



THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

6

Meeting Date: November 2, 2018

Committee: Education, Research, and Service

Item: **UTHSC Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Review of all Tenured Faculty**

Type: Action

Presenter(s): Joseph A. DiPietro, President

Background (See Tab 12)

Summary of UTHSC Procedures

The template for periodic post-tenure review procedures developed by the President and his staff (see Tab 12) leaves to each campus the choice regarding certain issues, primarily: (1) whether to make its chief academic officer or its college deans responsible for overseeing the process; (2) how to select the post-tenure review committee members; (3) how to conduct external review; and (4) whether to conduct committee voting anonymously or non-anonymously. A summary of UTHSC’s choice on these issues appears below, and the complete set of UTHSC procedures follows the Resolution for approval.

Responsibility for Post-Tenure Review	Chief Academic Officer
Committee Selection	The chief academic officer selects committee members from list compiled by the faculty member undergoing review and the faculty member’s department chair.
External Reviews	External reviewers are selected based on the mutual agreement of the faculty member undergoing review and the chair of the review committee; if agreement cannot be reached, the chief academic officer selects reviewer from a list in which the faculty member and the committee chair each place three names.
Type of Committee Voting	Anonymous
Other Significant Campus-Level Decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UTHSC has several large departments that are broken down into divisions that resemble departments on other campuses; the committee may contain two members from the same department as long as they are from different divisions.



THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In addition to specifying whether the faculty member's performance meets expectations for discipline and academic rank, the committee must specify whether the faculty member's six annual performance reviews satisfy the expectations of being reasonably, fair, accurate, and of high quality.
--	---

6

Committee Action: The Education, Research, and Service Committee will consider this item at a meeting on November 2. If recommended for approval by the Committee, the item will come forward to the full Board for action on the Committee's recommendation. The appropriate motion appears below.

Motion by Committee Chair: On the recommendation of the Education, Research, and Service Committee, I move adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials to approve the UTHSC procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty.



The University of Tennessee
Board of Trustees

Resolution 00_-2018*

UTHSC Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Review of all Tenured Faculty

Resolved: The Board of Trustees approves the UTHSC procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty as presented in the meeting materials, which shall be attached to this Resolution after adoption.

Adopted this 2nd day of November, 2018.

* Number will be inserted after adoption.

Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review (PPPR) / Post-Tenure Review (PTR)

Proposed location in the UTHSC Faculty Handbook, resulting in a re-numbering of the following sections):

- 4.16 Career Development and Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Members
- 4.16.1 General
- 4.16.2 Career Development Planning and Evaluation Process for Tenured Faculty Members
- 4.16.3 Annual Performance and Planning Review
- 4.16.4 Post-Tenure Review (PTR)
- 4.16.5 Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR)
- 4.16.6 Career Remediation Program
- 4.16.7 Recognition of Excellence

6

Summary of Proposed UTHSC Changes to the Post-Tenure Performance Review (PTR) Template

The review areas are addressed below from two perspectives. One, the template material that was intended for each campus to make campus-specific. Two, additional proposed revisions with a brief explanation as to the decision for having additional revisions beyond the yellow-highlighted material.

A. Revisions in Template Material

1. We inserted The University of Tennessee Health Science Center (UTHSC) in any area where we were prompted to insert the campus name (*I. Introduction*)
2. We added an exception for faculty members who have made a binding commitment to retire (*II. Post-Tenure Review (“PTR”) Period, #4*)
3. Instead of indicating Fall or Spring semester for completion of PTRs, we merely noted they would be completed during the academic year according to the proposed schedule (*III. Annual Schedule for Post-Tenure Review*)
4. Our campus decision was to have the chief academic officer (CAO), not the dean of the faculty member’s college, manage the process (*III. Annual Schedule for Post-Tenure Review, #1* and other relevant sections throughout the document)
5. PTR committees will be appointed by the CAO no later than mid-August (*III. Annual Schedule for Post-Tenure Review, #1*)
6. PTR committees will be provided with materials no later than September 1 (*III. Annual Schedule for Post-Tenure Review, #2*)
7. We included a time frame for soliciting external review materials (*III. Annual Schedule for Post-Tenure Review, #3*)
8. PTR committees will submit their reports no later than March 1 (*III. Annual Schedule for Post-Tenure Review, #4*)

9. Our decision was to have three (3) members on each PTR committee (*IV. Appointment and Composition of Post-Tenure Review Committee*)
10. Insert manner of selection of committee; among other things, address assuring that no PTR committee member will have an actual or apparent conflict of interest and what to do in case of the need for an alternate member: our edits here (*IV. Appointment and Composition of Post-Tenure Review Committee, A. Appointment of the PTR Committee, # 1-6*) included-
 - a. Where there are legitimately recognized divisions in departments (occurs in many College of Medicine clinical departments), the division will serve as the smallest organizing unit
 - b. The faculty member under review will nominate 3 committee members (one from within the division/department, two from outside the division/department)
 - c. The department chair, in consultation with the division chief and college dean, nominates 6 committee members (two from within the division/department and four from outside the division/department)
 - d. The faculty member may ask to have one of the names from the chair's list removed
 - e. Nominations (either eight [if faculty member has asked to remove one of the names] or nine) are forwarded to the CAO for final selection for the committee. This ensures a sufficient number of nominees in case alternates are required.
 - f. One of the three committee members must be from the faculty member's list of nominees
 - g. No faculty members who are relatives as defined in HR0115: Employment of Relatives policy will be placed on the PTR committee of the faculty member under review
11. Given that UTHSC has several formally-recognized divisions along with departments, we developed requirements for the composition of the PTR committee (*IV. Appointment and Composition of Post-Tenure Review Committee, B. Composition of the PTR Committee, # 1-5*). These requirements include:
 - a. Committee members being required to have sufficient expertise in the field or and/or similarity of activities to the faculty member whose progress is being evaluated
 - b. Only one member can be from the faculty member's division (or department, if that is the smallest unit)
 - c. At least one PTR committee member must hold an appointment in a different division/department from the faculty member being reviewed, but should be from the same college
 - d. Since basic science and clinical departments in the College of Medicine function so differently, we specified that they will be considered as different colleges
 - e. The third PTR committee member may be from a different college from the faculty member being reviewed or, if in the same college, must be from a different department than the faculty member being reviewed
12. We inserted language for functioning of the PTR committees, including the role of the chair *IV. Appointment and Composition of Post-Tenure Review Committee*)
13. We specified that external reviews may be requested by the PTR committee, the CAO, or the faculty member under review (*V. Materials to be Reviewed by Post-Tenure Review Committee*)

14. We developed procedures for soliciting external reviews (*V. Materials to be Reviewed by Post-Tenure Review Committee, B. Procedures and Approvals for External Reviews*)
15. Since UTHSC requires anonymous voting, we left intact the sentence that the PTR committee's voting must be conducted by anonymous ballots as well as the language in the following paragraph re: anonymous voting (*VII. Post-Tenure Review Committee's Conclusions and Report*)
16. In terms of the two procedural options for managing the review of the PTR committee report once the work has been concluded, UTHSC selected the option for the CAO being in charge of the PTR process. We specified the report must be retained in the official faculty file located in the CAO's office (*VII. Post-Tenure Review Committee's Conclusions and Report*)
17. We inserted the UTHSC Faculty Handbook appeal section (*VIII. Appeal*)

Additional Proposed Revisions (outside of the template material) with rationale

1. II. paragraph #1 – the insertion of “as described below” and deletion of “some form of” clarifies that the PTR is required every six years, except when the listed circumstances occur
2. II. Paragraph #2 - note that the CAO, rather than the dean, is the person who develops the initial plan. If left to the deans, there would be several variations of a plan, versus the single plan for the campus that will be developed by the CAO
3. II. paragraph #2 – the last sentence specifies an annual random selection procedure to be used during the first six years conducted by the CAO and with participation of the Faculty Senate will result in the selection of faculty members to undergo reviews. While there is a universe of tenured faculty members, the exclusions need to be considered each year to determine the potential pool. We also intend that the random selection process be transparent, thereby lessening the chance that faculty members feel as if they are being targeted for PTR.
4. III. in item #4 – references a new section in the document, Section XI, where timelines for conducting the PTR are included
5. IV. For PTR committee members - two PTR committee members can be from the same department, provided they are from different divisions. Some of the departments in the College of Medicine are so large (departments of pediatrics and of medicine, for instance) that the different divisions are essentially like different departments in other colleges.
6. IV. in item #5 – provides option for the third PTR committee member to hold appointment in the same college as the faculty member under review or in a different college. Some faculty members would find reviewers with more expertise and similarity of activities in the same college, while others will find those individuals in a different college
7. V. A. #1 and #2 – clarified that the annual review materials are bounded by the last six years OR since the last PTR review
8. V. B. – developed a full procedure for external reviews, that was based on the already approved procedure for external reviews recently approved for UTHSC's tenure materials. Qualifications

of external reviewers are virtually identical to the June 2018 approval for UTHSC’s tenure section 4.11.2.1. Specified how external evaluators are to be identified and what to do when mutual agreement for identifying evaluators does not work. Specified materials to send to evaluators (essentially, what the PTR committee receives) and general information to provide to external evaluators. Notes, specifically, that the external evaluator will review materials and make a determination similar to that of the PTR committee (the faculty member’s performance for the time period under review does/does not satisfy expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and rank).

9. VI. – altered language for the “areas” that are specified to be consistent with that used at UTHSC: teaching, research/creative and other scholarly activities, service, and/or clinical care. We do not reference “artistic” work at UTHSC.
10. VII. – included language that the PTR committee is required to make a judgment on the candidate’s performance as well as on the adequacy of the annual performance reviews written/completed by the division chief or department chair - so, reviewing the faculty member under review as well as the reviews of that faculty member
11. VII. Added the requirement for “supporting reasons for the conclusions” for the PTR committee’s report
12. VII. - Specified that the electronic versions of reports will be submitted to the UT office of AASS upon request rather than automatically
13. IX – if a PTR improvement plan is required, specified that the plan will be evaluated quarterly for a minimum of four quarters and evaluated as part of the faculty member’s next annual performance review
14. X – specification that outcomes of the PTR process will be evaluated on an annual basis and shared with a variety of groups and individuals
15. XI – three timelines developed, mirroring the EPPR timelines, for (a) timeline for conducting the PTR, (b) timeline for conducting the PTR if external reviews are required, and (c) additional timeline if a PTR improvement plan is required

Additional Items not included in the Procedures document

1. Each year, the CAO’s office will develop and post a list of faculty members by rank, division (where relevant), department and college who are eligible for nomination to a PTR committee. This will facilitate development of the lists of nominees by the faculty member under review and the department chair.

TEMPLATE

CAMPUS PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC POST-TENURE PERFORMANCE REVIEW

I. Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

III. Annual Schedule for Post-Tenure Review

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

- 1. The chief academic officer shall appoint all PTR Committees as set forth in Section IV below no later than mid-August.
- 2. Each PTR Committee shall be provided with the materials required by Section V below no later than September 1.
- ~~2.3.~~ When external reviews are necessary, identification of the evaluator should take no more than fourteen (14) days and there should be no more than four (4) weeks between the request to the evaluator and the evaluator’s decision.
- 4. Each PTR Committee shall submit its report required by Section VII below no later than March 1. Section XI provides a timeline for conducting the PTR, indicating the steps in the process, typical timing of each step, as well as additional timelines if external review materials are required or if a PTR improvement plan is required.

IV. Appointment and Composition of Post-Tenure Review Committee

A. Appointment of the PTR Committee

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

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

B. Composition of the PTR Committee

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

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

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

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

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

A. Materials to be Reviewed by the PTR Committee

The PTR Committee must review:

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

B. Procedures and Approvals for External Reviews

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

Qualifications of external evaluators include the following:

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

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

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

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

1. Materials to be sent to external evaluators:
 - a. Required materials submitted by the division chief (if relevant) and/or department chair
 - b. Required materials submitted by the faculty member
 - c. UTHSC Faculty Handbook statements about PTR and, if available/developed, college and (if present) departmental bylaws about PTR

2. General information to provide to external evaluators in the request for evaluation:
 - a. Faculty member's name
 - b. Description of the PTR process
 - c. The external evaluator will be asked to review the materials submitted (see item #1 above) and conclude that the faculty member's performance (a) satisfies the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and rank or (b) does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member's discipline, rank, effort distribution, and expectations listed in the annual reviews provided. The external evaluator will also be asked to provide a one-paragraph explanation of his or her conclusion.
 - d. Request for evaluator to state the nature of any association with the faculty member
 - e. Request for the evaluator's letter to be submitted on institutional letterhead with the evaluator's signature that includes rank as well as tenure status
 - f. Date when the letter must be received
 - g. Thank you

3. External reviews should be addressed to the PTR Committee chair who requested the review.

4. Letters should be submitted via email.

5. Any letters solicited and received must be included in the PTR Committee's report.

VI. Criteria for Post-Tenure Review

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

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

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

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

The PTR Committee must conclude for the annual reviews either:

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

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

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

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

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

VIII. Appeal

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

IX. Further Actions

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

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

X. Annual Report to the Board of Trustees

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

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

XI. Timelines for Conducting the PTR

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

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

UTHSC PTR Final Language

6

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

UTHSC PTR Final Language

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

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

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

6

UTHSC PTR Final Language

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

6

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

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

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

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

UTHSC PTR Final Language

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