



University of Tennessee, Knoxville

TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange

Faculty Handbooks

Office of the Provost

2006

Manual for Faculty Evaluation, 2006

University of Tennessee - Knoxville

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_fachand


Recommended Citation

University of Tennessee - Knoxville, "Manual for Faculty Evaluation, 2006" (2006). *Faculty Handbooks*.
https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_fachand/3

This Bulletin is brought to you for free and open access by the Office of the Provost at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Handbooks by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

Manual for Faculty Evaluation

**The University of Tennessee, Knoxville
2006**



**Office of the Provost
and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs**



Table of Contents

Manual for Faculty Evaluation

Introduction.....	1
Part I - Annual Retention Review of Tenure-Track Faculty	
A. General Information	3
B. Procedures for Retention and Non-Retention	4
Part II - Annual Evaluation of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty	
A. General Information	8
B. Procedures for the Annual Evaluation of Faculty.....	8
C. Follow-Up in Cases of Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory Ratings	11
D. Compensated Outside Activities	12
Part III - Tenure and/or Promotion Review	
A. General Information	13
B. Probationary Period for Tenure-Track Faculty	13
C. Review Procedures.....	14
D. Statements of Criteria and Expectations for Tenure/Promotion	18
Part IV - Assembly of the Tenure and/or Promotion Dossier	
A. The Dossier: General Overview	19
B. Assembly of the Dossier	20
Part V - Cumulative Performance Review of Tenured Faculty	
A. General Information	25
B. Review Materials.....	25
C. Review Process	26
D. Following up on the CPR Committee's Recommendation.....	27
Appendix A - Forms	
Annual Recommendation on Retention of Tenure-Track Faculty.....	29
Faculty Annual Evaluation Report	30
Cumulative Peer Review Report	31
Appendix B - Instructions for Assembly of the Tenure and/or Promotion Dossier	32
A. Summary Sheet, Educational and Employment History, Statement of Responsibilities, Department and College Criteria Statements, Certification of Competence to Communicate in English.....	33
B. Teaching Ability and Effectiveness.....	34
C. Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity	35
D. Institutional, Disciplinary, and/or Professional Service.....	37
E. Candidate Signature Statement	38
F. External Letters of Assessment.....	38
G. Evaluative Recommendations, Reports, and Statements.....	39

Appendix B - (Forms & Examples)

Summary Sheet Form: Recommendations for Promotion and/or Tenure.....	41
Educational History and Employment History Example	42
Certification of Competence to Communicate in English Form	43
Teaching Evaluation Summary Table Example	44
Candidate Signature Statement Form	45
Letter to External Evaluators Example	46
Log of External Letters of Assessment Example	47
Method of Selection of External Evaluators Example.....	48
Qualifications of External Evaluators.....	49
Master Checklist for Tenure Review	50

Appendix C – University of Tennessee Board of Trustees Policy

Governing Cumulative Performance Review	53
---	----

Appendix D - Revisions to the Manual for Faculty Evaluation.....57

Best Practices Statements

Assessment and Evaluation of Faculty Teaching.....	60
Evaluating Faculty Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity.....	64
Evaluating Faculty Service.....	66
Faculty-To-Faculty Mentoring	68

Introduction: General Information and Guidelines for Using this Manual

The *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* is a collaborative effort involving the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, the Office of the Provost, the Faculty Ombudsperson, the Council of Deans, and the Office of the General Counsel. The provisions of this manual are meant to be read in conjunction with the *Faculty Handbook* and the published policies of The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees. If any provision of the manual conflicts with any provision of the handbook or board policy, the *Faculty Handbook* and The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees' Policy control. This manual contains material that applies to all faculty members in the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, faculty in the University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture, and faculty at the University of Tennessee Space Institute.

In this manual, the term "department" is used to designate the smallest academic unit of the University. In some cases, this unit may be denominated a school or college rather than a department. "Department head" refers to the department's highest ranking academic administrator and includes administrators with other titles, such as director or dean, who perform the duties of a unit administrator. Accordingly, the responsibilities of the department head may be executed by directors, deans, or other academic administrators. The term "bylaws" is used in this manual to designate the unit's core procedures and policies that have been ratified by the majority of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the unit. Although certain academic units do not refer to their core procedures and policies as "bylaws," the term is nevertheless intended to reference those procedures and policies, however denominated. Colleges not organized into departments or with a small number of departments are encouraged to work with the Office of the Provost to adapt the procedures in this manual.

The Faculty Evaluation Calendar is published at the beginning of each academic year on the Chancellor's web site (<http://chancellor.tennessee.edu/tenure>). This calendar contains the timelines and reporting deadlines for all the review and evaluation processes described in this manual.

Many of the procedures in this manual require affirmative action or participation by the faculty member who is being reviewed, evaluated, or considered for promotion or tenure. The manual contemplates a good faith effort on the part of the faculty member in complying with the provisions of the manual. A lack of a good faith effort may be properly taken into consideration in the retention review, annual evaluation, cumulative review, or tenure and promotion process.

Faculty and administrators are encouraged to participate in the University's Quality Enhancement Plan for International and Intercultural Awareness, now called *Ready for the World*. This initiative provides that discussion of the importance of international/intercultural expertise and experience should be incorporated into tenure, promotion, and annual review statements.

The appeal process available to faculty members is described in chapter 5 of the *Faculty Handbook*. A faculty member may initiate an appeal after receiving notice of a final administrative decision concerning any of the evaluation processes in this manual.

Revisions to the Manual for Faculty Evaluation are made in consultation with and the approval of the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for final approval by the full Faculty Senate.

PART I - ANNUAL RETENTION REVIEW OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Annual Evaluation Process and Retention Review

a. **Annual evaluation and retention review.** Department heads evaluate tenured and tenure-track faculty members annually. For information on the annual evaluation of faculty, please refer to Part II of this manual. In accordance with the *Faculty Handbook* (3.8.2; 3.11.3.4), tenure-track faculty members receive an annual retention review in addition to the annual evaluation. The specific criteria for the evaluation and review of tenure-track faculty must be described in collegiate and/or departmental bylaws.

b. **Articulation of the retention review with the annual evaluation process.** The annual evaluation and the retention review may be conducted separately or jointly according to collegiate and/or departmental bylaws. If the processes take place jointly, the review and evaluation must be submitted according to the timeline for the retention review process, published in the Faculty Evaluation Calendar.

2. Annual Retention Review Process for Tenure-Track Faculty

a. **Goals of the retention review.** The regular and thorough assessment of tenure-track faculty is an important step in the professional development of those faculty members. The annual retention review process is designed to ensure that a tenure-track faculty member receives clear and timely feedback from the tenured faculty and the department head about his or her progress as measured by the standards and criteria for rank as defined in departmental bylaws and the *Faculty Handbook*. Accordingly, the tenured faculty plays an important role in the retention process and is responsible for providing the faculty member with a clear, thoughtful, and professional consideration of his or her progress toward promotion and tenure in the context of his or her appointment and departmental bylaws.

b. **Schedule for retention reviews.** The annual retention review will take place in each year of the probationary period leading up to the year of tenure consideration. For the schedule of due dates for retention reviews, please consult the Faculty Evaluation Calendar.

c. **Recommendation form.** The retention review process is documented using the Annual Recommendation on Retention form (see Appendix A of this manual).

d. **English language competency.** The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees mandates that each candidate for tenure and promotion who is not a native speaker of English be certified as competent to communicate in English. The department head monitors effectiveness in communication in English in the annual retention review process. Should student evaluations or other indicators suggest that the faculty member's English language communication is not effective, the department head will work with the faculty member to identify areas for improvement and to develop, as appropriate, a plan for improving the faculty member's skills in English language communication.

3. Mentor

The department head assigns a faculty mentor or a mentoring committee for each tenure-track faculty member. The mentor should be a senior member of the same department or another unit, who can serve as a model and as a source of information for the tenure-track faculty member. Department heads should not serve as mentors for faculty within their own departments. The mentor may participate in the annual retention review in a manner to be determined in collegiate and/or departmental bylaws.

B. PROCEDURES FOR RETENTION AND NON-RETENTION

1. Departmental Retention Review Process for Tenure-Track Faculty

a. **Preparation for the retention review.** The faculty member prepares a written summary of his or her accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service for the previous academic year in accordance with departmental bylaws. The department head requests this summary in writing from each tenure-track faculty member on behalf of the tenured faculty at least two weeks before it is needed for the review.

b. **Review by the tenured faculty.** The tenured faculty will review the summary submitted by the faculty member in accordance with Part I.B.1.a and solicit input from the faculty member's mentor or mentoring committee. The tenured faculty review is intended to provide the faculty member with a clear, thoughtful, and professional narrative that describes and discusses his or her progress toward promotion and tenure in the context of his or her appointment and departmental bylaws.

c. **The vote of the tenured faculty.** The tenured faculty will take a formal retention vote. The vote and the written narrative, attached to the Annual Recommendation on Retention form, will be shared with the faculty member and the department head.

d. **The department head's review.** The department head conducts an independent retention review based upon the faculty member's written

summary, the written narrative and vote of the tenured faculty, and a scheduled meeting with the faculty member.

e. **The department head's report.** The department head makes an independent recommendation on retention and reports this recommendation on the Annual Recommendation on Retention form. The department head's report includes a written recommendation to the dean as to retention or non-retention, including an evaluation of performance that uses the ratings for tenured faculty members from "exceeds expectation" to "unsatisfactory."

i. If a retention review results in a recommendation by the department head to retain the tenure-track faculty member, the department head shall ensure that the written report includes express guidance to the faculty member on ways to improve performance as these seem justified.

ii. If the retention review results in a recommendation by the department head not to retain the tenure-track faculty member, the department head includes in the report specific reasons for that decision.

f. **Dissemination of the Annual Recommendation on Retention.** The department head will provide to the faculty member a copy of the finalized Annual Recommendation on Retention form, including the department head's report and recommendation. The department head will furnish to the tenured faculty a copy of the head's retention report and recommendation.

g. **Dissenting statements.** Any member of the tenured faculty may submit a dissenting statement to the department head. A copy of the dissenting statement will be furnished to the faculty member under review. The dissenting statement will be attached to the Annual Recommendation on Retention form.

h. **Faculty member's review and signature of the Annual Recommendation on Retention form.** The faculty member reviews the Annual Recommendation on Retention form and each attached narrative and report. The faculty member signs the form. The faculty member's signature indicates that she or he has read the entire evaluation, but the signature does not necessarily imply agreement with its findings.

i. **Faculty member's response.** The faculty member under review has the right to submit a written response to the vote and narrative of the tenured faculty, to the report and recommendation of the department head, and/or to any dissenting statements. The faculty member shall be allowed two weeks from the date of receipt from the head of the finalized Annual Recommendation on Retention and its complete set of attachments to submit any written response. If no response is received after two weeks of the date of receipt, the faculty member relinquishes the right to respond.

j. **Transmission of the Annual Recommendation on Retention form.** The department head will forward to the dean the finalized Annual Recommendation on Retention form, together with the head's report and recommendation, the retention vote and the narrative of the tenured faculty, and all dissenting statements and responses.

2. Dean's Review of the Annual Recommendation on Retention Form

a. **The dean's review and recommendation.** The dean makes an independent review and recommendation on retention after reviewing the materials referred to in Part I. B.1.j. This recommendation will include a statement summarizing the dean's recommendation when it differs from that of the head or tenured faculty or stating any other concerns the dean might wish to record, as appropriate.

b. **Transmission of the dean's recommendation and statement.** The dean will indicate his or her recommendation for retention or non-retention on the Annual Recommendation on Retention form, sign the form, attach his or her statement, if any, and forward the form with its complete set of attachments to the chief academic officer. The dean will send a copy of his or her recommendation and statement, if any, to the department head and the faculty member.

c. **Faculty member's right to respond.** The faculty member has the right to submit a written response to the dean's retention recommendation and any accompanying statement. The faculty member will be allowed two weeks from the date of receipt of the dean's recommendation to submit any written response. If no response is received after two weeks of the date of receipt, the faculty member relinquishes the right to respond.

3. Chief Academic Officer's Review of Recommendations for Retention

a. **The chief academic officer's review.** The chief academic officer shall review all retention recommendations, make the final decision on retention, and indicate his or her decision on retention on the Annual Recommendation on Retention form. The chief academic officer signs the form and sends a copy of the fully executed form to the faculty member with copies to the dean and department head.

b. **Notification in cases of non-retention.** If the chief academic officer decides that the faculty member will not be retained, the chief academic officer will notify the faculty member receiving the negative decision in accordance with notification requirements described in the Faculty Evaluation Calendar. The chief academic officer will attach to the Annual Recommendation on Retention form a statement of the reasons for the non-renewal decision. The

chief academic officer's statement, together with subsequent correspondence concerning the reasons, becomes a part of the official record.

PART II - ANNUAL EVALUATION OF TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Policies Governing Annual Evaluation. Policies adopted by The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees require that each faculty member and his or her department head engage in a formal annual performance-and-planning evaluation. Each faculty member's annual performance-and-planning evaluation must proceed from guidelines and criteria contained in the *Faculty Handbook* 3.8, this manual, and appropriate collegiate and/or departmental bylaws.

2. Goals of the Annual Evaluation. The goals of the annual performance-and-planning evaluation are to:

a. review accomplishments as compared to objectives set forth by the faculty member and department head both upon appointment and in any subsequent evaluations consistent with departmental bylaws, and the *Faculty Handbook*;

b. establish new objectives for the coming year using clearly understood standards that are consistent with collegiate and/or departmental bylaws and the *Faculty Handbook*;

c. provide support (e.g., resources, environment, personal and official encouragement) to achieve these objectives within the capability and priorities of the department, college, and university;

d. fairly and honestly assess the performance of the faculty member; and

e. recognize and reward outstanding achievement.

3. Timetable for Annual Evaluation. Each faculty member is evaluated annually on his or her performance in the previous calendar year.

4. Articulation with the Retention Review. Tenure-track faculty members undergo the annual retention review process as well as an annual evaluation. Please refer to Part I.A.1.b of this manual for further instructions.

B. PROCEDURES FOR THE ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY

1. Initiating the Annual Evaluation Process. The department head manages the process of annual evaluation of tenured and tenure-track faculty in a timely way to ensure compliance with all deadlines for submission of the evaluation forms to the dean and chief academic officer.

a. **Scheduling the annual evaluation conference.** The department head should schedule the annual evaluation conference with each tenured and tenure-track faculty member at least two weeks in advance of the date to allow faculty adequate notice to prepare the required materials.

b. **Preparing for the evaluation meeting.** The department head will inform the departmental faculty of the materials which should be prepared and submitted before the conference and the format to be used for submission of materials for the evaluation. (Suggested materials are listed in Part II.B.2 of this manual.)

2. Documents Prepared by the Faculty Member. The faculty member prepares a written summary of work in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service. The summary includes work accomplished in the previous calendar year. It is suggested that each faculty member under review provide to the department head review materials which contain at least the following:

a. a summary of the past year's plans and goals developed at the previous year's annual review;

b. a summary of the faculty member's activities and accomplishments during the past calendar year in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service, in accordance with Section 3.8 of the *Faculty Handbook*. The summary may include evidence, if any, of international and intercultural expertise or experience.

c. listing of specific plans and goals for the upcoming year;

d. any documentation requested by the department head or required by departmental and/or collegiate bylaws that evidences the faculty member's activities during the past year, which may include information supporting accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service;

e. a current *curriculum vitae*.

3. The Department Head's Evaluation. The faculty member and the department head have a scheduled conference to discuss the previous year's goals and accomplishments and to formulate goals for the coming year.

a. **Preparation of the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report.** The department head documents his or her evaluation of each faculty member on the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report with attachments if necessary (see Appendix A of this manual). The department head signs the report. The evaluation report should include the following components as applicable.

i. The department head writes a narrative describing and discussing the performance of the faculty member in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service during the previous calendar year based on procedures and standards in the departmental bylaws, this manual, and the *Faculty Handbook*. This narrative also outlines objectives for the coming year and may include evidence, if any, of international and intercultural expertise or experience.

ii. The department head indicates on the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report whether the performance of the faculty member exceeds expectations for his or her rank, meets expectations for his or her rank, needs improvement for his or her rank, or is unsatisfactory for his or her rank, based on previously established objectives for that faculty member and departmental bylaws (including the department's criteria for the various ratings at the different ranks).

4. Reviewing and Signing the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report. The department head gives the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report to the faculty member, who reviews and signs it. The faculty member's signature indicates that he or she has read the entire evaluation, but the signature does not necessarily imply agreement with the findings.

5. Responding to the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report. The faculty member may prepare a written response to the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report. This response should be copied to the department head and it becomes part of the package of evaluation materials forwarded to the dean and chief academic officer. The faculty member shall be allowed two weeks from the date of receipt of the finalized Faculty Annual Evaluation Report from the department head to submit any written response. If no response is received by the department head after two weeks from the date of receipt, the faculty member relinquishes the right to respond.

6. Transmitting the Evaluation. The department head forwards to the dean the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report and its attachments. The department head also forwards any written response received from the faculty member.

7. The Dean's Review of the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report

a. **Reviewing and signing the evaluation forms.** The dean reviews the Faculty Annual Evaluation Reports submitted by each department head and sign the reports indicating either concurrence with or dissent from the department head's rating of each faculty member.

b. **Dissent from the department head's rating.** In cases where the dean does not concur with the department head's rating, the dean assigns a different rating and prepares a written rationale summarizing the reasons for his or her dissent from the department head's rating. Copies of the dean's rating and rationale must be forwarded to the faculty member and the department head.

c. **Faculty member's right to respond.** The faculty member has the right to submit a written response to the dean's rating and any accompanying rationale. The faculty member will be allowed two weeks from the date of receipt of the dean's rating and rationale to submit any written response. If no response is received after two weeks of the date of receipt, the faculty member relinquishes the right to respond.

d. **Transmitting the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report.** The dean forwards the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report for each faculty member to the chief academic officer by the deadline established in the Faculty Evaluation Calendar. In addition, the dean prepares a spreadsheet listing all faculty and the ratings (exceeds expectations, meets expectations, needs improvement, unsatisfactory) organized by academic department and forwards the spreadsheet to the chief academic officer.

8. Chief Academic Officer's Review of the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report

The chief academic officer reviews all Faculty Annual Evaluation Reports, indicates a final decision on the rating to be assigned to the faculty member, and signs the form. Fully executed copies of the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report will be returned to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean. In cases where the chief academic officer does not concur with the rating given by the dean, the chief academic officer assigns a different rating and prepares a narrative summarizing the reasons for dissent from the dean's rating. Copies of the chief academic officer's rating and narrative must be forwarded to the faculty member, the dean, and the department head.

C. FOLLOW-UP IN CASES OF NEEDS IMPROVEMENT OR UNSATISFACTORY RATINGS

Faculty members who receive notice from the chief academic officer that they have received ratings of "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory" must develop a plan of improvement and submit the plan to the department head within 30 days of receipt of the fully executed Faculty Annual Evaluation Report (as described in Part II.B.8 of this manual). The faculty member has the responsibility of developing a written response for each area needing attention in the report, 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.

1. Administrative Review of the Plan of Improvement. The department head will review the plan of improvement submitted by a faculty member whose performance is deemed either to need improvement or to be unsatisfactory. The department head must approve the plan before forwarding it to the dean for approval. The dean must approve the plan before forwarding it to the chief academic officer for approval. The chief academic officer will notify the dean, department head, and faculty member of his or her approval of the plan. The department head has primary responsibility for monitoring the progress of the faculty member according to departmental bylaws.

2. Following up on the Plan of Improvement

a. **Progress reports.** The faculty member should, upon agreement with the department head, submit periodic updates on progress on the goals of the improvement plan. The first annual evaluation following an evaluation indicating that performance needs improvement or is unsatisfactory shall include a report that clearly describes progress in any area(s) needing improvement or noted as unsatisfactory.

b. **Cumulative Performance Review.** Cumulative performance reviews for tenured faculty are triggered by the rating from the annual evaluation. A faculty member whose performance is found to be unsatisfactory for his or her rank in two out of five consecutive years or whose evaluations in any three of five consecutive years indicate performance that needs improvement for his or her rank or is unsatisfactory for his or her rank shall undergo a cumulative performance review. This process is described in Part V of this manual.

3. Rating of Unsatisfactory. A faculty member who receives a rating of unsatisfactory shall be ineligible for rewards.

D. COMPENSATED OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES

As outside compensated activities are not part of the full-time commitments of a faculty member, they cannot be substituted for commitments of a faculty member to teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service within the University. Correspondingly, the annual review of the performance of a faculty member is based only on her/his regular responsibilities and duties as part of her/his full-time commitments to the University which are negotiated annually and must be consistent with the *Faculty Handbook* and applicable bylaws. Should a faculty member wish to pursue compensated outside activities, the faculty member and her/his department head must agree about the faculty development benefits that will be gained by the planned activities, as part of the annual review process. (See the full policy on Compensated Outside Activities in the *Faculty Handbook*, chapter 7.)

PART III - TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION REVIEW

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

The *Faculty Handbook* and the Board of Trustees of The University of Tennessee *Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure* govern tenure and promotion. Part III of this manual describes the process of review for tenure and/or promotion. Part IV contains instructions for the assembly of the tenure and/or promotion dossier. Appendix B contains explanations, examples, and sample forms of the materials contained in the dossier.

1. **Definition of Tenure.** Tenure is a principle that entitles a faculty member to continuation of his or her annual appointment until relinquishment or forfeiture of tenure or until termination of tenure for adequate cause, financial exigency, or academic program discontinuance.

2. **Burden of Proof.** The burden of proof that tenure should be awarded rests with the faculty member. The award of tenure shifts the burden of proof concerning the faculty member's continuing appointment from the faculty member to the university.

3. **Role of the Board of Trustees and Location of Tenure.** Tenure at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville is acquired only by positive action of the Board of Trustees, and is awarded in a particular department, school, college, or other academic unit and any successor department in case of merger or alteration of departments.

4. Promotion

a. Generally, assistant professors will be considered for promotion to the rank of associate professor at the same time as they are considered for tenure.

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

B. PROBATIONARY PERIOD FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

1. **Establishing the Probationary Period.** A tenure-track faculty member must serve a probationary period prior to being considered for tenure. The original appointment letter shall state the length of the faculty member's probationary period and the academic year in which he or she must be considered for tenure if he or she has met the minimum eligibility requirements for consideration. The stipulation in the original appointment letter of the length of

the probationary period and the year of mandatory tenure consideration does not guarantee retention until that time.

2. Length of the Probationary Period. The probationary period at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville shall be no less than one and no more than seven academic years. (For policies on the probationary period, please consult *Faculty Handbook* 3.11.3.)

a. A faculty member appointed at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, to the rank of assistant professor will normally be given a probationary period of seven years with tenure consideration in the sixth year. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the department head, dean, and chief academic officer.

b. A tenure-track faculty member with an extraordinary record of accomplishment may request to be reviewed early for tenure and promotion. This request must be approved by the department head, dean, and chief academic officer.

c. A tenure-track faculty member may apply to extend the probationary period beyond seven years for reasons related to the faculty member's care-giving responsibilities as described in the *Faculty Handbook* 6.4.2 and the *Knoxville Family Care Policy*.

C. REVIEW PROCEDURES

1. Levels of Review. The promotion and tenure review process has several sequential levels. 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. It is incumbent that consultation among review levels, by committees and academic administrators, should take place when there is a need to clarify differences that arise during the review process. For most academic units the review includes peer review by the department, review by the department head, review by the college, and review by the university. Evaluative statements assessing the candidate's case for tenure and/or promotion shall be provided at the department, college, and university levels as described in Part III of this manual. When a candidate has not received a unanimous committee vote, the statement must include a discussion of the reasons for the divergent opinions.

2. 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 the *Faculty Handbook*.

a. **Department procedures.** Each department of the university will develop and state in departmental bylaws detailed review procedures,

supplemental to and consonant 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.

i. When conducting the initial departmental review, only tenured faculty members make recommendations about candidates for tenure.

ii. When conducting the initial departmental review, only faculty members of higher rank than the candidate make recommendations about promotion.

iii. 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.

iv. If a department does not form a subcommittee (see Part III.C.2.c) to present the candidate's case to the faculty, as might be the case in a small department, a representative of the review committee, selected according to departmental bylaws, shall summarize the faculty discussion and present a written recommendation and vote to the department head.

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 objective data.

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. **Statement from the faculty.** A representative of the departmental review committee, selected according to departmental bylaws, shall summarize the faculty discussion and present a written recommendation and vote to the department head. This recommendation must be made available to the candidate and to the departmental review committee 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.)

f. **The department head's review.** 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 based on the department head's review and evaluation of materials in the dossier. The department head's letter must be made available to the candidate and to the departmental review committee so that they may (if they wish) prepare a dissenting statement. The department head's letter, together with any dissenting statement, becomes part of the dossier.

g. **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 tenure and promotion committee. Dissenting statements must become part of the dossier and must be available to the candidate, the department head, the departmental review committee, the college review committee, the dean, and the chief academic officer.

h. **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. The faculty member's response becomes part of the dossier and must be available to the department head, the departmental review committee, the college review committee, the dean, and the chief academic officer.

3. **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 the *Faculty Handbook*.

a. **The college 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.

i. 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.

ii. The college 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.

b. **The dean's review.** The dean of the college shall prepare a letter providing an independent recommendation based on his or her review and evaluation of the materials in the dossier. The dean's letter becomes part of the dossier.

4. **University Review.** Review at the university level will involve similar but less detailed evaluations and, in addition, will provide an essential campus-wide perspective. University-level review is based on criteria for promotion and/or tenure as set forth in departmental and collegiate bylaws and the *Faculty Handbook*.

a. **Review of the chief academic officer.** The chief academic officer shall review each dossier and prepare a letter providing an independent recommendation based on his or her review and evaluation of the materials in the dossier. The chief academic officer's letter becomes part of the dossier. The chief academic officer reports his or her recommendation to the chancellor 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.

5. **Reviewing and Responding to Insertions.** The candidate for tenure/promotion has the right to review and respond to any statements, reports, summaries, or recommendations added to the dossier by faculty, administrators, or peer review committees.

D. STATEMENTS OF CRITERIA AND EXPECTATIONS FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

1. Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion. All candidates for promotion and/or tenure are evaluated according to general criteria as described in the *Faculty Handbook* 2.2, 3.2, and 3.11.4.

2. Role of the Department, College, and Chief Academic Officer in Developing Statements of Criteria and Expectations

a. Departmental statements of criteria and expectations. Departmental bylaws should include a statement of criteria and expectations, which elaborates on the general criteria and is consistent with the mission of the department and the professional responsibilities normally carried by faculty members in the department.

b. College criteria. For colleges organized into departments, collegiate bylaws may also include a statement of criteria and expectations which elaborates on the general criteria and is consistent with the mission of the college and the professional responsibilities normally carried out by faculty members in the college.

c. Role of the Chief Academic Officer. The chief academic officer shall approve all statements of criteria and expectations. The chief academic officer shall maintain a master set of approved statements of criteria and expectations.

3. Dissemination of Statements of Criteria and Expectations

a. Deans and department heads shall 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.

b. Deans shall ensure that copies of the current collegiate and departmental bylaws are on file in the office of the chief academic officer.

PART IV: ASSEMBLY OF THE TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION DOSSIER

A. THE DOSSIER: GENERAL OVERVIEW

1. Review Materials

a. **Materials required for tenure and/or promotion review.** The particular materials required for adequate review of a faculty member's activities in teaching, research/creative achievement/scholarship, and service at the departmental, collegiate, and university levels will vary with the academic discipline. However, those materials must include the following items:

- i. the dossier;
- ii. the *curriculum vitae*;
- iii. any supporting materials such as sample publications, videos, recordings, or other appropriate forms of documentation.

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 review consist of the original and four copies of the dossier and one copy of the *curriculum vitae*. Other documentation will be requested as needed by the chief academic officer. Instructions for the preparation of the dossier and sample forms are given in Appendix B of this manual.

b. **The dossier.** The dossier, organized around the primary criteria by which candidates are assessed, is used for review at the departmental, collegiate, and university 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 and summaries of teaching evaluations. (See the detailed description in Appendix B.)

c. **The *curriculum vitae*.** The *curriculum vitae* is used to provide background for the department head's request for external assessments. One copy of the *curriculum vitae* is also forwarded with the dossier to all peer committees and administrators.

d. **Supporting materials.** Supporting materials, such as sample publications, videos, recordings, or other appropriate forms of documentation, must be made available for review in the department and the college.

e. **Attachments to the dossier.**

i. The department head attaches letters from external evaluators who have conducted an assessment based on the *curriculum vitae* and supporting materials such as sample publications, videos, recordings, or other appropriate forms of documentation.

ii. The department head also attaches to the dossier previous evaluative reports such as Annual Recommendation on Retention forms and Faculty Annual Evaluation Reports.

iii. All statements, reports, summaries and recommendations generated by the peer committees and administrators involved in the review process will become part of the dossier. The votes taken by peer committees are recorded on the Summary Sheet (see Appendix B of this manual).

2. Changes in the Informational Sections of the Dossier.

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. In the event that additional material is submitted for inclusion either through 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. ASSEMBLY OF THE DOSSIER

1. Organization of Information in the Dossier

a. **The role of the department head in assembling the dossier.** The department head manages the assembly of the factual and evaluative information in the dossier based upon the materials furnished by the faculty member.

b. **Standard format required.** A standard format for presenting and organizing the information in the dossier shall be used by all departments. The format is described in detail in Appendix B to this manual. Any questions about the format and/or contents of the dossier should be directed to the chief academic officer.

c. **Items *not* to be included in the dossier.** The dossier should *not* contain the following items unless unusual circumstances prevail and the materials are necessary for making an assessment and recommendation (this judgment shall be made by the dean):

i. Evaluative statements written by the candidate;

- ii. Statements about a candidate's personal life unless they are germane to the quality of the candidate's work;
- iii. Letters of appreciation or thanks except when they include an explanation of the contribution made to teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, or service; or
- iv. Course syllabi, outlines, and other course materials; course evaluation forms.

2. **Role of the Faculty Member in Preparation of the Dossier**

- a. **Factual information.** Each faculty member shall assist in supplying relevant information for his or her dossier which shall include the following items:
 - i. A current *curriculum vitae* to assist the department head in preparing the factual information in the dossier;
 - ii. Supporting material on research/scholarship/creative activity which will, along with a copy of the current *curriculum vitae*, be sent to external evaluators; and
 - iii. Required statements and factual information found in the dossier sections on teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service.
- b. **Faculty member's review and signature statement.** Each faculty member shall review for accuracy and completeness the factual and evaluative information contained in his or her dossier prior to the beginning of the review process. The faculty member signs a statement certifying that he/she has reviewed these parts of the dossier. External letters of assessment will be made available upon written request from the candidate.
- c. **Faculty member's role in identifying external evaluators.** Faculty members may suggest names of external evaluators, but in no case should the candidate directly solicit the external letters of assessment.

3. **Role of the Department Head in Preparation of the Dossier**

The department head manages the assembly of the factual and evaluative information in the dossier based upon the materials furnished by the faculty member. In addition, the department head must supply the following information.

- a. **Statement of responsibilities.** A statement defining the responsibilities of the faculty member shall appear in the front of a candidate's dossier. It is recommended that the department head, or an appropriate administrator, write, in the

third person, in consultation with the faculty member, a brief statement of responsibilities. The statement should be descriptive, not evaluative, and should clarify the areas of responsibility assigned to the faculty member in regard to the criteria used in promotion and tenure reviews. The first statement of faculty responsibilities should be developed within the first six months of employment and updated annually.

b. **Teaching evaluation summary and peer review.** The department head assembles and prepares the portions of the dossier documenting the teaching evaluation and peer review of the candidate for tenure and promotion. In preparation for tenure and promotion review, departments must conduct a peer evaluation of teaching. Normally, a peer evaluation will be conducted within a year of the faculty member's initial appointment and repeated after a period of several years but prior to review for tenure and/or promotion according to departmental bylaws. Dossiers not containing evidence of self assessment and peer evaluation in addition to student evaluation will not be considered for promotion and tenure.

c. **External letters of assessment.** External letters of assessment must be obtained for candidates being reviewed for all tenure and/or promotion actions. The department head manages the process of obtaining external letters of assessment based upon the guidelines outlined in Part IV.B.4 of this manual.

d. **Previous evaluative reports.** The department head furnishes previous evaluative reports.

i. For candidates for tenure and promotion, the Annual Recommendation on Retention forms each annual retention review during the probationary period shall be included in the dossier. The Annual Recommendation on Retention forms shall be presented in chronological order beginning with the earliest through the most recent retention reviews.

ii. For candidates for promotion only, the Faculty Annual Evaluation Reports from annual reviews since the most recent promotion or tenure action will normally be included. The Faculty Annual Evaluation Reports shall be presented in chronological order beginning with the earliest through the most recent evaluation. Evaluative statements from prior promotion reviews and from prior tenure reviews are not to be included.

4. The process for obtaining external letters of assessment

The department head manages the process of obtaining external letters of assessment. Dossiers shall include at least three letters from external evaluators assessing the quality and importance of the candidate's research/scholarship/creative activity.

a. **Identifying and contacting external evaluators.** The department head should initiate 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. If letters arrive after the review process has begun, please follow the procedure in Part IV.A.2.

b. **Method for obtaining external assessments.** The department head shall be responsible for providing a statement explaining the method by which the external evaluators were selected. Department heads shall obtain assessments from experts in the candidate's particular area of specialization who are qualified to give authoritative assessments of the candidate's work both with respect to quality and to productivity.

i. Normally, the department head requests names of potential external evaluators from the faculty member under review as well as from faculty colleagues and experts external to the university. The final list of those contacted to serve as external evaluators must be drawn from diverse sources and shall in no case be taken solely from the list furnished by the candidate.

ii. Department heads shall *not* request external assessments from the candidate's former teachers or students or from evaluators who do not have expertise in the candidate's area of specialization. External evaluators shall be asked to describe the nature of their association with the candidate.

iii. Department heads shall request external assessments from individuals who hold higher rank than the candidate. In general, it is inappropriate to request assessments from non-tenured assistant professors for candidates for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor or from assistant or associate professors for candidates for promotion to professor.

iv. Department heads will send to the external evaluators information and documentation for use in preparing the external assessment including the *curriculum vitae*, appropriate supporting materials concerning research/scholarship/creative activity, and the departmental and collegiate criteria statements for promotion and/or tenure.

v. The department head shall be responsible for providing a brief biographical statement about the 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.

c. **Log of contacts with external evaluators.** A log shall be inserted in the dossier to document the following:

i. date of request to the external evaluator;

ii. date of receipt of letter from external evaluator; and

iii. date of entry of letter into dossier.

d. **Sample letter.** A sample copy of the letter requesting the external assessment shall be inserted in the dossier. The letter will request a critical assessment of the candidate's achievements and reputation within his or her discipline, with reference to the duties and responsibilities assigned to the candidate. Requests should be for letters of assessment, not for letters of recommendation.

5. Duties of the Deans and the Chief Academic Officer in the Dissemination of Information about Dossier Preparation

a. **Duties of the dean.** Each collegiate dean shall ensure that faculty members in his or her college are informed about the manner in which dossiers are prepared and the appropriate content of dossiers.

b. **Duties of the 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.

PART V - CUMULATIVE PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Policies and Procedures Governing Cumulative Performance Review.

The policies and procedures governing cumulative review of tenured faculty are given in the University of Tennessee Board of Trustees' policy (<https://san4.dii.utk.edu/pls/portal30/docs/folder/BOT/HTML/tenure.html>) and the *Faculty Handbook* (3.8.3). Cumulative performance reviews for tenured faculty are triggered by evaluations from the annual evaluation of tenured and tenure-track faculty (see Part II of this manual).

2. Initiation of a Cumulative Performance Review. Board of Trustees' policy mandates that a cumulative performance review is triggered for a faculty member in the following circumstances:

a. A faculty member whose annual evaluation results in a rating of unsatisfactory in any two of five consecutive years;

b. A faculty member whose annual evaluation results in any combination of unsatisfactory or needs improvement ratings in any three of five consecutive years.

3. Notification of the Cumulative Performance Review. The department head will notify in writing any faculty member who qualifies for a cumulative performance review under the conditions outlined in Part V.A.2 of this manual. This notification will be included in the department head's narrative on the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report as part of the normal reporting process for the annual evaluation of faculty as described in Part II.B of this manual.

B. REVIEW MATERIALS

1. General Information. The materials to be used in the cumulative performance review of a tenured faculty member should include at least the following:

a. The Faculty Annual Evaluation Reports and supporting documents for the preceding five years;

b. Review materials for the faculty member's activities in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service during the year immediately preceding the cumulative review (i.e., the equivalent of annual review materials, as referenced in Part II.B.2 of this manual);

c. Documentation, not included in the annual review summaries, required by departmental bylaws, that relates to the faculty member's activities for the preceding five years; and

d. A current *curriculum vitae*.

C. REVIEW PROCESS

1. Establishing a Cumulative Peer Review (CPR) Committee. Within 30 days of receipt of notification that a cumulative review has been triggered, the college dean shall appoint a peer review committee consisting of at least five members (including the chair) and shall determine its chair. The committee shall be composed of appropriate tenured faculty members at the same or higher rank as the faculty member under review drawn from departmental faculty members and appropriate faculty members from outside the department. One member of the peer review committee shall be selected from a list submitted by the faculty member, one member shall be selected based on a recommendation from the department head, and at least two additional members shall be selected based on nominations by the Faculty Senate (one of which shall be from outside the department). The department head may not serve on the peer review committee.

2. The Committee's Deliberations. The peer review committee shall examine the above referenced review materials and shall make an evaluation of the faculty member's performance in the categories of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service. The committee shall then reach an overall assessment of the faculty member's performance over the preceding five years by indicating whether the faculty member satisfies expectations for his or her rank or fails to satisfy expectations for his or her rank and shall comment on specific weaknesses and/or strengths in performance. The peer review committee evaluation shall be summarized on the Cumulative Peer Review Report form (see Appendix A of this manual).

3. Reviewing and Signing the Cumulative Peer Review Report. The faculty member reviews and signs the Cumulative Peer Review Report. The faculty member's signature indicates that he or she has read the entire report, but the signature does not necessarily imply agreement with the findings.

4. Transmitting the Cumulative Peer Review Report. The committee chair forwards the Cumulative Peer Review Report to the department head, the college dean, the chief academic officer, and the faculty member under review.

5. Responding to the Cumulative Peer Review Report. The faculty member may prepare a written response to the Cumulative Peer Review Report. This response shall be copied to the department head, the college dean, the chief academic officer, and the CPR Committee. The faculty member shall be allowed two weeks from the date of receipt of the report from the committee to submit any

written response. If no response is received after two weeks from the date of receipt, the faculty member relinquishes the right to respond.

D. FOLLOWING UP ON THE CPR COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

Additional information regarding the cumulative performance review process and its potential outcomes is set forth in the Revised Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure, as adopted by The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees in June, 2003, and referenced above in Part V.A.1. Appendix C of this manual contains the text of the board policy.

APPENDIX A:

ANNUAL RECOMMENDATION ON RETENTION FORM FACULTY ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT FORM CUMULATIVE PEER REVIEW REPORT

ANNUAL RECOMMENDATION ON RETENTION OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Name of faculty member: _____

Rank: _____ Department: _____

Year of appointment: _____ Tenure consideration scheduled for AY: _____

Name of assigned faculty mentor: _____

This form documents the retention review process according to the procedures in Part I of the Manual for Faculty Evaluation. All narratives, reports, statements, and responses generated in the retention review process are attached to this form.

1. **Review by the tenured faculty.** The narrative of the tenured faculty is attached and the vote recorded below.

Vote of the tenured faculty: For retention _____ Against retention _____ Abstention _____

Recuse (state reason for conflict) _____

2. **Review by the department head.** The report of the department head is attached.

The department head recommends: ☐ retention ☐ termination as of _____

Overall rating:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeds Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Expectations
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory

Signature of department head: _____ Date: _____

3. **Review by the faculty member.**

Signature of faculty member: _____ Date: _____

4. **Review by the dean.** The dean's statement (when required by Part I.B.2 of this manual) is attached.

The college recommends: ☐ retention ☐ termination

Signature of dean: _____ Date: _____

5. **Review by the chief academic officer.** The chief academic officer's statement (when required by Part I.B.3 of this manual) is attached.

The chief academic officer recommends: ☐ retention ☐ termination

Signature of the chief academic officer: _____ Date: _____

FACULTY ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

Name of faculty member: _____

Rank: _____ Department: _____

Review Period: _____

Areas to be evaluated are teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service. The department head rates each category: exceeds expectations, meets expectations, needs improvement, unsatisfactory, and provides an overall rating based on the individual ratings. The department head writes a narrative describing and discussing the performance of the faculty member in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service during the previous calendar year (see Part II.B.3 of this manual). Extra pages may be attached as needed.

Research/scholarship/creative activity

Rating for Research/scholarship/creative activity []

Teaching

Rating for Teaching []

Service

Rating for Service []

Overall rating: [] Exceeds Expectations [] Meets Expectations
[] Needs Improvement [] Unsatisfactory

By signing below, I acknowledge that I have participated in the evaluation process and have received a copy of the evaluation.

Signature of Faculty Member Date

Department Head Date

Dean (Attach rating and rationale as necessary) Date

Chief Academic Officer (Attach rating and rationale as necessary) Date

CUMULATIVE PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of faculty Member: _____

Rank: _____ Department: _____

Year of appointment: _____ Number of years at current rank: _____

Overall assessment of the faculty member's performance:

☐ Satisfies expectations for rank

☐ Fails to satisfy expectations for rank

The chair of the Cumulative Peer Review Committee shall attach a narrative summarizing specific weaknesses and/or strengths in performance.

Signature of the chair of the peer review committee:

_____ Date: _____

Signature of faculty member: _____ Date: _____

Signature of the dean: _____ Date: _____
(Attach assessment and recommendation)

Signature of chief academic officer: _____ Date: _____
(Attach assessment and report)

Signature of the chancellor or vice president: _____ Date: _____
(Attach assessment and report)

APPENDIX B:

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ASSEMBLY OF THE TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION DOSSIER WITH EXAMPLES AND SAMPLE FORMS

General Directions. This section contains explanations and examples of the materials that comprise the dossier and its attachments. The dossier must be assembled to include the information and documentation given in the sequence listed below in this section. Each section must be arranged exactly as listed below and paginated with the section and page number (i.e. A-1, A-2; B-1, B-2, etc.). The sections of the dossier (in the original and copies) should be separated by tabs, colored paper or some other mechanism for ease of review. The original and four copies will be forwarded by the dean to the chief academic officer. One file copy must be retained in the department. Any dossiers which do not conform to this order or which contain inaccuracies will be returned to the department or college for correction.

Sample forms and tables are provided in this appendix. The Master Checklist for Tenure Review is included at the end of this appendix.

- A. Summary Sheet: Recommendations for Promotion and/or Tenure**
 - Educational History and Employment History**
 - Statement of Responsibilities**
 - Department and College Criteria Statements**
 - Certification of Competence to Communicate in English**
- B. Teaching Ability and Effectiveness**
 - Teaching Evaluation Summary**
- C. Research, Scholarship, Creative Achievement**
- D. Institutional, Disciplinary, and/or Professional Service**
- E. Candidate Signature Statement**
- F. External Letters of Assessment**
 - Letter to External Evaluators for Tenure and/or Promotion Decisions**
 - Log of External Letters of Assessment**
 - Method of Selection of External Evaluators**
 - Qualifications of External Evaluators**
- G. Annual Recommendation on Retention forms (for tenure-track faculty only)**
 - Faculty Annual Evaluation Reports (for faculty seeking promotion only)**
 - Department Head's Letter**
 - Statements of Evaluation by Review Committees**
 - Dissenting Reports**
 - Candidate's Response**

A. Summary Sheet, Educational and Employment History, Statement of Responsibilities, Department and College Criteria Statements, Certification of Competence to Communicate in English

1. The Summary Sheet. The summary sheet records the basic data of the candidate's employment and eligibility for tenure and/or promotion review. Note: If the recommendation for tenure comes earlier or later than that specified in the faculty member's letter of appointment (or for promotion after fewer than the normal number of years in rank), approval for early review shall have been requested and granted by the department head, dean, and chief academic officer. A copy of the approval must be attached to the summary sheet.

The summary sheet also documents the process of review by peer committees and administrators. Care should be taken to ensure that all entries on the form are correct and complete. The numerical vote of each committee is reported on the Summary Sheet. Reports from peer committees and administrators is attached as part G of the dossier.

2. Educational History and Employment History. An example of the format for presenting this information is given below.

3. Statement of Responsibilities. The department head shall prepare a statement of the responsibilities of the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. The assigned workload for full-time faculty consists of a combination of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service. The normal maximum teaching responsibilities of a full-time faculty member engaged only in teaching is 12 credit hours each semester. The precise teaching responsibility of each individual shall be based on such factors as class size and the number of examinations, papers, and other assignments that require grading and evaluation. In addition, the number of different courses taught and other appropriate considerations shall be used to determine teaching responsibility.

The actual responsibilities of a faculty member will typically be a mix of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service. These responsibilities will be determined in consultation between the faculty member and department head with their nature, status, and progress as documented on the Annual Recommendation on Retention forms and/or the Faculty Annual Evaluation Reports for the faculty member, which become part of the dossier. The university requires that each member of the faculty perform a reasonable and equitable amount of work each year.

4. Department and College Statements of Criteria and Expectations. Each department and college must include a description of the criteria used to appoint and evaluate faculty in these respective units as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* 3.11.4. (See Part III.D of this manual for information about the development, approval, and dissemination of department and college criteria statements.)

5. Certification of Competence to Communicate in English. The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees requires that certification of competence to communicate in English shall accompany the tenure and promotion dossier of any candidate who is not a native speaker of English.

B. Teaching Ability and Effectiveness

The material in this section should document clearly the candidate's teaching ability and effectiveness. This section contains the following statements and information arranged in the order given.

1. Required statements, information, and reports. Section B must contain the following items.

- a. A statement by the candidate of his/her teaching philosophy and its implementation;
- b. A list of courses taught in resident instruction, continuing education, and international programs for each term or semester of instruction with enrollments in each course;
 - i. honors courses should be identified separately;
 - ii. a record of clinical assignments will be included; and
 - iii. a list of advising responsibilities for the period will be included.
- c. A concise compilation of results of student evaluation or documented evaluation of candidate's programs, activities, and skills;
- d. A report from a peer evaluation of teaching and any other faculty input concerning the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, including any statements from colleagues who have visited the candidate's classroom for the purpose of evaluating his/her teaching, or who are in good position to evaluate fairly and effectively clinical or field assignments or advising. Internal letters about teaching effectiveness should be included in this section.
- e. If a summary of student comments is included, the summary should include "the best liked" and "the least liked" qualities. These comments should be compiled by the department head from student evaluation of teaching.

2. Other indicators of quality. Section B may contain the following indicators of quality as appropriate:

- a. any statements from administrators which attest to the candidate's teaching and advising effectiveness;
- b. other documentation of evidence of teaching and advising effectiveness (e.g., performance of students in subsequent courses, tangible results and benefits);
- c. any honors and awards received for teaching;
- d. a list of supervised graduate dissertations (or equivalent) required for graduate degrees with types of degrees and years granted;
- f. a list of undergraduate honor theses supervised;
- g. membership on graduate degree candidates' committees;
- h. any evidence of expertise or experience in international or intercultural activities.

C. Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity

The material in this section should document clearly the candidate's achievements in research/scholarship/creative activity (according to the terms of the candidate's appointment). This section contains the following statements and information arranged in the order given.

1. Candidate's statement. The statement describes the candidate's research/scholarship/creative achievement approach and/or agenda.

2. Research and/or scholarly publications. Publications should be listed in standard bibliographic form, preferably with the earliest date first. Citations should include beginning and ending page numbers or total number of pages, where appropriate. For multiple-authored works, the contribution of the candidate should be clearly indicated (e.g., principal author, supervised person who authored the work, etc.). Manuscripts accepted for publication should be placed in the appropriate category as "in press"; letters of acceptance from editors for such contributions should be included at the end of this section. Publications should be listed as follows:

- a. Articles published in refereed journals;
- b. Books;
- c. Scholarly and/or creative activity published through a refereed electronic venue;
- d. Contributions to edited volumes;
- e. Papers published in refereed conference proceedings;
- f. Papers or extended abstracts published in conference proceedings (refereed on the basis of abstract);
- g. Articles published in popular press;
- h. Articles appearing in in-house organs;
- i. Research reports submitted to sponsors;
- j. Articles published in non-refereed journals;
- k. Manuscripts submitted for publication (include where and when submitted).

3. Creative activity. This section should document exhibitions, installations, productions, or publications of original works of architecture, dance, design, electronic media, film, journalism, landscape architecture, literature, music, theatre, and visual art. Performance of original dance, literary, musical visual arts, or theatrical works, or works from traditional and contemporary repertoires of the performing arts should be chronicled with critiques.

4. **Projects, grants, commissions, and contracts** (date, title, agency, amount). These should be referenced in the following order:
- a. Completed;
 - b. Funded and in progress;
 - c. Under review.
5. **Other evidence of research or creative accomplishments** (identify patents, new product development, international and intercultural expertise or experience, new art forms, new computer software programs developed, etc.).
6. **Record of participation in, and description of, seminars and workshops** (short description of activity with titles, dates, sponsor, etc.); indication of role in seminar or workshop, e.g., student, invited participant, etc.
7. **Papers presented at technical and professional meetings** (meeting and paper titles, listed chronologically in standard bibliographic form); indication of whether the candidate was the presenter, whether the paper was refereed, and whether the paper was invited.
8. **List of honors or awards for research/scholarship/creative achievement**
9. **List of grants and contracts for instruction or for training programs**, with an indication of the candidate's role in preparing and administering the grants and contracts

D. Institutional, Disciplinary, and/or Professional Service

The material in this section should document the candidate's achievement in institutional, disciplinary, and/or professional service. This section contains the following statements and information arranged in the order given.

- 1. Candidate's statement.** The statement will describe the candidate's achievement in institutional, disciplinary, and/or professional service.
- 2. Summary of his/her service record arranged according to the following categories.**
 - a. Institutional Service**
 - i. Record of committee work at department, college, and university levels;
 - ii. Participation in university-wide governance bodies and related activities;
 - iii. Record of contributions to the University's programs, at home and abroad, to enhance equal opportunity, cultural diversity, and international and intercultural awareness.
 - b. Disciplinary Service**
 - i. Record of membership and active participation in professional and learned societies related to his or her academic discipline (e.g., offices held, committee work, journal refereeing, and other responsibilities);
 - ii. List of honors or awards for service activity within the academic discipline.
 - c. Professional Service**
 - i. Service to public and private organizations or institutions in which the candidate uses his/her professional expertise;
 - ii. Service to governmental agencies at the international, federal, state and local levels;
 - iii. Service to industry, e.g., training, workshops, consulting;
 - iv. Participation in community affairs as a representative of the University.

E. Candidate Signature Statement

A sample form is provided at the end of this appendix.

F. External Letters of Assessment

The following items, including the letters and other required statements and information, must be arranged in the order given.

- 1. External letters of assessment.** The dossier must include at least three external letters of assessment.
- 2. Letters to external evaluators.** When letters are solicited, the request should be for letters of assessment rather than "recommendation" or "endorsement", and evaluators should be encouraged to concentrate on those aspects of the candidate's record which are most important to the external visibility and professional standing of the candidate. A sample letter is included at the end of this appendix. Letters to external evaluators should include the criteria for rank in the department, college, and university.
- 3. Log of external letters of assessment.** The log documents the date on which each external letter was requested by the department and the date on which the letter was received. All requests should be entered regardless of whether a response was obtained. A sample log is included at the end of this appendix.
- 4. Method of selection of external evaluators.** The head shall attach a description of the procedure used for selecting external evaluators. A sample description is included at the end of this appendix.
- 5. Qualifications of external evaluators.** The head shall attach a brief statement identifying those who have written the assessments, including evidence demonstrating the evaluator's qualifications and standing in his/her discipline. A sample statement is included at the end of this appendix.

G. Evaluative Recommendations, Reports, and Statements. The following recommendations, reports, and statements are included in the order given below.

- 1. Annual Recommendation on Retention forms (for tenure-track faculty only)**
- 2. Faculty Annual Evaluation Reports (for faculty seeking promotion only)**
- 3. Department Head's Letter**
- 4. Statements of Evaluation by Review Committees**
- 5. Dissenting Reports**
- 6. Candidate's Response**

**SAMPLE FORMS, LETTERS, AND TABLES TO BE INCLUDED IN
THE TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION DOSSIER**

Summary Sheet: Recommendations for Promotion and/or Tenure

Name of faculty member: _____

Present rank: _____ Candidate for: ☐ Tenure ☐ Promotion to _____

Department: _____ Highest degree earned: _____

Original rank at UTK: _____ Subsequent promotions (year, rank): _____

RECORD AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE

Date of original appointment as a full-time probationary faculty member: _____

Years of full-time teaching experience at instructor rank or above before
UTK probationary period: _____

Years of full-time teaching at UTK, as of the May 31st prior to the review: _____

Total years of teaching: _____

Latest year for tenure review as stipulated in appointment letter: _____

RECOMMENDATIONS

DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY

Date of departmental discussion: _____

Result of discussion: For: _____ Against: _____ Abstain: _____

Recuse (attach explanation for conflict of interest): _____

Is there a dissenting report? ☐ Yes (please attach) ☐ No

Is there a response from the candidate ☐ Yes (please attach) ☐ No

INTERDISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE OR DIRECTOR (where appropriate)

For: _____ Against: _____ (Provide letter)

DEPARTMENT HEAD ☐ Recommend approval ☐ Do not recommend approval

Provide a statement on the professional record and a summary recommendation.

COLLEGE COMMITTEE

For: _____ Against: _____ Abstain: _____

Recuse (attach explanation for conflict of interest): _____

A copy of the report of the departmental and college committees must also be attached. In cases where this report disagrees in any substantial way with the departmental recommendation, this report must go beyond a listing of the vote to indicate as fully as possible the reasons for the differences.

DEAN ☐ Approve ☐ Disapprove (Provide letter)

CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER ☐ Approve ☐ Disapprove (provide letter)

CHANCELLOR'S RECOMMENDATION TO PRESIDENT ☐ Approve ☐ Disapprove (provide letter)

Educational History and Employment History
Example

Candidate Name: Jane/John Doe

Educational History (List most recent degree first)

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Program or Degree</u>	<u>Dates in Program</u>	<u>Degree</u>
University of California, Berkeley	Ph.D. History	1980 – 1985	Ph.D.
University of Michigan	B.A. History	1976 – 1980	B.A.

Employment History (List current appointment first)

<u>Ranks Held</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>Effective Date of Rank</u>
Associate Professor	University of Tennessee	History	1994- present
Assistant Professor	University of Tennessee	History	1987 - 1994
Lecturer	University of Arizona	History	1985 - 1987

Certification of Competence to Communicate in English

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE, ENGLISH COMPETENCY FORM

I have sufficient evidence to affirm that _____,

who has been recommended to a teaching position in the Department/Unit of

at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, is competent in communicating in the English
Language.

Department/Unit Head

Date

TEACHING EVALUATION SUMMARY¹

Example

SEM/YEAR	COURSE	# STUDENTS	RANKING				
			COURSE OVERALL	COURSE CONTENT	INSTRUCTOR CONTRIBUTION	TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS	# ADVIS
L/91	SSE 419(4)	12	4.4	4.1	4.6	3.7	15 UC
	ED 401(3)	57	4.4	4.1	4.6	4.9	5 G
	ED 401(3)	53	3.2	4.4	4.1	3.9	
	SSE 593(3)	2					
ING/92	ED 401(3)	59	4.4	4.1	3.4	3.7	15 UC
	ED 401(3)	42	3.2	4.1	4.6	4.9	4 G
	SSE 422(3)	6	4.4	4.4	4.1	3.9	
	SSE 523(3)	3					
	SSE 593(3)	1					
L/92	ED 401(3)	46	4.4	4.1	4.2	3.7	15 UC
	SSE 419(4)	7	3.2	4.4	4.5	4.9	4 G
ING/93	ED 401(3)	50	4.5	4.6	3.2	3.7	25 UC
	ED 401(3)	50	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.9	5 G
	SSE 416(3)	9	4.3	3.1	3.1	3.9	
	SSE 523(3)	2					
L/93	FYS 101(2)	18	3.2	4.5	4.6	3.7	25 UC
	SSE 419(4)	10	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.9	5 G
	ED 401(3)	26	4.2	4.3	3.1	3.9	
	ED 574(2)	1					
	ED 575(4)	1					
	SSE 500(3)	1					

¹ Range 5-0: 5=excellent, 0=very poor

Candidate Signature Statement

I hereby attest that I have examined for accuracy the factual and informational parts of my dossier (excluding the external letters of assessment).

Candidate Signature

Date

Letter to External Evaluators for Tenure and/or Promotion Decisions

This letter may be adapted for tenure or promotion decisions as appropriate.

EXAMPLE

Dear _____:

Dr. _____, (rank), is being considered for tenure and promotion to associate professor this year at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. I would very much appreciate your assessment of Dr. _____'s professional performance.

University policy mandates that I seek evaluations of a candidate from professionals who are qualified to judge the candidate's research/creative achievement, scholarly qualities, career development, and contributions to the discipline. Of particular value would be 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. A copy of his/her *curriculum vitae* and a sample of pertinent publications, and the departmental and collegiate statement of criteria and expectations for tenure and/or promotion are included. Please also describe the nature of your association with Dr. _____.

We are aware of the imposition that this inquiry provides; however, we assure you that guidance from scholars like you is vital to our decision-making process. An early report would be most appreciated as we do hope to have all letters in the file by November 1, _____. You should be aware that the State of Tennessee has a Freedom of Information Law, and therefore, we are unable to guarantee that the candidate will not request to see your letter. However, your letter is not provided to the candidate unless the candidate specifically requests it in writing. Thank you for your assistance in this matter which is of such great importance to us.

Sincerely,

**Log of External Letters of Assessment
Example**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Request</u>	<u>Date of Receipt</u>	<u>Date of Entry into Dossier</u>
Professor Rosemarie Tong Davidson College	phone 7/23/99 letter 8/1/99	9/15/99	9/20/99
Professor Howard Brody Michigan State University	phone 7/23/99 letter 8/5/99	9/20/99	9/22/99
Professor Mary Mahowald University of Chicago	email 8/2/99 letter 8/5/99	9/30/99	10/1/99
Professor James F. Childress University of Virginia	phone 9/15/99 letter 9/20/99	9/27/99	10/2/99
Professor Thomas Akerman University of Kentucky	email 8/5/99 letter 8/10/99 email 9/1/99	not received	

Method of Selection of External Evaluators

Example

The department solicited evaluations of Professor Hindle's scholarship from five scholars in the field of biomedical ethics. All of these scholars are highly respected in Professor Hindle's area of specialization and have published numerous books and journal articles in the area. They were asked to evaluate several of Professor Hindle's journal articles and his recent monograph. Four of the five scholars responded. They are Professor Rosemarie Tong (Davidson College), Professor Howard Brody (Michigan State University), Professor Mary Mahowald (University of Chicago) and Professor James F. Childress (University of Virginia).

Two of the scholars who responded (Tong and Brody) were selected from a list compiled by the department head in consultation with departmental faculty. The other two responses were from scholars selected from a list of possible reviewers provided by the candidate.

Qualifications of External Evaluators

Example

Rosemarie Tong, Ph.D., is Professor in Medical Humanities and Philosophy at Davidson College, and has been Visiting Professor in 1993 at Lafayette College. She is the author of ten books in feminist bioethics, and has published over sixty articles in refereed journals. She has reviewed numerous books for a variety of journals, and is the editor of Rowan & Littlefield's New Feminist Perspectives series, which includes thirteen renowned volumes in contemporary feminist ethics, epistemology and bioethics. She is the series editor of Point/Counterpoint volumes of Political Correctness, Assisted Suicide, and Gun Control. She is on the editorial boards of seven major journals, and has consulted for hospitals, State Departments of Human Resources, and the National Research Council.

Howard Brody, M.D., Ph.D., is Professor of Family Practice and Philosophy, and Director of the Center for Ethics and Humanities in the Life Sciences at Michigan State University. He is a board certified family practice M.D. as well as a Professor of Philosophy. He is the author of four books, twenty-four book chapters, and has published over forty-five articles in national and international refereed journals. He is one of the patriarchs of medical ethics in the U.S.

Mary Mahowald, Ph.D., is Professor in the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology at the University of Chicago and is also Assistant Director of the MacLean Center for Clinical Medical Ethics at the University of Chicago. She is the author of two books and the editor of three more. She is also the author of two textbooks and over seventy-five articles in excellent refereed journals. She is one of the most highly respected ethicists of her generation.

James F. Childress, Ph.D., is Professor in the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Virginia. He is the author of numerous books and articles in biomedical ethics. Dr. Childress is one of the lions of the field, and one of the most visible and public of all philosophically-trained medical ethicists in the country.

MASTER CHECKLIST FOR TENURE REVIEW

	SUBMISSION RESPONSIBILITY		SUBMISSION REVIEW			
MASTER CHECKLIST OF TENURE REVIEW ITEMS	CANDIDATE	ADMIN	DEPT FACULTY REVIEW	OUTSIDE EVALUATOR	COLLEGE REVIEW	CAO REVIEW
CURRICULUM VITAE	X		YES	YES	YES	YES
ANNUAL REVIEWS		X	YES	NO	YES	YES
TEACHING						
CANDIDATE'S STATEMENT	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
LIST OF COURSES	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
STUDENT EVALUATIONS	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
PEER REVIEW		X	YES	NO	YES	YES
FACULTY/OTHER INPUT	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
HONORS AWARD	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
STUDENT SUPERVISION AND COMMITTEE WORK	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
SELECTED WORK RELATED TO TEACHING: SYLLABI, COURSE MATERIALS, STUDENT WORK,	OPTIONAL		OPTIONAL	NO	OPTIONAL-MAY REQUEST	NO
RESEARCH, CREATIVE WORK, SCHOLARSHIP						
CANDIDATE STATEMENT ALL FACTUAL INFORMATION ADDITION OF FACTUAL INFO	X X X		YES YES YES	NO NO NO	YES YES YES	YES YES YES
SELECTED PUBLICATIONS, VIDEOS, RECORDINGS, AND OTHER EXAMPLES OF RESEARCH AND CREATIVE WORK	X		YES	RECOMMENDED- SELECT ITEMS DETERMINED BY CANDIDATE	YES	NO
SERVICE						
UNIVERSITY SERVICE RECORD PUBLIC SERVICE RECORD PROFESSIONAL SERVICE RECORD	X X X		YES YES YES	NO NO NO	YES YES YES	YES YES YES
EVALUATIVE STATEMENTS FROM APPROPRIATE INDIVIDUALS	X		YES	NO	YES	YES
OTHER INPUT						
EXTERNAL LETTERS LOG OF EXTERNAL LETTERS SELECTION OF REVIEWERS QUALIFICATIONS OF REVIEWERS		X X X X	YES YES YES YES	NO NO NO NO	YES YES YES YES	YES YES YES YES

STATEMENTS OF EVALUATION

DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE		X	YES	NO	YES	YES
DEPARTMENT HEAD		X	YES	NO	YES	YES
COLLEGE COMMITTEE		X	NO	NO	-	YES
DEAN		X	NO	NO	NO	YES
PROVOST		X	NO	NO	NO	-
CHANCELLOR		X	NO	NO	NO	-

APPENDIX C:

**UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES POLICY
GOVERNING CUMULATIVE PERFORMANCE
REVIEW**

Excerpted from: Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure

June 2003

A comprehensive, formal, cumulative, performance review is triggered for following tenured faculty members:

- **a.** a faculty member whose annual review is Unsatisfactory in any two of five consecutive years;
- **b.** a faculty member whose annual review is any combination of Unsatisfactory or Needs Improvement in any three of five consecutive years.

Each campus shall establish policies and procedures for peer evaluation of the faculty member's cumulative performance. Within thirty days of being triggered, a CPR Committee shall be convened by the Dean, who shall determine its chair. This committee shall be composed of appropriate, same or higher rank, tenured departmental faculty members (excluding the Head), and appropriate faculty (same or higher rank) from outside the department. The faculty member being reviewed and the Head may each name a campus tenured professor (same or higher rank) to the committee, which normally should have at least five (5) members including the CPR Committee chair, and at least two additional faculty members nominated by the Faculty Senate (one departmental faculty member [same or higher rank] and one non-departmental faculty member [same or higher rank]). The Committee chair shall forward the committee consensus recommendation to the Head, Dean and Chief Academic Officer. Performance ratings for cumulative reviews shall be as follows:

- Satisfies Expectations for Rank
- Fails to Satisfy Expectations for Rank

If the CPR Committee consensus rates the faculty member's performance as Fails to Satisfy Expectations for Rank, it may develop with the affected faculty member and Head a written CPR Improvement Plan (which may include, but shall not be limited to, skill-development leave of absence, intensive mentoring, curtailment of outside services, change in load/responsibilities), normally of up to one calendar year, and a means to assess its efficacy, with the plan to be reviewed by the Dean and approved by the Chief Academic Officer; or the committee may recommend to the Dean and Chief Academic Officer that the Chancellor initiate proceedings, as specified in the *Faculty Handbook*, to terminate the faculty member for adequate cause after the Chancellor has consulted with the Faculty

Senate President and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (which may delegate its responsibility to the appropriate Faculty Senate committee).

If the CPR Committee consensus rates the faculty member's performance as Satisfies Expectations for Rank, the Committee must forward its justification/rationale to the Dean. The Dean must recommend one of the following three actions by the Chief Academic Officer:

a. concur that the faculty member's performance has been Satisfies Expectations for Rank, that his/her personnel file should show that both the Committee and the Dean concur in a Satisfactory CPR rating, and that a new five-year period annual review cycle will begin; or

b. find that the faculty member's performance has been Fails to Satisfy Expectations for Rank (including a rationale for that ranking), and recommend that the Chief Academic Officer should require that the CPR Committee develop with the affected faculty member a written CPR Improvement Plan (which may include, but shall not be limited to, skill-development leave of absence, intensive mentoring, curtailment of outside services, change in load/responsibilities), normally of up to one calendar year, and a means to assess its efficacy; or

c. find that the faculty member's performance has been Fails to Satisfy Expectations for Rank (including a rationale for that ranking), and recommend to the Chancellor that he/she initiate proceedings, as specified in the *Faculty Handbook*, to terminate the faculty member for adequate cause after the Chancellor has consulted with the Faculty Senate President and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (which may delegate its responsibility to the appropriate Faculty Senate committee).

At the end of the time allotted for a CPR Improvement Plan, the Head, CPR Committee, Dean, and Chief Academic Officer shall send a written consensus report to the campus Chancellor, recommending:

(i) that the faculty member's performance is Satisfies Expectations for Rank and no other action need be taken at this time; or

(ii) that the faculty member's performance has improved sufficiently to allow for up to one additional year of monitoring of improvement, after which the Head, CPR Committee, Dean, and Chief Academic Officer must by consensus determine if the faculty member's performance is Satisfies Expectations for Rank or recommend that the Chancellor initiate Proceedings, as specified in the *Faculty Handbook*, to terminate the faculty member for adequate cause after the Chancellor has consulted with the Faculty Senate President and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (which may delegate its responsibility to the appropriate Faculty Senate committee); or

(iii) that the Chancellor initiate proceedings, as specified in the *Faculty Handbook*, to terminate the faculty member for adequate cause after the Chancellor has consulted with the Faculty Senate President and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (which may delegate its responsibility to the appropriate Faculty Senate committee).

APPENDIX D:

**REVISIONS TO THE MANUAL
FOR FACULTY EVALUATION**

Appendix D – Revisions to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*

The 2005 *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* was a collaborative effort involving the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Faculty Ombudsperson, the Council of Deans, and the Office of the General Counsel. Revisions to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* are made in consultation with and the approval of the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for final approval by the full Faculty Senate. This appendix records duly approved revisions to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* as they are incorporated into the manual on an annual basis.

Proposed Revisions to the Manual for Faculty Evaluation Approved by the Faculty Senate, May 1, 2006

- 1) The appendixes (A,B,C) on “Best Practices for the Review of Faculty Teaching”, “Best Practices for the Evaluating Faculty Research, Scholarship and Creative Achievement” and “Best Practices for Evaluating Faculty Service” would not be listed as appendixes to avoid confusion with other appendixes in the document. Instead, they would be called “Best Practice Documents.” Text referring to these documents in the introduction will be changed.
- 2) A new “Best Practices for Faculty-to-Faculty Mentoring” will be incorporated into the document based on a report from the Professional Development Committee of the Faculty Senate (May 2005).
- 3) The introduction should state the scope of the manual based on the sentence that appears at the beginning of the Faculty Handbook (1.1): “This manual contains material that applies to all faculty in The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, faculty in the University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture, and faculty at the University of Tennessee Space Institute.”
- 4) Text will be added to the introduction which states “Revisions to the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, if any, are made in consultation with and the approval of the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for final approval by the full Faculty Senate.”
- 5) Page 33 (B.1.e): Add the word “if” to: “If a summary of student comments is included, the summary should include “the best liked” and “the least liked” qualities.” Note: This change has already been amended to the current Manual.
- 6) Page 37 (F.2) While the sample letter to external evaluators indicated this principle, a sentence will be added that states “Letters to external evaluators should include the criteria for rank in the department, college and university.”
- 7) In Part V (A.1) on Cumulate Review will reference *Faculty Handbook*, Chapter 3.8.3 in addition to Board Policy.

8) Six changes to the Manual for Faculty Evaluation are proposed to integrate the goals of the QEP into the annual review, promotion, and tenure processes. These are:

a) Introduction, page 1, last paragraph, add:

In addition, faculty and administrators are encouraged to participate in the University's Quality Enhancement Plan for International and Intercultural Awareness (QEP). The QEP provides that, discussion of the importance of international/intercultural expertise and experience should be incorporated into tenure, promotion, and annual review statements.

b) Page 8, § II, b add: The summary may include evidence, if any, of international and intercultural expertise or experience.

c) Page 8, § II, B, 3, a, I add: and may include evidence, if any, of international and intercultural expertise or experience.

d) Page 33, Appendix B – Teaching, 2 other indicators) add: h. any evidence of expertise or experience in international or intercultural activities.

e) Page 35, Appendix C – Research, 5 add words in italics: Other evidence of research or creative accomplishments (identify patents, new product development, *international and intercultural expertise or experience*, new art forms, new computer software programs developed, etc.).

f) Page 36, Appendix D – Service, 2, a, iii add words in italics: Record of contributions to the University's programs, at home and abroad to enhance equal opportunity, *cultural diversity and international and intercultural awareness*.

9) With the implementation of the new Chapter 7 of the *Faculty Handbook*, Part II (Annual Evaluation of Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty) of the Manual, B.2 should state that compensated outside activities are to be documented and approved each year in discussion between a faculty member and a department head, but that such activities are not part of the annual review process and may not be submitted for institutional responsibilities of a faculty member in research, teaching and service.

Best Practices Statements

These statements reflect the work of several Faculty Senate committees and were initially included as appendices to the 1999 Manual for Faculty Evaluation. Following revisions drafted by the Faculty Affairs Committee, the current Best Practices Statements were presented to and approved by the Faculty Senate for inclusion in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation at the Senate meeting of May 1, 2006.

BEST PRACTICES FOR ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION OF FACULTY TEACHING

This statement reflects input from the Teaching Council, Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. This document incorporates changes approved by the Faculty Senate on May 1, 2006.

This document is intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating faculty members. These ideas are promoted by the Teaching Council and the Faculty Affairs Committee and should be considered as recommendations.

Goals and Approach for the Review of Teaching

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville is dedicated to excellence in teaching. Excellence means effectively providing learning experiences that prepare students for the challenges of a complex, ever-changing, and diverse workplace and society. To promote and identify excellence, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville must have an effective process for evaluation of teaching. The goals of the review process are to: (1) improve the quality and emphasize the importance of teaching across the campus, (2) reward excellence in teaching with positive incentives, (3) recognize the quality of faculty teaching to those within and outside the university, (4) promote the scholarship of teaching, (5) recognize teaching as one aspect of outreach, (6) encourage the connection between teaching and research, (7) provide means for protecting intellectual freedom, and (8) foster high standards among faculty in the university community.

The effectiveness of teaching is cited specifically as a key criterion in the Faculty Handbook in matters of professional advancement including retention, promotion and tenure. The process of regular assessment of teaching should be included in the bylaws of all units where teaching is conducted. Review of teaching should be multi-faceted, including inputs from the faculty member being reviewed, peers, and students. As the various departments across the University are quite diverse in function and size, details of the review process will vary by discipline to accommodate diversity in teaching techniques and content. This process of teaching assessment and evaluation should be designed to minimize burdens for faculty, administrators, and students.

Assessment and Evaluation

Assessment is a critical step to improve the quality and status of teaching. For the purposes of this document, assessment of faculty teaching includes feedback about strengths and areas for improvement based on inputs from the faculty member being reviewed, as well as from peers, and students. Faculty members should gain an understanding of their strengths and areas for improvement through self-examination, dialogue with peers, and feedback from students. An assessment should not include a performance rating.

Evaluation is an indicator of whether a faculty member's teaching exceeds, meets, or fails to meet a specified standard articulated in department bylaws. The evaluation and the resulting performance measure are necessary to recognize excellence in teaching. Evaluation will be the responsibility of the department head and will result in a specific performance measure, which synthesizes the results of the self, peer, and student reviews.

Teaching Review Process

Self Assessment

Self assessment allows faculty members to reflect on their teaching both for their benefit and to facilitate dialogue about their teaching with others. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members should conduct two forms of self assessment of their teaching. As part of their annual review document, faculty should write a brief narrative with a description and analysis their teaching. In preparation for a peer assessment of teaching, faculty should compile a more extensive document as outlined below.

A self assessment review produced in conjunction with a peer assessment of teaching would include a person's teaching philosophy and may also include, but not be limited to, self-assessment results from previous reviews, teaching goals, methods for achieving these goals, and plans for achieving teaching excellence. The document may be supported by a teaching portfolio that illustrates implementations or successes of the philosophy, documents activities such as short courses that improved teaching skills, considers alternative teaching objectives and methods, or possibly other aspects of teaching for the faculty member being reviewed. For tenure-track faculty, their mentor may offer advice in preparing the self assessment document. The self assessment document should be given to the peer review team at the beginning of the review process.

Peer Assessment

Peer assessment provides faculty members with feedback from their peers that will assist them in identifying strengths and areas for improvement in their teaching. Peer assessment of teaching can foster constructive dialogue about teaching that can benefit not only the faculty member under review, but the members of the peer assessment team.

A peer teaching review should be conducted for a tenure-track faculty member typically twice during their probationary period, and for a tenured faculty member at least once prior to consideration for promotion. Department bylaws may specify more specific intervals for peer assessment, as well as whether or if full professors are reviewed. Where special circumstances arise, a faculty member has the right to request reconvening of a peer assessment team or formation of a new peer assessment team in the interval between scheduled peer reviews. Peer assessment of teaching should also be conducted as part of a "triggered" cumulative review of tenured faculty as described in the Faculty Handbook (3.8).

The peer assessment team should consist of three tenured faculty members. One is

selected by the faculty member under review, one by the department head, and the third is agreed upon by the two. Departments are encouraged to have at least one faculty member from outside the department included on peer assessment teams.

Department bylaws should address the process of peer assessment of teaching. The peer review team should offer feedback that: (1) considers whether the courses of the faculty member have appropriate content and offer students sufficient opportunity to acquire appropriate skills; (2) considers whether the grading system and evaluation/assessment tools are consistent with course content and student skill development; (3) examines the teaching methods of the faculty member for effectiveness; and (4) recognizes the potential risks and benefits inherent in innovative teaching methods. Feedback is facilitated by meetings with the faculty member to discuss teaching before, after, and otherwise as needed or requested during the assessment process.

Feedback may be based on: (1) examination and discussion of materials for the course (e.g., handouts, tests, web pages, etc.); and (2) observation in the classroom or instructional setting for at least one course being taught during the semester of the peer assessment. The peer review team will produce a report and discuss the content with the faculty member being reviewed. After discussing the report with the department head, the faculty member being reviewed has the right to submit a written response to the report. The report and response (if any) should be part of promotion and tenure considerations.

Student Review

Student review of teaching is mandated. To increase the feedback component of the student review, written student comments should be solicited in addition to any mandatory questionnaire. Results of the open-ended student comments would be returned to the faculty member after grades are sent to the central administration. The faculty member may choose to include a summary of open-ended comments as part of their promotion and tenure dossier or as part of a self-assessment of teaching. While student review of instruction occurs each semester, it should not receive greater weight than self or peer assessments during the faculty evaluation processes.

Annual Evaluation by the Department Head

Annual evaluations should include a brief self assessment the results of student reviews and the peer assessment of teaching if it was held during the preceding year. The three criteria and performance measures for the annual review should include:

- 1) Assuming that a department has agreed to the roles of its courses, do courses of the faculty member have appropriate content and are students given opportunity to acquire the appropriate skills?
- (2) Are the grading system and evaluation/assessment tools consistent with course content and student skill development?

(3) Are the teaching methods of the faculty member effective?

The assessment results – particularly the peer assessment – should be given considerable weight in the annual evaluation by the department head. The standards for the evaluation are to be constructed by each department.

After an annual review, the faculty member has the right to an additional previously unscheduled peer assessment with self assessment, if she/he believe it to be appropriate.

The results of the annual teaching evaluations will be documented by the department head in terms of the standards established by the faculty of that department and using the campus-level system of performance categories.

BEST PRACTICES FOR EVALUATING FACULTY RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE ACTIVITY

(Last revised by Faculty Affairs on May 1, 2006)

This section is intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating faculty members. These are promoted by the Research Council and should be considered as recommendations.

Goals

One of the three basic missions of the University is research, which is the foundation and key to all learning that occurs at the University. Research may be simply learning at the most advanced, creative, and systematic edges of knowledge where discovery and imagination constantly recast the relation between the known and the unknown. This best practices document follows the formulation of the *Faculty Handbook* for research as research, scholarship and creative activity, so as to recognize the broad diversity of faculty contributions to this institutional mission. While the research of discovery is a major contributor to this mission, the research of application and integration are central to the contribution of some colleges and departments to the mission. Interdisciplinary collaboration in research, scholarship, and creative activity also contribute to the mission, and should be strongly encouraged where appropriate.

Research, scholarship, and creative activity should not be measured only in terms of quantity but also in terms of quality. In each discipline, certain outlets and venues for research, scholarship, and creative activities are considered to be more prestigious and to demonstrate greater merit than others. Publication, presentation, exhibition, or performance through these settings should be recognized as demonstrating a high standard of merit. Because standards of merit vary greatly, primary assessment of quality measures should be made within a discipline, or across contributing disciplines, where appropriate. While the appropriate mix of research, scholarship, and creative input and output activities may be specific to a given discipline, some general dimensions of research, scholarship, and creative achievement can be identified:

Input Activities

Faculty members must engage in input activities to achieve research, scholarship and creative activity outputs by which they will be judged. These input activities could include:

- Selecting realistic yet challenging topics for research, scholarship and creative activity;
- Using appropriate methods and techniques in meeting objectives;
- Optimizing the outputs of research, scholarship and creative activity relative to inputs, such as time, personnel, materials, facilities and equipment;

- Internalizing responsibility for research, scholarship and creative achievement program effectiveness;
- Expending personal effort in the research, scholarship and creative activity effort;
- Investing in professional growth and development;
- Providing leadership in research, scholarship and creative activity efforts;
- Adhering to high standards of professional conduct in research, scholarship and creative activities;
- Integrating short-term and long-term goals into a comprehensive strategy of research, scholarship and creative activity;
- Conducting on-going projects to a timely conclusion;
- Committing appropriate efforts to seeking external funds;
- Securing appropriate external funds;
- Providing effective oversight to externally funded activities;
- Committing appropriate efforts to joint research, scholarship and creative activity.

Output Activities

Faculty members are evaluated in research, scholarship and creative activities. Faculty members are encouraged to consider the following questions when assessing performance:

- Are research, scholarship and creative activity outputs provided to collaborators in a timely manner?
- Is the research, scholarship and creative activity innovative and does it serve important constituencies?
- Does the research, scholarship and creative activity demonstrate merit?
- Is the research, scholarship and creative activity output commensurate with research responsibilities and available sources?
- Does the research, scholarship and creative activity contribute to the mission of the department, college and University?
- Does the research, scholarship and creative activity contribute to the goals of the discipline at large?
- Does the research, scholarship and creative activity contribute to the betterment of the larger community and the people of Tennessee?
- Are the research, scholarship and creative activity outputs communicated effectively to appropriate audiences through appropriate vehicles (print and electronic journals, non-traditional peer-reviewed venues, conference proceedings, presentations, performances, etc.) in a timely manner;
- Has the research, scholarship, creative activities resulted in awards, key-note presentations, major teaching assignments, grants and other forms of recognition;
- Are the research, scholarship and creative activity outputs protected as university property and used, when appropriate, to advance institutional entrepreneurial goals?

BEST PRACTICES FOR EVALUATING FACULTY SERVICE

(Last reviewed by the Faculty Affairs Committee on May 1, 2006)

Chapter 2.2.4 of the *Faculty Handbook* affirms that faculty members are expected to offer professional knowledge, skills, and advice from their disciplines to their communities (University, profession, and public). Service activities, whether compensated or not, that draw on professional and disciplinary expertise, relate to the teaching and research and outreach missions of the University, and, typically, imply a connection to the University. The scope and nature of university, professional and public service may vary somewhat by discipline as articulated in college and department bylaws. Compensated Outside Activities are not regarded as service as they are not evaluated as part of the faculty member's annual review.

Sharing professional expertise with those outside the academy is both an educational experience and a test of the results of research, scholarship and/or creative activity. It follows that not all "services" faculty members perform will be relevant to the University's judgment of their work. Activities in which faculty engage that do not involve their professional expertise - activities centered on the family, neighborhood, church, political party, or social action group - are commendable as being the normal commitments of citizenship, but are not components of the annual review of a faculty member. When involved in those activities, faculty members do not typically present themselves as representatives of the University.

Institutional Service

Service to the University may include, but is not restricted to, the following activities:

- Participation in the review of the teaching and research of peers;
- Service as mentor to a tenure-track faculty member;
- Active service on the Faculty Senate or other department, college, campus or university committees;
- Participation in the development of interdisciplinary or inter-university programs and/or courses.

Disciplinary Service

Service to the disciplinary specialty (local, regional, national or international in scope) may include, but is not restricted to, the following:

- Active service in leadership structure or on a committee of a professional organization;
- Service on the editorial board of a journal;
- Maintenance of web site or moderation of listserve;
- Service as a reader for a journal, university press or funding agency/foundation.

Professional Service

Faculty members benefit the community beyond the institution by lending their professional expertise to aid or to lead organizations that create beneficial linkages between the university and the community. These activities may include, but are not restricted to:

- Advising on matters within the professional expertise of the faculty member;
- Conducting workshops or presentations in one's area of expertise;
- Enhancing K-12 education;
- Engaging in creative activities and research projects which are intended to benefit the public;
- Evaluating community sponsored programs or activities.

While service is, like teaching and research/scholarship/creative activity, a required component of the professional life of a faculty member, the type and amount of service a faculty member engages in will vary from year to year and from department to department. Specific service expectations will be negotiated by the faculty member and the department head at the annual planning and review conference. For tenure-track faculty or faculty who do not meet expectations for rank, service is not a substitute for the establishment of a solid record of independent research and/or creative activities and quality instruction, and as such, service activity may need to be limited in its type and amount until the faculty member has a record of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity that meets expectations.

BEST PRACTICES FOR FACULTY-TO-FACULTY MENTORING

(Last Revised by Faculty Affairs on May 1, 2006)

Introduction

Faculty-to-faculty mentoring assists tenure-track faculty members to balance and improve their performance in research/scholarship/creative activity, teaching, and service. The aim of mentoring is to support junior faculty members in becoming productive and successful members of the university community.

This best practices document developed from a survey of junior faculty initiated by the Faculty Senate with the assistance of the UT Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Three recommendations emerged:

1. New hires should meet with the unit leader to assess mentoring needs. Mentors(s) should be chosen during the first semester of employment.
2. The faculty member, mentor(s), and unit leader should meet to clarify roles, responsibilities, and how these will be carried out.
3. The unit leader is responsible for monitoring existing arrangements, reassessing needs, and facilitating changes. Monitoring mentoring relationships should be done annually.

With these and other recommendations, the Faculty Senate Professional Development Committee compiled the following recommendations to strengthen and enhance faculty-to-faculty mentoring.

Description

Through this mentoring program, tenured faculty (mentors) are matched with new faculty (mentees) to orient them to UTK, serve as sources of information, and assist them in the early stages of their academic careers. Mentors will create a positive, supportive environment in which they can guide mentees in developing strategies for attaining tenure and promotion.

Matching Mentors and Mentees

- The Department Head will consult with a potential mentor(s) to confirm his/her willingness to serve as a mentor.
- Prior to assignment, new faculty may meet with potential mentor(s) to assess compatibility.
- A new faculty member may request more than one mentor, if desired, to advise on different aspects of his/her appointment (e.g., teaching, research, grant writing, professional practice, interdisciplinary activities). Mentors do not have to be in the same department as the new faculty member.

- The Department Head will, in consultation with the new faculty member, formally assign the mentor within the first semester of the new faculty member's appointment.
- The mentoring relationship may be discontinued by either party, at any time, for any reason. If this occurs and the new faculty wishes to have a new mentor, the Department Head will again work with the faculty member to assign a new mentor.
- The mentoring relationship does not have a set duration. It is likely, however, that most mentoring activities (with one or more mentors) will carry on throughout the new faculty member's probationary period.

Mentor Qualifications

- Mentors may be selected from tenured Associate or Full Professors, and should be professionally mature and successful.
- Mentors should have experience within the department and should be able to acquaint the new faculty member with departmental culture and expectations for research, teaching, extension, service, and professional practice.
- Mentors should have an appreciation/understanding for the discipline of the new faculty.
- Mentors should be based primarily on campus during the first year of mentoring and readily available during subsequent years.

Roles and Responsibilities of Mentors

Mentors should be considered professional "friends" who have the best interests of their mentee at heart and who will advocate for their mentees. Their roles include coach, career guide, role model, instructional resource, or confidant, depending on the needs of their mentees and the nature of their mentoring relationship. This may include:

1. Meet with Department Head and mentee to clarify roles and responsibilities, and how these will be carried out.
2. Take initiative for contacting their mentees and staying in touch.
3. Devote time to the relationship and be available when requested.
4. Assist mentees with various questions, needs, or concerns.
5. Share their knowledge and experience and track mentee's progress.
6. Maintain confidentiality of information shared by their mentees.
7. Treat mentees with respect and consideration, and foster collegiality.

Suggested Mentoring Activities

- Develop research concepts, and provide editing and critical review of proposals. Advice may include on-campus administrative procedures.
- Help with teaching procedures including development of courses, preparation of a syllabus, and identification of teaching resources.
- Discuss student issues including motivation, academic ethics, student resources, and academic support services on campus.
- Discuss long- and short-term career goals and interests.
- Share experiences on managing time, handling stress, and balancing workload effectively.

- Discuss preparations for retention reviews and tenure.
- Identify professional development opportunities.
- Help in understanding departmental protocols and procedures.
- Address special needs, questions, and help in troubleshooting difficult questions.

Benefits to Mentors

Tenured faculty members who agree to mentor make a commitment to devote their time and effort

to help new faculty become successful. Mentors experience the unique satisfaction of guiding new colleagues, sharing their ideas about teaching and research, and helping their department and UT develop excellent faculty.

Roles and Responsibilities of Mentees

1. Mentees can take on various roles such as friend, protégé, new colleague, or junior faculty, depending on their needs, academic experience, and the nature of the mentoring relationship.
2. Meet with potential mentor(s) to assess compatibility and personality.
3. Meet with Department Head to finalize selection of mentor(s).
4. Meet with or exchange memos with Department Head and mentor(s) to clarify roles and responsibilities, and how these will be carried out.
5. Create annual professional development plan.
6. Meet in person regularly with mentor, and frequently by phone and email.
7. Seek support and guidance; don't try to "go it alone."
8. Devote time to the mentoring relationship.
9. Make use of opportunities provided by mentor(s).
10. Keep mentor informed of academic progress, difficulties, and concerns.

Benefits to Mentees

Mentees have an experienced guide(s) to help them through the formative years of professional development. This crucial relationship will provide the mentee with the opportunities, connections, and networking that is necessary for success, in an atmosphere , that fosters respect, consideration, and collegiality.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

