adopted unanimously if a dissenting member chooses to provide one, (4) an identification of any incongruences observed between the faculty member's performance and his or her annual evaluations, (5) a statement of any additional concerns identified or actions recommended, and (6) if applicable, an identification of areas of extraordinary contribution and/or performance.

The detailed PTR Committee report shall be provided to the faculty member, division chief, department chair, dean, and chief academic officer.

The faculty member under review, his or her division chief, department chair, and dean must have the opportunity to provide a written response to the PTR Committee report. These responses must be submitted to the chief academic officer with copies to the faculty member, the division chief, department chair, dean, and Committee. The chief academic officer shall either accept or reject the PTR Committee's determination that the faculty member's performance satisfies or does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank. Additionally, the chief academic officer shall either accept or reject the PTR Committee's determination that annual performance reviews satisfy or do not satisfy the expectations for the conduct of reasonable, fair, accurate and high quality reviews. The Chancellor shall indicate in writing whether or not he or she concurs in the chief academic officer's determination. If the PTR Committee report is not unanimous, the chief academic officer shall provide the supporting reasons for his or her determination. If the chief academic officer or the Chancellor do not concur in a determination, then he or she shall provide the supporting reasons for the non-concurrence. The chief academic officer's determination, the Chancellor's concurrence, and any written

responses of the faculty member, [division chief](#), department chair and the dean will be maintained with the PTR Committee report in [the official faculty file located in the chief academic officer's office](#) and, [upon request](#), submitted electronically to the University of Tennessee Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success.

VIII. Appeal

Within thirty [\(30\)](#) days of receipt of the PTR Committee report, the faculty member may appeal any conclusion with which the faculty member disagrees. The procedure for appeal is described in [Section 7 of the UTHSC Faculty Handbook](#), except that a final decision on the appeal shall be made within ninety (90) days of the faculty member's appeal, and the final decision of the Chancellor on an appeal shall not be appealable to the President.

IX. Further Actions

If the PTR Committee concludes that the faculty member's performance has not satisfied the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and rank, a PTR improvement plan must be developed using the same procedures used for the development of an EPPR improvement plan as detailed in Board Policy BT0006 Appendix E [Section 7.b. The PTR improvement plan will be evaluated quarterly for a minimum of four \(4\) quarters. The evaluation of the PTR improvement plan will be conducted as part of the faculty member's next annual performance review.](#)

If the chief academic officer, [based on the PTR Committee's report](#), concludes that deficiencies exist in the departmental annual performance review process (including failure of [division chiefs-or](#) department chairs to conduct rigorous [\(i.e., reasonable, fair, accurate, high quality\)](#) annual performance reviews) or other incongruences are observed between the PTR performance review and rankings assigned through the annual performance review process, the chief academic officer must develop a process for addressing the issues.

X. Annual Report to the Board of Trustees

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

[The outcomes of the PTR process will be evaluated on an annual basis, with data reported to the Board of Trustees also shared with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, deans, department chairs, and division chiefs.](#)

XI. Timelines for Conducting the PTR

[All PTR deadlines are counted in calendar days rather than business days, except when the last day of the time period falls during a holiday or administrative closure lasting five \(5\) business days or longer \(such as the administrative closure between fall and spring semesters or an extended weather-related closure\). The following tables summarize key events in the PTR process that have deadlines.](#)

Timeline for Conducting the PTR (using the EPPR process as a basis)

<u>Example 2019 Dates</u>	<u>Event begins</u>	<u>Days (Weeks)</u>	<u>Event ends</u>
<u>July 1</u>	<u>Written notice from the chief academic officer that the faculty member is required to have a PTR – normally will occur by July 1.</u>	<u>42 (6)</u>	<u>PTR Committee is selected.</u>
<u>Aug. 12</u>	<u>PTR Committee is selected.</u>	<u>7 (1)</u>	<u>Chief academic officer provides instructions, guidelines, template for report, and best practices to the PTR Committee.</u>
<u>Aug. 19</u>	<u>Chief academic officer provides instructions, guidelines, template for report, and best practices to the PTR Committee.</u>	<u>7 (1)</u>	<u>PTR Committee receives all required materials from division chief (if relevant), department chair, from faculty member, and determines if external reviews are needed.</u>
<u>Aug. 26</u>	<u>PTR Committee receives all required materials from division chief (if relevant), department chair, from faculty member, and determines if external reviews are needed.</u>	<u>42 (6)</u>	<u>PTR Committee report is prepared; dissenting explanation prepared if a dissenting member chooses to provide one. Report is distributed for review by the faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, and dean.</u>
<u>Oct. 7</u>	<u>PTR Committee report is prepared; dissenting explanation prepared if a dissenting member chooses to provide one. Report is distributed for review by the faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, and dean.</u>	<u>14 (2)</u>	<u>Faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, and dean submit written responses to the chief academic officer.</u>
<u>Oct. 21</u>	<u>Faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, and dean submit written responses to the chief academic officer.</u>	<u>14 (2)</u>	<u>Chief academic officer reviews timely responses to the report and makes an independent evaluation.</u>
<u>Nov. 4</u>	<u>Chief academic officer reviews timely responses to the report and makes an independent evaluation.</u>	<u>14 (2)</u>	<u>Chief academic officer submits to the Chancellor the committee's report, all timely responses, and any additional conclusions and recommendations based on the chief academic officer's independent evaluation.</u>
<u>Nov. 18</u>	<u>Chief academic officer submits to the Chancellor the committee's report, all timely responses, and any additional conclusions and recommendations based on the chief academic officer's independent evaluation.</u>	<u>14 (2)</u>	<u>Chancellor indicates whether or not he or she concurs in the chief academic officer's determination.</u>
<u>Dec. 2</u>	<u>Chancellor indicates whether or not he or she concurs in the chief academic officer's determination.</u>	<u>30 (4+)</u>	<p>(1) <u>Within 30 days of the receipt of the PTR Committee report, the faculty member may appeal any conclusion with which he or she disagrees (note: the PTR procedure does not halt based on a faculty member's appeal).</u></p> <p>(2) <u>If the PTR Committee concludes that the faculty member has not satisfied the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and rank, a PTR improvement plan must be developed using the procedures using for development of an EPPR improvement plan (see next table: Additional Timeline Required if a PTR improvement plan is required).</u></p>
<u>Jan. 1</u>	<u>Within 30 days of the receipt of the PTR Committee report, the faculty member may appeal any conclusion with which he or she disagrees.</u>	<u>90 (13)</u>	<u>Within 90 days of the faculty member's appeal, the Chancellor renders a final decision on the faculty member's appeal. The decision is not appealable to the President.</u>

			Within 90 days would be by March 31, 2020.
--	--	--	--

Timeline for Conducting the PTR (using the tenure process as a basis) – if EXTERNAL REVIEWS are required

<u>Example 2019 Dates</u>	<u>Event begins</u>	<u>Days (Weeks)</u>	<u>Event ends</u>
<u>July 1</u>	<u>Written notice from the chief academic officer that the faculty member is required to have a PTR – normally will occur by July 1.</u>	<u>42 (6)</u>	<u>PTR Committee is selected.</u>
<u>Aug. 12</u>	<u>PTR Committee is selected.</u>	<u>7 (1)</u>	<u>Chief academic officer provides instructions, guidelines, template for report, and best practices to the PTR Committee.</u>
<u>Aug. 19</u>	<u>Chief academic officer provides instructions, guidelines, template for report, and best practices to the PTR Committee.</u>	<u>7 (1)</u>	<u>PTR Committee receives all required materials from division chief (if relevant), department chair, from faculty member, and determines if external reviews are needed.</u>
<u>Aug. 26</u>	<u>PTR Committee receives all required materials from division chief (if relevant), department chair, from faculty member, and determines if external reviews are needed.</u>	<u>42 (6)</u>	<u>Allow 2 weeks for deciding if external reviews are required and who will provide external review. Require any external reviews to be received within 4 weeks.</u>
<u>Oct. 7</u>	<u>Allow 2 weeks for deciding if external reviews are required and who will provide external review. Require any external reviews to be received within 4 weeks.</u>	<u>21 (3)</u>	<u>PTR Committee report is prepared; dissenting explanation prepared if a dissenting member chooses to provide one. Report is distributed for review by the faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, and dean.</u>
<u>Oct. 28</u>	<u>PTR Committee report is prepared; dissenting explanation prepared if a dissenting member chooses to provide one. Report is distributed for review by the faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, and dean.</u>	<u>14 (2)</u>	<u>Faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, and dean submit written responses to the chief academic officer.</u>
<u>Nov. 11</u>	<u>Faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, and dean submit written responses to the chief academic officer.</u>	<u>14 (2)</u>	<u>Chief academic officer reviews timely responses to the report and makes an independent evaluation.</u>
<u>Nov. 25</u>	<u>Chief academic officer reviews timely responses to the report and makes an independent evaluation.</u>	<u>14 (2)</u>	<u>Chief academic officer submits to the Chancellor the committee's report, all timely responses, and any additional conclusions and recommendations based on the chief academic officer's independent evaluation.</u>
<u>Dec. 9</u>	<u>Chief academic officer submits to the Chancellor the committee's report, all timely responses, and any additional conclusions and recommendations based on the chief academic officer's independent evaluation.</u>	<u>14 (2)</u>	<u>Chancellor indicates whether or not he or she concurs in the chief academic officer's determination.</u>
<u>Dec. 23</u>	<u>Chancellor indicates whether or not he or she concurs in the chief academic officer's determination.</u>	<u>30 (4+)</u>	<p>(1) <u>Within 30 days of the receipt of the PTR Committee report, the faculty member may appeal any conclusion with which he or she disagrees (note: the PTR procedure does not halt based on a faculty member's appeal).</u></p> <p>(2) <u>If the PTR Committee concludes that the faculty member has not satisfied the</u></p>

			<u>expectations for the faculty member's discipline and rank, a PTR improvement plan must be developed using the procedures using for development of an EPPR improvement plan (see next table: Additional Timeline Required if a PTR improvement plan is required).</u>
<u>Jan. 22</u>	<u>Within 30 days of the receipt of the PTR Committee report, the faculty member may appeal any conclusion with which he or she disagrees.</u>	<u>90 (13)</u>	<u>Within 90 days of the faculty member's appeal, the Chancellor renders a final decision on the faculty member's appeal. The decision is not appealable to the President.</u>

Additional Timeline Required if a PTR Improvement Plan is Required (using the EPPR process as a basis)

If the PTR Committee concludes that the faculty member has not satisfied the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and rank, a PTR improvement plan must be developed using the procedures used for development of an EPPR improvement plan.

The division chief (if relevant) and department chair are encouraged to engage the faculty member in the early stages of development of the PTR improvement plan. If development of the PTR improvement plan becomes the responsibility of the PTR Committee, the committee is encouraged to engage the faculty member in the plan's development.

<u>2020 Dates</u>	<u>Event Begins</u>	<u>Days (Weeks)</u>	<u>Event Ends</u>
<u>Jan. 6</u>	<u>If a PTR improvement plan is required, the chief academic officer provides written notice to all parties (faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, dean, PTR Committee.</u>	<u>21 (3)</u>	<u>Division chief (if relevant) and department chair submit to the chief academic officer a proposed improvement plan supported by the dean, chief academic officer, and a majority of the PTR Committee.</u>
<u>Jan. 27</u>	<u>Division chief (if relevant) and department chair submit to the chief academic officer a proposed improvement plan supported by the dean, chief academic officer, and a majority of the PTR Committee.</u>	<u>14 (2)</u>	<u>If the division chief (if relevant) and department chair fail to produce an improvement plan supported by the dean, chief academic officer, and a majority of the PTR Committee, then the PTR Committee assumes responsibility for drafting a plan.</u>
<u>Feb. 10</u>	<u>If the division chief (if relevant) and department chair fail to produce an improvement plan supported by the dean, chief academic officer, and a majority of the PTR Committee, then the PTR Committee assumes responsibility for drafting a plan.</u>	<u>14 (2)</u>	<u>PTR Committee submits the proposed PTR improvement plan to the dean and chief academic officer for review and approval.</u>
<u>Feb. 24</u>	<u>PTR Committee submits the proposed PTR improvement plan to the dean and chief academic officer for review and approval.</u>	<u>14 (2)</u>	<u>Upon approval by the chief academic officer, the proposed PTR improvement plan is sent to the faculty member for review.</u>
<u>Mar. 9</u>	<u>Upon approval by the chief academic officer, the proposed PTR improvement plan is sent to the faculty member for review.</u>	<u>14 (2)</u>	<u>Faculty member submits to the PTR Committee any written response (including any requested modifications to the improvement plan).</u>
<u>Mar. 23</u>	<u>Faculty member submits to the PTR Committee any written response (including any requested modifications to the improvement plan).</u>	<u>14 (2)</u>	<u>PTR Committee considers faculty member's response and may revise the proposed PTR improvement plan.</u>

PTR Penultimate Draft

<u>Apr. 6</u>	<u>PTR Committee considers faculty member's response and may revise the proposed PTR improvement plan.</u>	<u>14</u> <u>(2)</u>	<u>PTR Committee submits the proposed PTR improvement plan to the chief academic officer for review and approval.</u>
<u>Apr. 20</u>	<u>PTR Committee submits the proposed PTR improvement plan to the chief academic officer for review and approval.</u>	<u>7</u> <u>(1)</u>	<u>Chief academic officer reviews the proposed PTR improvement plan, responds to the PTR Committee as needed, and approves a final PTR improvement plan.</u>
<u>Apr. 27</u>	<u>Chief academic officer reviews the proposed PTR improvement plan, responds to the PTR Committee as needed, and approves a final PTR improvement plan.</u>	<u>7</u> <u>(1)</u>	<u>Chief academic officer sends the approved PTR improvement plan to the faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, and dean for implementation.</u>

TEMPLATE

CAMPUS PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC POST-TENURE PERFORMANCE REVIEW

I. Introduction

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

II. Post-Tenure Review ("PTR") Period

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

The dean of each college shall develop, and submit to the chief academic officer for approval, an initial plan for staggering post-tenure reviews to avoid excessive administrative burden at any given time. The initial staggering plan may be revised with the approval of the chief academic officer if later developments require changes in order to avoid excessive administrative burden. The post-tenure review period begins at the granting of tenure, and, except as otherwise provided by the staggering plan, a faculty member's PTR will occur no less often than every six years thereafter unless one of the following circumstances results in a different timetable:

- Suspension of post-tenure review period – A faculty member's post-tenure review period is suspended during any year in which the faculty member is granted a leave of absence or a modified duties assignment.
- Restarting of post-tenure review period due to alternative comprehensive review – A comprehensive review of a faculty member's performance restarts the faculty member's PTR period under the following circumstances:
 - If a tenured faculty member undergoes a successful promotion review or a promotion is in progress during the year scheduled for PTR, the promotion review fulfills the PTR requirement and the PTR period is modified to require PTR six years after the promotion review.
 - If a tenured faculty member undergoes an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR) (generally triggered by annual performance review rating(s)) and is either rated as meeting expectations or successfully completes the terms of the EPPR improvement plan, the EPPR process fulfills the PTR requirement and the PTR cycle is modified to begin with the date of the EPPR committee's report.

- Start of the PTR period upon conclusion of an administrative appointment – Full time administrators and faculty members with a majority administrative appointment (more than 50%) are not subject to PTR; faculty members holding a less than majority administrative appointment (50% or less) are subject to PTR regarding their faculty duties based on expectations consistent with their faculty duty allocation. When a full-time or majority-time administrator leaves his or her administrative position to assume a tenured faculty position, the faculty member’s initial PTR shall occur within six years after leaving the administrative post.
- **CAMPUSES MAY ADD AN EXCEPTION FOR FACULTY MEMBERS WHO HAVE MADE A BINDING COMMITMENT TO RETIRE**
- A faculty member’s scheduled PTR may be otherwise deferred or modified only for good cause approved by the chief academic officer.

III. Annual Schedule for Post-Tenure Review

All post-tenure reviews will be conducted and completed during the **FALL/SPRING** semester according to the following schedule:

- The dean of the faculty member’s college/chief academic officer **CHOOSE WHICH** shall appoint all PTR Committees as set forth in Section IV below no later than _____ **FILL IN DATE**.
- Each PTR Committee shall be provided with the materials required by Section V below no later than _____ **FILL IN DATE**.
- Each PTR Committee shall submit its report required by Section VII below no later than _____ **FILL IN DATE**.
- **INCLUDE OTHER DEADLINES, SUCH AS FOR SOLICITING EXTERNAL REVIEW MATERIALS, AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE**

IV. Appointment and Composition of Post-Tenure Review Committee

All post-tenure reviews must be conducted by a committee established for the sole purpose of post-tenure review. Each PTR Committee shall include _____ members **MINIMUM OF THREE; MUST BE AN ODD NUMBER**, appointed by the dean of the faculty member’s college/chief academic officer **CHOOSE WHICH** in the following manner: **INSERT MANNER OF SELECTION OF COMMITTEE; AMONG OTHER THINGS, ADDRESS ASSURING THAT NO PTR COMMITTEE MEMBER WILL HAVE AN ACTUAL OR APPARENT CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND WHAT TO DO IN CASE OF THE NEED FOR AN ALTERNATE MEMBER**. The composition of the PTR Committee must meet the following requirements:

- Each PTR Committee member must be a tenured full-time faculty member who is at the same or higher academic rank, and whose locus of tenure is at the same campus, as the faculty member being reviewed.
- One, and only one, PTR Committee member must hold an appointment in the same department as the faculty member being reviewed, unless there is no such faculty member eligible to serve. **OR** One, and only one, PTR Committee member must hold an appointment in the same division as the faculty member being reviewed, unless there is no such faculty member eligible to serve; provided that no other PTR Committee members may hold an appointment in the same

department. **[EXPLANATORY NOTE: CAMPUSES MAY REQUIRE THAT THE DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY MEMBER BE IN THE SAME DIVISION AS THE FACULTY MEMBER UNDER REVIEW FOR THOSE CAMPUSES THAT HAVE DEPARTMENTS DIVIDED INTO DIVISIONS]**

The chief academic officer, working with the University of Tennessee Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success, will provide instructions, guidelines, and best practices to members of PTR Committees.

[INSERT ANY DESIRED ADDITIONAL PROCEDURES REGARDING THE FUNCTIONING OF PTR COMMITTEES, INCLUDING THE ROLE OF THE CHAIR].

V. Materials to be Reviewed by Post-Tenure Review Committee

The PTR Committee must review (1) annual review materials (including the department head's/chair's evaluation and rating of the faculty member's performance, and student and any peer evaluation of teaching) for each year since the last review (to be supplied by the department head/chair); (2) the faculty member's current CV; a narrative, not to exceed two pages, prepared by the faculty member describing the faculty member's milestone achievements and accomplishments since the last review as well as goals for the next review period; and (if there has been a previous PTR) a copy of the narrative submitted as a part of the faculty member's previous PTR (each to be supplied by the faculty member); and (3) external reviews when deemed necessary by the PTR Committee or when deemed necessary by the dean of the faculty member's college/chief academic officer **[CHOOSE WHICH]. [INSERT ANY DESIRED CAMPUS PROCEDURES FOR SOLICITING EXTERNAL REVIEWS] [CAMPUSES MAY ALSO INCLUDE PROVISIONS ALLOWING A FACULTY MEMBER TO REQUEST EXTERNAL REVIEW, INCLUDING ANY NECESSARY PROCEDURES AND APPROVALS FOR SUCH EXTERNAL REVIEW].**

VI. Criteria for Post-Tenure Review

The post-tenure review process should ensure the faculty member has demonstrated continued professional growth and productivity in the areas of teaching, research (including scholarly, creative and artistic work), service, and/or clinical care pertinent to his or her faculty responsibilities. The criteria for assessing the faculty member's performance must be consistent with established expectations of the department, school/college, and campus and provide sufficient flexibility to consider changes in academic responsibilities and/or expectations. The expectations for faculty performance may differ by campus, college, department, and even among sub-disciplines within a department or program. Those expectations may be commonly-held standards in the discipline or sub-discipline. Those expectations may be stated explicitly in the faculty member's own past annual performance reviews, work assignments, goals or other planning tools (however identified), as well as department or college bylaws, the campus faculty handbook, this policy, and in other generally-applicable policies and procedures (for example, fiscal, human resources, safety, research, or information technology policies and procedures).

VII. Post-Tenure Review Committee's Conclusions and Report

The PTR Committee is charged to review the faculty member's performance during the review period and to conclude whether the faculty member's performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank. **The PTR Committee's voting must be conducted by anonymous ballots. [CAMPUSES MAY DELETE THIS SENTENCE IF NOT REQUIRING ANONYMOUS VOTING]** All conclusions and recommendations shall be adopted upon the vote of a simple majority of the PTR Committee. No member of the PTR Committee may abstain or recuse himself or herself from voting. Based on the judgment of its members, the PTR Committee must conclude either:

- That the faculty member’s performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank; or
- That the faculty member’s performance does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank.

The committee must report its conclusions and recommendations in writing using a standard format prepared by the chief academic officer, including (1) an enumeration of the **anonymously cast [DELETE IF NOT REQUIRING ANONYMOUS VOTING]** vote, (2) the supporting reasons for its conclusion, (3) a dissenting explanation for any conclusion that is not adopted unanimously if a dissenting member chooses to provide one **[CHOOSE THIS OPTION IF REQUIRING ANONYMOUS VOTING]** / a dissenting explanation for any conclusion that is not adopted unanimously **[CHOOSE THIS OPTION IF NOT REQUIRING ANONYMOUS VOTING]** , (4) an identification of any incongruences observed between the faculty member’s performance and his or her annual evaluations, (5) a statement of any additional concerns identified or actions recommended, and (6) if applicable, an identification of areas of extraordinary contribution and/or performance.

The detailed PTR Committee report shall be provided to the faculty member, department head/chair, dean, and chief academic officer.

[CHOOSE ONE OF THE FOLLOWING TWO PROCEDURAL OPTIONS]

[OPTION IF DEAN IS IN CHARGE OF PTR PROCESS] Faculty members and department heads/chairs must have the opportunity to provide a written response to the PTR Committee report. The dean shall either accept or reject the PTR Committee’s determination that the faculty member’s performance satisfies or does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank. The chief academic officer and the Chancellor shall indicate whether or not they concur in the dean’s determination. If the PTR Committee report is not unanimous, the dean shall provide the supporting reasons for his or her determination. If the dean, the chief academic officer, or the Chancellor do not concur in a determination, then he or she shall provide the supporting reasons for the non-concurrence. The dean’s determination, the chief academic officer’s and Chancellor’s concurrences, and any written responses of the faculty member and department head/chair will be maintained with the PTR Committee report in **[INSERT OFFICIAL CAMPUS REPOSITORY – E.G., OFFICIAL PERSONNEL FILE, ONLINE STORAGE SYSTEM, CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER’S OFFICE, ETC.]** and submitted electronically to the University of Tennessee Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success.

[OPTION IF CAO IS IN CHARGE OF PTR PROCESS] Faculty members, department heads/chairs, and deans must have the opportunity to provide a written response to the PTR Committee report. The chief academic officer shall either accept or reject the PTR Committee’s determination that the faculty member’s performance satisfies or does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank. The Chancellor shall indicate whether or not he or she concurs in the dean’s determination. If the PTR Committee report is not unanimous, the chief academic officer shall provide the supporting reasons for his or her determination. If the chief academic officer or the Chancellor do not concur in a determination, then he or she shall provide the supporting reasons for the non-concurrence. The chief academic officer’s determination, the Chancellor’s concurrence, and any written responses of the faculty member, department head/chair and the dean will be maintained with the PTR Committee report in **[INSERT OFFICIAL CAMPUS REPOSITORY – E.G., OFFICIAL PERSONNEL FILE, ONLINE**

STORAGE SYSTEM, CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER'S OFFICE, ETC.] and submitted electronically to the University of Tennessee Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success.

VIII. Appeal

Within thirty days of receipt of the PTR Committee report, the faculty member may appeal any conclusion with which the faculty member disagrees. The procedure for appeal is described in Section [REDACTED] **[INSERT CAMPUS FACULTY HANDBOOK APPEAL CITATION]**, except that a final decision on the appeal shall be made within ninety (90) days of the faculty member's appeal, and the final decision of the Chancellor on an appeal shall not be appealable to the President.

IX. Further Actions

If the PTR Committee concludes that the faculty member's performance has not satisfied the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and rank, a PTR improvement plan must be developed using the same procedures used for the development of an EPPR improvement plan as detailed in Board Policy BT0006 Appendix E.

If the chief academic officer concludes that deficiencies exist in the departmental annual performance review process (including failure of department heads/chairs to conduct rigorous annual performance reviews) or other incongruences are observed between the PTR performance review and rankings assigned through the annual performance review process, the chief academic officer must develop a process for addressing the issues.

X. Annual Report to the Board of Trustees

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

Appendix B

The attached pages represent edits in the UTHSC Faculty Handbook that are required by language in the current Board of Trustees Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure, version 7, effective date 3/23/2018.

In brief, these edits include:

1. Adding consequences for a tenure track faculty member who seeks an early consideration for tenure but who is not successful (Section 4.8.1 of the Faculty Handbook)
2. Specifying that an appeal of the Mandatory Interim Probationary Review would follow the same procedures as the appeal for an annual performance and planning review (Section 4.14.3.3 of the Faculty Handbook)
3. Deleting no longer applicable language in Appendix K and inserting the required Board language that we had already included in Section 4.14.3.3 that specifies when the Interim Probationary Review is to be conducted

Each edit is on a different page. Deletions are in ~~this font~~. Additions are in this font.

EXPLANATORY NOTE:

In 4.8.1, we are adding required language from the Board of Trustees policy. The language in full is:

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. Each campus shall adopt policies and procedures regarding a faculty member's early application for tenure, and the consequences of such a candidate's failure to receive tenure upon an early application, which shall be effective upon approval by the Board of Trustees and shall be included in the faculty handbook. (see Article III, E., 1., p. 6 of 49 of the Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure, version 7, effective date 3/23/2018)

While we had language permitting an early consideration for tenure before the sixth year, we did not have the "consequences" if such an early consideration was not supported. Simply put, we noted in the 3rd paragraph of 4.8.1 that a faculty member may request an early consideration for tenure but if the Chancellor does not recommend the faculty member for early tenure, then the consequence is that the faculty member will go up for tenure at the end of his or her normal (sixth year) probationary period.

4.8.1 Length of Probationary Period

Except as otherwise provided in the Board's Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure, a tenure track faculty member must serve a probationary period prior to being considered for tenure. The probationary period at UTHSC shall 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. If a faculty member has served in a tenure-track appointment at another institution, his or her total probationary service may extend beyond six 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 (Section 4.11.1). 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.

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 procedures to be used in requesting early consideration for tenure are those set forth in Appendix L. Faculty members who request an early consideration for tenure and who are not recommended for tenure by the Chancellor may seek tenure again on their regular schedule of the sixth year of probationary service, but may not request an early consideration for tenure a second time.](#)

For good cause related to procedural error (e.g., lack of due process), UTHSC and a tenure track faculty member may agree in writing to extend a six-year probationary period for a maximum of two additional years. The proposed extension must be approved in advance by the UTHSC Chief Academic Officer, the Chancellor, the President (or designee), and the General Counsel (or designee).

<See next page for additional language to review>

EXPLANATORY NOTE:

In 4.14.3.3, we are adding required language from the Board of Trustees policy. The language in full is:

Each campus shall adopt further procedures regarding the ETTR, including specifications of the required contents of the materials to be reviewed, which shall be effective upon approval by the Board of Trustees and shall be included in the campus faculty handbook. Any appeal regarding the ETTR shall follow the same procedures for an appeal of an annual performance and planning review.

While it might be implied that the appeal would follow the same procedures for an appeal of an annual performance and planning review, since the department chair is conducting the Interim Probationary Review at the same time as the annual review, it is important to add this expressly so that it is clear that a faculty member may appeal an annual performance and planning review as well as an Interim Probationary Review/ETTR.

4.14.3.3 Interim Probationary Review

For each tenure track faculty member, the department and the Chair 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 chair's sole discretion). The purpose of the Interim Review is to establish a mutual understanding between the faculty member and the Chair regarding his or her progress towards attainment of tenure.

This two-part review will be conducted by the tenured faculty in the department, and by the Chair at the same time as the Annual Performance and Planning Review. After reviewing each tenure track faculty member's dossier (Section 4.11.2), the tenured faculty will record a formal, anonymous vote on the individual's progress towards tenure.

A report will be written to the faculty member's Chair and will contain the following: a list of the participating tenured faculty members; all suggestions; the majority and minority views, if relevant; and the summary vote. The Chair will present and discuss the tenured faculty's report, as well as his or her own assessment, with the faculty member during the Annual Performance and Planning Review; this meeting with the Chair constitutes the second part of the Interim Review. The Chair will certify in the summary of the Annual Performance and Planning Review that the Interim Review by the tenured faculty has been completed and note the results thereof. Copies of these interim review documents are given to the faculty member and placed in his or her personnel file.

A favorable Interim Review does not commit the department or the college to a subsequent recommendation for the award of tenure. A negative Interim Review by either the tenured departmental faculty or the Chair should place the candidate on notice of deficiencies that must be corrected before the award of tenure could be recommended. In response to a negative review, the Chair and the faculty member should develop a written plan whereby the faculty member can meet the departmental expectations; this plan must be contained in the summary of the Annual Performance and Planning Review. Alternatively, an unfavorable review may lead to a notice of non-renewal (Section 4.10).

At any time during the probationary period, the Chair may request that the tenured faculty review the faculty member's progress. [Any appeal regarding the Interim Probationary Review shall follow the same procedures for an appeal of an annual performance and planning review.](#)

<See next page for additional language to review>

EXPLANATORY NOTE:

While we revised Faculty Handbook Section 4.14.3.3 in the last Board of Trustee review (June 2018), we did not simultaneously revise Appendix K to:

1. Include required Board language that the Mandatory Interim Probationary Review (ETTR) would be conducted during the third or fourth year of the probationary period (with the year to be determined in the department chair's discretion), or
2. Delete language referring to anything other than the mandatory probationary period of six years (see Section 4.8.1: Length of Probationary Period where we specified this correctly).

The first paragraph of Appendix K has been edited to include the required language for the timing of the Mandatory Interim Probationary Review/ETTR and to strike out the language that is no longer applicable (that relating to anything other than a six year probationary period and a timing of the Mandatory Interim Probationary Review that is consistent with current Board of Trustees language).

APPENDIX K – PROCEDURE FOR THE INTERIM PROBATIONARY REVIEW FOR THE AWARD OF TENURE

General Information about the Mandatory Interim Probationary Review

For each tenure-track faculty member, the department and the Chair 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 chair's sole discretion). The purpose of the Mandatory Interim Probationary Review is to establish a mutual understanding between the faculty member and the Chair regarding his or her progress towards attainment of tenure ~~whose probationary period is four or more years, a Mandatory Interim Review will be conducted~~ (*Faculty Handbook*, Section 4.14.3.3). This two-part review will be conducted (1) by the tenured faculty in the department (or division) or the College Promotion and Tenure Committee (CPT Committee), if appropriate, and (2) by the Chair at the same time as the Annual Performance-and-Planning Review. ~~An example of the summary document for the Mandatory Interim Review (Form 2) is attached. If the probationary period is four years, the Mandatory Interim Review occurs in the second year (Faculty Handbook, Section 4.14.3.3). If the probationary period is five, six, or seven years, the Mandatory Interim Review occurs during the third year (Faculty Handbook, Section 4.14.3.3).~~ Annually, the time line for completing this review is the same as that for the Annual Performance-and-Planning Review (*Faculty Handbook*, Section 4.14.3.3).