

BY-LAWS
FINANCE DEPARTMENT
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

[Ratified by faculty, May 16, 2005]
[Appendix A Revised by Faculty, April 2006]
[Appendix A revised by faculty, August 31, 2010]
[By-laws amended by faculty vote: November 24, 2009]

Version from Jan 12, 2010

The purposes of these by-laws are to establish the overall organization of the Department of Finance and to provide for the cooperation, advice and consent of the Faculty in the conduct of the department's affairs, all within the organization and regulations of the College of Business Administration and The University of Tennessee. Several University of Tennessee (UT) and College of Business Administration (CBA) documents are incorporated herein by reference:

Faculty Handbook (<http://provost.utk.edu/facultyhandbook>),
Manual for Faculty Evaluation
(<http://Provost.utk.edu/evaluation/>)

CBA *Bylaws*, and the
CBA *Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Guidelines*.

I. Faculty Membership in the Department

MEMBERSHIP of the Finance department faculty shall consist of all those holding regular or temporary departmental tenure and non-tenure-track appointments.

Voting members of the faculty are faculty members in tenure-track positions, including those who have not yet earned tenure. This includes persons on joint appointments between the department and other units of the University of Tennessee. Tenure-track faculty members on full- or part-time leaves of absence, or on reduced time, are voting members of the faculty. "Participating" NTT (non-tenure track) faculty members in the department are considered voting members of the department for program-, departmental-, and college-level decisions brought to

the department, with the following parameters. 1) “Participating” NTT faculty members may vote on all issues except for any issue or procedure involving the evaluation of tenure track faculty or where the UT Faculty Handbook prohibits their participation, e.g., promotion and tenure decisions. 2) NTT faculty members who have less than a 75% appointment and/or are considered “Supporting” will not be considered voting faculty members.

Special voting requirements for promotions in academic rank and the granting of tenure are specified in the Faculty Handbook and take precedent over this document.

II. Departmental Business

A. Academic Policy

Generally, academic policy matters concerning the Finance Department shall be determined under a democratic system consisting of Departmental Faculty Meetings, Standing Committees, Special Committees and other appointments as set forth in subsequent sections.

B. Routine Decisions

Other, more or less, routine items of business affecting the day-to-day operations of the department such as teaching assignments, class schedules, committee appointments, budgetary decisions, assignment of office space, personnel matters, etc., shall be reserved to the discretion of the Department Head. Situations may arise in which routine matters require a faculty decision, but to defer action until a scheduled faculty meeting will unduly delay moving forward with regard to the specific action. At the discretion of the Department Head a vote of the faculty may be taken by mail/e-mail. For votes taken in this manner, the decision will be based on a simple majority of those voting. When voting in this manner, one option available to the faculty will be to request deferral of the vote until discussion is held at the next scheduled faculty meeting. Deferral will occur if 10% or more of the faculty members who cast a vote so request.

Searches for, and hiring, of non-faculty departmental staff shall be in accordance with university policies.

C. Budget Issues

The faculty will be consulted by the Department Head on major departmental budgetary issues.

D. Department Faculty Meetings

1. Department Faculty Meetings shall be held at least twice a semester during the academic year, and as necessary to facilitate the work of departmental faculty committees as outlined in these bylaws. Additional meetings may be called by the Department Head or upon written request of 25 percent of the faculty. One-half the voting membership of the faculty shall constitute a quorum. Voting members who are absent, but who have appointed a proxy who is present, shall be considered present when determining if a quorum is constituted. A simple majority of those voting shall decide any issue.
2. A voting member who will be absent from a faculty meeting may either vote an absentee ballot on specific issues that are expected to arise, or may assign a proxy to vote in his or her place. An absentee ballot must be received either in writing or via email by the Department Head one half hour before the meeting's scheduled starting time. A proxy must be appointed with notification to the Department Head, either in writing or via email, one half hour before the meeting's scheduled start time.
3. A voting member may request to be present via an electronic "teleconference." The Department Head will allow this provided a) the requestor arranges for a telephone (or equivalent technology) to be placed in the meeting room and b) the requestor participates in the meeting via speakerphone (or equivalent technology). It shall not be the Department Head's responsibility to arrange for the teleconference, nor shall this provision be deemed to require that an absent member be telephoned to solicit a vote. In the absence of an absentee ballot or proxy assignment, the failure of communications during a teleconference meeting shall be the

same as if the member attending via teleconference were absent.

4. The Department Head (or another voting member duly appointed by the Head) shall preside over department meetings.
5. The initial agenda for regular departmental meetings shall be prepared by the Department Head and circulated in written form among the faculty at least one week prior to the meeting. Additional items may be suggested by individual faculty and, at the discretion of the Department Head, added to the agenda for the forthcoming meeting. Alternatively, items may be placed on the agenda by written petition of 25 percent of the voting faculty. In addition, agenda items may originate in Departmental committees as described elsewhere in these bylaws.

E. Conduct of Meetings

1. All meetings shall be conducted in accordance with acceptable parliamentary procedures. Minutes of all meetings, results of all votes taken, and copies of all reports submitted shall be retained and made available to the faculty.
2. Procedures for voting by faculty at scheduled meetings are as follows:
 - A faculty member on leave may vote in absentia as indicated in section II.D.2 above.
 - Additional item: In the absence of arrangements specified in items II.D.2 or II.D.3, a faculty member who is absent from a meeting will lose their voting privilege on votes taken in that meeting.
 - A secret ballot vote may be called for by any voting member on any issue that requires a vote.
 - A simple majority of those voting shall decide any issue.

III. Departmental Committees

A. Standing Committees

The following standing committees shall be created to assume the responsibilities described.

1. Undergraduate Program Committee

- (a) This Committee shall be concerned with all matters relating to the undergraduate curriculum. Proposals with regard to such matters may be submitted to the Committee by individual faculty members or by the Department Head. It shall be the duty of the Committee to discuss such proposals and to place them, along with a Committee report, on a departmental faculty meeting agenda if departmental action is required. Final decisions on these matters shall rest with the department.
- (b) The Committee, appointed by the Department Head, shall consist of the Department Head and at least four other faculty members.
- (c) The Committee shall meet as often as necessary to ensure timely action on matters under its jurisdiction. The time and place of meetings shall be announced to the entire faculty, any of whom shall have the right to attend and be heard. Minutes of Committee meetings shall be kept and made available to faculty upon request.
- (d) A member of the Undergraduate Program Committee shall be assigned by the Department Head to represent the department in matters relating to undergraduate advising.

2. MBA Program Committee

- (a) This Committee shall be concerned with matters relating to the MBA program as they impact the Finance Department. Proposals with regard to such matters may be submitted to the Committee by faculty

members or by the Department Head. It shall be the duty of the Committee to discuss such proposals and to place them, along with a Committee report, on a departmental faculty meeting agenda if departmental action is required. Final decisions on these matters shall rest with the department.

- (b) The Committee, appointed by the Department Head, shall consist of the Department Head, and at least three other faculty members.
- (c) The Committee shall meet as often as necessary to ensure timely action on matters under its jurisdiction. The time and place of meetings shall be made known to the entire faculty, who shall have the right to attend and be heard. Minutes of Committee meetings shall be kept and made available to the faculty upon request.
- (d) A member of the MBA Program Committee shall be assigned by the Department Head to represent the department in matters relating to MBA advising.

3. PH.D. Program Committee

- (a) This Committee shall be concerned with all matters relating to the Ph.D. curriculum, courses and programs as they impact the Finance Department. Proposals with regard to such matters may be submitted to the Committee by faculty members or may be generated by the Department Head. It shall be the duty of the Committee to discuss such proposals and to place them, along with a Committee report, on a departmental faculty meeting agenda if departmental action is required. Final decisions on these matters shall rest with the department.
- (b) The Committee, appointed by the Department Head, shall consist of the Department Head and at least four other faculty members.
- (c) The Committee shall meet as often as necessary to ensure timely action on matters under its jurisdiction. The time and place of meetings shall be made known to the entire faculty, who shall have

the right to attend and be heard. Minutes of Committee meetings shall be kept and made available to faculty on request.

- (d) The Committee, through its chairperson, shall be responsible for the coordination of student advising, and one member shall be appointed as primary advisor of Ph.D. students.
- (e) This Committee shall be concerned with the recruitment and evaluation of applicants for admission to the doctoral program. Within standards and guidelines established by the University, the College of Business Administration and the Finance Department, it shall decide, by majority vote, whether individual applicants are to be admitted. It also shall make recommendations to the Department Head concerning graduate assistantships and other forms of financial aid to be granted.
- (f) For the benefit of the Committee and the department, the primary advisor of the Ph.D. students shall be responsible for the maintenance and retention of all graduate students' records, qualifying and comprehensive exam scores, copies of examination questions, and all other student related information necessary to the operation of the Ph.D. program.

B. Ad Hoc Committees

The department head may assign faculty to ad hoc committees, such as those necessary to address faculty appointments, annual performance evaluation, and promotion and tenure decisions, as specified elsewhere in these bylaws, or as deemed necessary to address other issues that come before the department.

IV. Faculty Appointment, Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure

A. Criteria for Appointment, Retention and Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty

Criteria for promotion, retention and evaluation of tenure-track and tenured faculty members are as set forth in the *Faculty Handbook, UT Manual for*

Faculty Evaluation, and CBA Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Guidelines.

B. The Process for Appointment to a Tenure-track Position

Departmental faculty nominate potential search committee members from which the department head selects a search committee. The committee shall be comprised of no less than two (2) faculty members from the Department, and may include one faculty member outside the Department. The Committee shall follow University and College guidelines appropriate to the type of search. The Committee will screen candidates according to the agreed position criteria and recommend principal and alternate pools of candidates to the Department Head and Dean. After approval from the College and University, the Committee will schedule interviews. Subsequent to the interviews, the tenured and tenure-track faculty will evaluate and vote on the candidates and make a recommendation to the department head. The recommendation may be negative for all candidates interviewed, or in favor of a single candidate, or in the form of a definitive ranking of candidates. The Department Head will make an independent recommendation to the Dean for approval before extending a formal offer. If the head's recommendation diverges from that of the faculty, the head must explain his or her reasons in detail to the faculty, who have the right to meet with the dean and chief academic officer about the recommendation.

C. The Process of Annual Performance Evaluation for Tenure-track Faculty

The annual performance evaluation process for departmental faculty is specified in Appendix A: *Finance Department Faculty Evaluation Policy and Procedures.*

D. Appointment and Evaluation of Non Tenure-track Faculty

The search process should be the same as for tenure-track faculty, except for part-time instructional (non-faculty) personnel, who may be hired to fill temporary needs that may arise. In the latter cases, the Department Head shall have the discretion, subject to University guidelines, to hire qualified personnel as necessary to fulfill the departmental teaching mission, e.g., to

cover courses when a member of the faculty is on professional development leave. Non-tenure track faculty performance evaluation shall be in a manner consistent with their assigned duties, and, as applicable, with the rank description in the Faculty Handbook, but otherwise follow the same procedural policies as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that they are reappointed annually. Specific procedures are found in Appendix A: Finance Department Faculty Evaluation Policy Document and Procedures.

E. Tenure and Promotion Committees

1. Committee on Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

- (a) A special departmental Committee, consisting of all tenured or tenure-track Professors and Associate Professors in the department shall be appointed to make recommendations to the Department Head with regard to candidates requesting promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.
- (b) The Department Head shall chair all meetings of this Committee which shall be called as often as necessary to consider requests for promotion. The time and place of meetings shall be made known to Committee members two weeks in advance.
- (c) With respect to all promotion decisions, the Committee shall be provided with all information necessary to consider in depth the teaching, research, and public and institutional service effectiveness of individual candidates.
- (d) Two-thirds of the Committee membership being in attendance shall constitute a quorum. Issues shall be decided by a simple majority of votes cast. Voting shall be by secret ballot, with votes to be counted independently by two Committee members designated by the Chairperson.
- (e) Absentee ballots shall be allowed if the absentee voter is willing to relinquish any claim to anonymity vis-à-vis the two Committee members counting the votes. An absentee ballot carrying the signature of the absentee voter must be delivered in writing to the Committee

members discharging this responsibility. There shall be, however, no further disclosure of the nature of the vote. In unusual circumstances, operational procedures may be altered by majority vote of the Committee.

2. Committee on Promotion to Rank of Professor

A special departmental Committee, consisting of all tenured or tenure-track Professors in the department shall be appointed to make recommendations to the Department Head concerning all candidates requesting promotion to the rank of Professor. Operational rules for this Committee shall be equivalent to those indicated above in IV.E.1, (b), (c), (d), and (e).

3. Tenure Committee

A special department Committee, consisting of all tenured members of the department faculty, shall be appointed to make tenure recommendations to the Department Head. The Department Head shall chair all meetings of this Committee which shall be called as often as necessary to consider requests for tenure. The time and place of meetings shall be made known to Committee members two weeks in advance. The operational rules for this Committee shall be equivalent to those indicated above in IV.E.1, (b), (c), (d), and (e).

F. Salary Adjustments

Annual salary recommendations are made by the head, after due consideration of annual and cumulative annual performance evaluations, and otherwise in accordance with University and College guidelines.

V. Appointment and Evaluation of the Department Head

A. Appointment

The process for appointment of the Department Head shall be in accordance with that set forth in the Faculty Handbook.

B. Evaluation

The department head will be reviewed annually according to University and College procedures as set forth in the Faculty Handbook and CBA Bylaws.

VI. Other Department Offices, Committees, and Representatives on College or University Committees

Other Department, College or University offices and/or Committee assignments may be required from time to time. Such positions may be filled by Department Head appointment, or by the Dean of the College of Business Administration. In some Committees, confidentiality may be essential, in which case only Committee members will participate in such Committee meetings.

VII. Leave of Absence

Requests for paid or unpaid leaves of absence shall be evaluated by an ad hoc committee consisting of at least three tenured or tenure-track faculty members who are not requesting a leave of absence. The committee shall be appointed by the Department Head. The committee shall provide to the Head a ranking of the requests and an independent recommendation of whether each request should be approved. The Department Head shall take the rankings and recommendations into consideration when evaluating leave requests. Differences in opinion between the Department Head and the ranking committee shall be reported in writing as the requests move forward. The criteria for the rankings and recommendations are as follows:

A. Paid Leaves of Absence

1. All proposals for paid leaves of absence are to be evaluated primarily on merit, which is defined herein to be the extent to which the activities to be

undertaken during the leave contribute to the missions of the Department, College, and University. Secondary criteria that may enter into the evaluation are: time since the faculty member's last leave of absence, and the result of any previous leave of absence. Seniority shall not in itself be considered.

2. Full-time tenured faculty with a minimum of six years full-time campus service since any previously granted professional leave are eligible to apply for Faculty Development Leave. Specific requirements are given in the UTK Chancellor's statement on Faculty Development Leave. Faculty are encouraged to take advantage of the program, and the department head will make reasonable efforts to facilitate Finance faculty participation in the program. Since Faculty Development Leave is a paid leave of absence, the terms of the previous paragraph apply.
3. Within three months of returning from paid leave, the faculty member shall submit to the department head and the evaluation committee a report of activities undertaken. The report will be used in evaluating the faculty member's future applications for professional leave. The report on the leave may also be used as part of the considerations for merit raises and subsequent promotion.

B. Unpaid Leaves of Absence

A request for an unpaid leave of absence is to be evaluated on the basis of whether it serves the department's interests.

VIII. Grievance and Hearing Procedures

Faculty members are entitled to fair, impartial, and honest resolutions of problems that may arise in relation to employment. All tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty have a right to bring complaints or grievances as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

IX. Ratification and Amendment Of These Bylaws

Ratification and subsequent amendment of these by-laws may be accomplished by two-thirds majority vote of the voting faculty as defined herein. Appendix A to this document, “Finance Department Faculty Evaluation Policy and Procedures” and Appendix A1, “Journal Classifications” may be amended and ratified separately by a two-thirds majority of the voting faculty, as defined herein, without requiring a vote on the complete by-laws.

Ratified: May 16, 2005

James W. Wansley, Department Head

Appendix A (to departmental by-laws)
Finance Department Faculty Evaluation Policy
and Procedures

Finance Department
College of Business Administration
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996

April 23, 2005

Approved by faculty vote on April 23, 2005
(Amended by faculty vote, April 12, 2006)
(Amended by faculty vote, November 24, 2009)
(Amended by faculty vote, August 31, 2010)

Finance Department Faculty Evaluation Policy and Procedures

Preface

The quality of the University is sustained through the dedicated and creative work of the faculty. Procedures for the fair, systematic, and thorough appraisal of each faculty for continued appointment, for promotion in academic rank, and for granting of tenure are extremely important to furthering the University mission. The *UTK Faculty Handbook* (<http://provost.utk.edu/facultyhandbook>), *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* (<http://provost.utk.edu/evaluation/>), and the *College of Business Administration Faculty Evaluation Policy Document and Procedures* provide expectations of faculty performance, and an outline of procedures for performance evaluation. If any provision of the Evaluation policy and Procedures conflicts with any provision of the handbook or board policy, the *Faculty Handbook* and The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees' Policy control.

Achieving a fair, systematic, and thorough evaluation process is a primary responsibility of the administrative leadership within the College of Business Administration, including the Dean and Department Heads. Departments have the primary responsibility for developing and implementing faculty evaluations that are consonant with general University procedures laid out in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation.

Objectives and Purpose of Faculty Evaluations

Appropriate selection, retention, and evaluation of faculty are critical to the professional growth and development of faculty, and for the continuing success of the College of Business Administration. An important element in the faculty growth and development process is the mutual agreement and understanding of their performance measures. Regular constructive feedback to each faculty member in the form of annual faculty reviews assists faculty members to plan and implement their specific goals and to understand how their performance enhances the visibility and stature of the Department in the academic and professional communities. It is understood that the objectives of such feedback are the mutual understanding of expectations and the assistance such feedback can bring in helping faculty improve performance.

The College of Business Administration and the Department of Finance embrace the discovery and dissemination of knowledge for the benefit of students, business professionals, and the academic community. Individual faculty members have different skills and opportunities to contribute to the success of the College and Department. While retaining the basic expectation that every tenure-track and tenured faculty member contribute in the areas of teaching; research, scholarship, and creative activities; and service, each faculty member's responsibilities and performance expectations may differ.

Performance Evaluation Processes

All faculty members, including probationary (tenure-track) faculty, full-time instructors, lecturers, tenured faculty and other faculty, are reviewed in accordance with University of Tennessee policy. The areas of performance evaluation for faculty include annual retention reviews for non-tenure-track and tenure-track faculty, annual reviews for tenured faculty, promotion and tenure reviews, post-tenure cumulative reviews, and reviews of Named Professorships/Chairs. The College of Business Administration's faculty evaluation policies and procedures are congruent with, and provide additional clarification to, *The Faculty Handbook* (<http://provost.utk.edu/facultyhandbook1>), the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* (<http://provost.utk.edu/evaluation/>), and the *Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure* (<http://provost.utk.edu/tenure>). These University policies and procedures are incorporated herein by reference. The Faculty Evaluation Calendar is published at the beginning of each academic year on the Provost's website (<http://provost.utk.edu/evaluation/>). This calendar contains the timeliness and reporting deadlines for all the review and evaluation processes described in this document.

Overview of the Annual Review Process

The *UTK Manual for Faculty Evaluation* requires that each faculty member be evaluated annually and receive a numerical rating of:

- 5-Outstanding (Excellent): far exceeds expectations,
- 4- More than expected (Very Good): exceeds expectations,
- 3-Expected (Good): meets expectations;

2-Less than Expected (Fair): falls short of meeting expectations; or

1-Unsatisfactory (Poor): falls far short of meeting expectations

rating of Exceeds Expectations (EE), Meets Expectations (ME), Needs Improvement in each of the three dimensions (a) teaching (b) research/scholarship/Creative Activity, and (c) service, as well as an Overall rating. In addition, for purposes of merit and performance-based salary adjustments, each faculty receives a rating of:

Exceeds Expectations: (Is eligible for significant merit/performance pay adjustments),

Meets Expectations: (Is eligible for minimum merit/performance pay adjustments),

Needs Improvement: (Is not eligible for merit/performance pay adjustments),

Unsatisfactory: (Is not eligible for merit/performance pay adjustments),

The following sections describe how this overall categorical performance evaluation shall be determined in the Finance Department. Faculty members shall have all rights of appeal as described in the *UTK Faculty Handbook* and the *UTK Manual for Faculty Evaluation*.

The following evaluation procedures apply to tenure-track faculty members who are on a “standard” load equivalent to teaching two three-hour courses each semester. The evaluation procedures for tenure-track faculty members who are not on such a “standard” teaching load is described at the end of this document. In addition, the evaluation procedures for non-tenure-track faculty members are described at the end of this document.

The relevant dates and deadlines for the annual review process set out by the Provost’s Office each year, and the department will conform to those dates.

This document (the *Finance Department Faculty Evaluation Policy Document and Procedures*) can be amended by approval of a simple majority vote of the eligible voting faculty.¹ The document can be amended without requiring that departmental by-laws be amended.

Determining the Overall Performance (1-5) and Categorical Rating (EE, ME, NI, or U)

As described in the following sections, the annual faculty evaluation system will use inputs from students, peer committees, the department head, the faculty member being evaluated and others, as appropriate, to produce for each faculty member an overall numeric score. The

Department Head will take these overall numerical scores, faculty performance during the reporting period, and other UTK and CBA guidelines into consideration during the annual review. The Department Head will then assign to each faculty member an overall performance evaluation as well as an evaluation for each of the three areas, (a) teaching, (b) Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity, and (c) Service and Professionalism. In addition, the department head will assign each faculty member a categorical rating of Exceeds Expectations (EE), Meets Expectations (ME), Needs Improvement (NI), or Unsatisfactory (U).² The Department Head's assignment of overall categorical ratings is not required to conform to the same ordinal ranking as the overall numerical score produced by the faculty evaluation system; i.e., the rating produced by the faculty evaluation system is only advisory.

A key element of the departmental faculty evaluation system is a high level of transparency/visibility, with a goal of promoting consistency throughout the evaluation process. Therefore, each faculty member shall receive the numerical ranking submitted for them by the department peer committees or by the department head and have access to the overall numerical ratings of all faculty members. The categorical ratings assigned by the Department Head are part of a faculty member's personnel file and are not publicly available information. However, in the interests of transparency, the Department Head will provide a distribution of numeric and categorical ratings to the faculty; i.e., the number of EE's, the number of ME's, etc. Also, if the assigned numeric and categorical ratings are not consistent with the overall numerical ratings (e.g., faculty member A has a numerical rating of 80 and B has a rating of 70, but A received an ME while B received an EE), then the Department Head will notify the affected faculty members.

The remainder of this document describes the process for determining the overall numerical score.

Determination of the Overall Numerical Score

¹ The vote shall be by secret ballot if any faculty member requests one.

² Notice that the faculty evaluation system "stops" with an overall numerical score and does not "translate" that score into a categorical rating of EE, ME, NI, or U. As explained later, faculty will rotate through different peer committees, which means that the ratings assigned by a peer committee one year may not be directly comparable to those assigned in previous years. In other words, the same committee will rate all faculty members in a given year, but the composition of the committee will change from year to year, leading to scores that may not be comparable

As described in subsequent sections, each faculty member will receive a numerical score in each of the following three areas of responsibility: (1) teaching; (2) research, scholarship, & creative activities (RS&CA); and (3) service/professionalism. A faculty member's scores from the three areas will be weighted to produce an overall numerical score. The weights may be different for different faculty members to recognize individual faculty members' strengths and to recognize individual contributions to departmental needs. However, all faculty members are expected to make contributions in all three areas. To reflect the required contributions in all three areas, the minimum weights for each area for a faculty member on a "standard" teaching/research/service workload are:³

<u>Area of Responsibility</u>	<u>Minimum Weights</u>
Teaching	30%
Research, Scholarship, & Creative Activities	30%
Service	5%

At the annual planning and performance evaluation review session, the Department Head and faculty member will discuss the weights that will be applied to the faculty member for the upcoming year. The Department Head, in consultation with the faculty member, will take into consideration the faculty member's strengths and the departmental needs when setting the faculty member's weights for the upcoming year, subject to the minimum weights shown above.

Following is a simple numerical example illustrating the determination of the overall numerical score. Suppose a faculty member received a score of 80 for teaching, 85 for RS&CA, and 60 for service/professionalism. Suppose the respective weights were set at 30.0%, 65.0%, and 5.0% at the previous year's planning and review session. As shown in the table below, this combination of scores and weights produces an overall numerical score of 82.25.

from year to year. Because there is no way for a fixed translation of numerical scores into categorical ratings to be reliable from year to year, the assignment of categorical ratings is left to the Department Head.

³ If a faculty member is on a non-standard teaching load (i.e., a load consisting of something other than the equivalent of four 3-hour courses per academic year), then the minimum weights for such a situation shall be determined by the Department Head.

Example	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Teaching	80	30.0%	24.00
Research, Scholarship, & Creative Activities	85	65.0%	55.25
Service	60	5.0%	3.0
Overall		100.0%	82.25

As noted earlier, the departmental system strives for a high level of visibility. Therefore, the table above for each faculty member will be available for viewing by all faculty members prior to the annual planning and performance review meetings between the Department Head and the faculty members.

The following sections explain how the numerical scores and assessment for each area of responsibility are determined.

Overview of the Determination of the Numerical Scores for Each Area of Responsibility

Details for each area of responsibility follow, but in general the numerical score for a particular area of responsibility will be based upon assessments that may include: (1) specific accomplishments by the faculty member, (2) ratings from student evaluation forms, (3) self-review, (4) assessments by the department head and and (5) peer review.

With respect to peer review, each year a research (RS&CA) peer review committee and in every third year a teaching peer review committee will be formed in the department. Only full-time faculty members, excluding those in visiting positions, shall serve on these committees. Each tenured faculty member will be assigned to one of these committees.⁴ Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members are eligible for assignment to the teaching peer review committee but not the research peer review committee. Membership in the peer committees shall be rotated annually so that all eligible faculty participate over time. In general, one faculty member from the peer research committee shall be retained from year to year in order to facilitate consistency. In general, the faculty member being reassigned to a new committee will be the faculty member with the longest tenure on the current committee.

⁴ Untenured, tenure-track faculty members do not serve on these committees because this puts them in the awkward position of having to evaluate the same faculty who will be making P&T decisions. Faculty on leave or on sabbatical will be excused from duty on these committees, unless they request to remain on a committee.

Each faculty member will provide to the Department Head appropriate review materials, describing accomplishments in (1) teaching, (2) research, scholarship, and creative activities and (3) service and professionalism. Faculty should submit review materials consistent with college and university requirements, although the department head may request additional, specific information. . The Department Head will make the appropriate information available to the respective peer evaluation committees. After the peer committees complete their evaluations, the peer committees will return the material to the Department Head along with the results of their evaluation.

Following are detailed descriptions of the evaluation process for each of the four areas of responsibility.

Determination of the Numerical Scores for Teaching

At a minimum, teaching will be assessed by students, the department head, and when available, a peer teaching committee. In addition, faculty with teaching responsibilities in college programs, such as the MBA or Executive or Professional MBA programs, will also be assessed by Directors or the appropriate individuals from those programs. Student evaluations will be used to assess instructional effectiveness, and the peer teaching committee will assess content design skills and pedagogy. Following is a matrix, with rows showing the components of the teaching area of responsibility and columns showing the assessors. Each cell shows the “weight” that will be applied to that particular cell. Notice that some cells have a zero weight, indicating that the assessor shown in the column title is not required to evaluate that particular cell. The result of the evaluation by the assessors for cells with non-zero weights shall be a numerical score between 0 and 100. The preliminary numerical score for the area of responsibility will be the weighted average of the cell scores.

Teaching	Students	Peers/Department	Total
Instructional Effectiveness	33.0%	0.0%	
Content Design (appropriate choice of material, textbooks, class notes, etc.)	0.0%	33.5%	
Pedagogy (appropriate tests, projects, grading, etc.)	0.0%	33.5%	
Total	33%	67%	100.00%

An Example of Determination of Teaching Evaluation

Assume that a faculty member received the scores within each cell, as shown below. This would result in a weighted average score of 48.2, given the weights in the table above. This weighted average will be augmented by any special teaching-related accomplishments that are above and beyond the normal teaching-related requirements placed upon all faculty; these are explained in detail later.⁵ In this example, suppose the faculty member received 5 points for special teaching-related accomplishments. The total score for teaching would be 53.2.

Example

Teaching	Students	Peers/Department	Total	
Instructional Effectiveness	80	0		
Content Design (appropriate choice of material, textbooks, class notes, etc.)	0	70		
Pedagogy (appropriate tests, projects, grading, etc.)	0	60		
	Total weighted score:	26.4	21.8	48.2
Weighted score:			48.2	
Extra points (college teaching awards, university teaching awards, participation in major curriculum development, etc.)			5	
Total teaching score:			<u>53.2</u>	

In the interests of transparency/visibility, the table above for each faculty member shall be made available to all faculty members.

With respect to individual cell scores, consider first the cell for student assessment of instructional effectiveness. The score in this cell shall be derived from student assessments of instruction. Following is a description of the process.

The standing departmental Undergraduate Committee, MBA Committee, and Ph.D. Committee shall examine the questions asked on the University's Student Assessment of Instruction (SAIS) forms or on any other assessment forms used by the College. The committees

⁵ The rationale for including such extra points outside of the weighted average is that including such accomplishments within the weighted average would have the effect of punishing faculty members who do not have such achievements. For example, it seems appropriate to recognize a faculty member who receives a university teaching award, but it seems inappropriate to penalize other faculty members who do not receive any such an award. A detailed explanation of these special points comes later in this section.

shall identify an appropriate subset of questions for each course within their domain (e.g., the Undergraduate Committee will identify the appropriate questions for each of the Finance Department's undergraduate courses).⁶ These committees will also determine an appropriate set of "comparison classes" for each course within their respective domains. For example, the Undergraduate Committee might identify an appropriate set of comparison courses for large sections (more than 60 students) of Fin 301, for regular sections of Fin 301 (less than 60), for required electives (Fin 425, Fin 435, and Fin 445), etc. After the comparison courses and the subset of questions have been identified, the Department Head shall be responsible for gathering the mean responses for each of the comparison courses for each question in the subset; these data are available at the web site for TN101, <http://ecommerce.cas.utk.edu/tn101online/default.asp>.⁷ The Department Head shall be responsible for having the mean and variance calculated for the comparison group for each question in the subset.

Each fall semester, the Department Head shall be responsible for obtaining the teaching evaluations for each faculty member for the previous year (i.e., the previous spring semester, the previous summer semester, and the previous fall semester). Using the appropriate comparison group mean and variance, the Department Head shall be responsible for calculating the faculty member's percentile score for each course taught by each faculty member during the previous spring semester, the previous summer semester, and the previous fall semester.⁸ The percentile scores for each course that the faculty member has taught in the previous three academic years shall be averaged to produce an average percentile score.⁹ This average percentile score shall be

⁶ This subset shall consist of approximately 4 to 6 questions related to the student's assessment of instructional effectiveness. There are 11 available Student Assessment of Instruction System (SAIS) Forms provided by the University for students to assess instructors, with different forms designed to be used by different types of classes (e.g., Form A is designed for "small lecture/discussion classes", while Form B is designed for "large lecture classes"). Each faculty member may choose the form that the faculty member deems most appropriate, subject to the constraint that the form contain the subset of questions identified by the departmental standing committees.

⁷ Similar data will be gathered for the various MBA programs. This data will be updated only as needed, and not necessarily each year.

⁸ Parts of the teaching loads of a faculty member may be in MBA programs, such as the MBA Core, PEMBA, and SEMBA. These programs use their own evaluation forms. A similar procedure (i.e., rank the faculty member relative to the other faculty teaching in those programs) shall be used for such teaching loads.

⁹ This shall be an average of all courses taught during this period, with no adjustment for different numbers of students in different courses. The scores for three years are used to encourage the faculty member to innovate in teaching, even if first efforts at innovation are not always successful. For example, if the faculty evaluation is occurring in the Fall of 2010, then teaching evaluations will be used from Summer 2010 (if available), Spring 2010, Fall 2009, Summer 2009, Spring 2009, Fall 2008, Summer 2008, Spring 2008, and Fall 2007. Time spent on professional leave does not count towards the rolling window. For example, the window is extending backwards as necessary so that the evaluation window covers the required number of semesters in the classroom.

multiplied by 100 and the result entered into the cell for student evaluation of instructional effectiveness in the spreadsheet that is maintained by the office of the Department Head. This spreadsheet, with the completed cell for the student assessment of instructional effectiveness, shall be provided to the peer committee assessing teaching.

With respect to peer and department assessment, the faculty member shall produce appropriate review materials, consistent with college and university requirements, for the previous three years: The review materials should include the following items:

- a. A written philosophy of teaching/learning and evidence of implementing that philosophy.
- b. Evidence indicating the degree of continuous improvement, innovation, and currency in the content, design, and conduct of teaching.
- c. Evidence that the course content exposes students to theory and application to contemporary problems and opportunities in organizational practice.

The faculty member is encouraged to include the following additional items listed in the *College of Business Administration Faculty Evaluation Policy Document and Procedures* as ways to demonstrate expanded teaching contributions:

- d. Evidence of ability to teach at different levels in traditional degree programs, including undergraduate, masters, and doctoral programs. Demonstrating the ability to teach at more than one level, to a variety of audiences, and across disciplinary boundaries is considered a positive attribute.
- e. Evidence of the ability to teach in a continuing education and non-degree executive education capacity, including degree programs such as executive MBA, and certificate programs.
- f. Evidence of any significant contributions to collaborative efforts to design, coordinate and otherwise improve the curricula.
- g. Evidence indicating book authorship in the relevant discipline.
- h. Evidence of program leadership.

Members of the peer committee for teaching evaluation (or the department head in the appropriate years) will review the dossier. After discussion, the committee will determine scores (between 0 and 100) for the cell for peer evaluation of content design and the cell for peer evaluation of pedagogy.¹⁰ When making this determination, members should apply the same standard to all faculty of the same rank, although they may apply different standards to faculty members of different ranks, as indicated in the College of Business Administration Faculty Evaluation document and the UTK Faculty Handbook. Members of the committee should also take into consideration the values espoused in the *College of Business Administration Faculty Evaluation Policy Document and Procedures*.

The faculty evaluation system also has a provision for recognizing outstanding accomplishments. In particular, for each College teaching award, a faculty member shall be rewarded 10 points for each award received and 5 points for being finalist for nominations during the previous three years; 20 points for each University teaching award received, 7.5 points for being a finalist for nominations during the previous three years; 20 points for each textbook published during the previous three years; and 3 points for each chapter in a textbook.

The faculty member being evaluated should identify all outstanding accomplishments (as described above) and provide to the peer committee a list of these accomplishments and the total of the extra points earned by those accomplishments. The committee/department shall add these points to the weighted average when determining the total numerical score for teaching. The chair of the committee will then submit the completed matrix (including extra points) to the Department Head. Points for outstanding achievements are capped so that total points from teaching cannot exceed 100.

Determination of the Numerical Scores for Research, Scholarship, & Creative Activities (RS&CA)

RS&CA will be assessed by measurable outcomes related to the scholarship of discovery and by peers. Following is a matrix, with rows showing the components of the RS&CA area of responsibility and columns showing the assessors. For all cells with a non-zero weight, the evaluation by the assessors will result in a numerical score. Each cell shows the “weight” that

¹⁰ Some committees may choose to assign the score by consensus, others might ask each committee member to submit a score and then average those scores. Non-tenure-track faculty will have full membership rights and “voting

will be applied to that particular cell. The preliminary numerical score for the RS&CA area of responsibility will be the weighted average of the cell scores.

Because accomplishments in the scholarship of discovery rarely occur smoothly over time, accomplishments in the scholarship of discovery will be evaluated using a rolling window. The rolling window will be the previous 36 months prior to February 1 of the year of the evaluation.¹¹

Research, scholarship, and creative activities	Outcomes: Scholarship of discovery	Peer Review	Total
Scholarship of Discovery: Journal acceptances and presentations at meetings (in three-year window)	40%	20%	
Research process: Learning activities (paper at conference, review a paper for a journal, providing written feedback for a colleague's working paper, chairing a dissertation committee, serving on a dissertation committee, etc.)	0%	20%	
Research process: Writing activities (presenting a draft of working paper at an in-house workshop, submitting a manuscript to a conference, having papers under review, presenting a paper at a non-top-three conference, invited research presentation at another university or conference, etc.)	0%	20%	
Total	40%	60%	100%

A detailed explanation of how the individual cell scores are determined is explained later, but for now suppose that a faculty member received the following scores within each cell, as shown below. Using the weights above, the weighted average is 86. This weighted average will be augmented by any special RS&CA-related accomplishments that are above and beyond the normal RS&CA-related requirements placed upon all faculty; these are explained in detail

rights” in those committees on which they serve.

¹¹ For a faculty member on professional leave, the terms of the leave agreement will determine the treatment of the rolling window. If the terms of the leave are such that the faculty member is expected to spend time on research, then time spent on leave has no effect on the research window; i.e., the window reaches back three year. If the terms of the leave are such that the faculty member is not expected to spend time on research, then the rolling window will include the most recent 36 months for which the faculty member has not been on leave.

later.¹² In this example, suppose the faculty member received 5 points for special RS&CA-related accomplishments. The total score for RS&CA would be 91.

Example			
Research, scholarship, and creative activities	Outcomes	Peer Review	Total
Scholarship of Discovery: Journal acceptances and presentations at meetings (in three-year window)	96	90	
Research process: Learning activities (paper at conference, review a paper for a journal, providing written feedback for a colleague's working paper, chairing a dissertation committee, serving on a dissertation committee, etc.)	0	80	
Research process: Writing activities (presenting a draft of working paper at an in-house workshop, submitting a manuscript to a conference, having papers under review, presenting a paper at a non-top-three conference, invited research presentation at another university or conference, etc.)	0	70	
Total weighted scores	38	48	86
Weighted score:	86		
Extra points for publications in top three finance journals (JFE, JF, RFS) during past three years, college research awards, university research awards, association best paper awards, books, chapters in books, etc.)	5		
Total RS&CA score:	91		

In the interests of transparency/visibility, the table above for each faculty member shall be made available to all faculty members.

With respect to the individual cells, consider first the cell for “Scholarship of Discovery: Journal acceptances and presentations at meetings.” Although there are many aspects of

¹² The rationale for including such extra points outside of the weighted average is that including such accomplishments within the weighted average would have the effect of punishing faculty members who do not have such achievements. For example, it seems appropriate to recognize a faculty member who receives an association's best paper award, but it seems inappropriate to penalize other faculty members who do not receive such an award. A detailed explanation of these special points comes later in this section.

research and scholarship, published papers provide the greatest impact on the profession and the greatest enhancement of the department's visibility and reputation. Different journals have different degrees of impact on the profession. The assessment of journal impact is necessarily subjective, but we have classified a large number of journals into three categories: Premium, High Quality, and Quality. A fourth category of journals, "Other" consists of all peer reviewed journals not included in one of the three listed categories. The fourth category of "Other" journals is included to properly recognize all faculty research accomplishments, although faculty are encourage to publish in high visibility, high impact outlets. The list of journals may be may be amended at any time by approval of a majority vote by the eligible faculty without having to amend any other portion of these by-laws or amendments thereto.¹³

Because journal acceptances are intertemporally "lumpy," the score is the cumulative number of points during the three-years prior to the beginning of the academic year of review. For example, if the review is being conducted in the fall of 2010, then the review period includes 8/1/2007-7/31/2010. Acceptances in each category providing the following number of points:¹⁴

Premium	= 48 points
High Quality	= 24 points
Quality	= 12 point
Other	= 6 points

Because journal publications are expected from all faculty members, they are explicitly included in this part of the valuation matrix shown above. Because books and chapters in books are valued but are not expected from all faculty members, they are included later.

Note that unlike the scores for teaching, which are capped at 100 points, there is no maximum for journal acceptance points.

Because different meetings have different impact on the profession, papers accepted for presentation at different meetings will score a different number of points. Meetings of the American Finance Association, the Western Finance Association, and the American Economics

¹³ The vote shall be by secret ballot if a faculty member requests one. If a journal's value is amended and a faculty member already has a publication in that journal, then the new value will be used during the remainder of the three-year window.

¹⁴ For purposes of tallying points during the three-year window, the date of record is the date that a publication was accepted for publication. Faculty will include the acceptance letter or notification with their annual review materials. For example, suppose a paper is accepted on 1/10/2010. The points for this acceptance would count for the fall 2010-2012 evaluations.

Association are classified as “Premium” meetings and papers presented there are worth 6 points. Meetings of the Financial Management Association are classified as “High Quality” and papers presented there are worth 4 points. Papers presented at other meetings are worth 2 points.¹⁵ Points for presentations at meetings are capped at 18.

The reported score is the cumulative number of points during the three-year review period. For example, if the annual evaluation takes place during Fall 2010, then the three year review period is the 36 month: 8/1/07-7/31/2010. An author receives full credit for a publication irrespective of the number of co-authors.

The faculty member being evaluated should identify all research outcomes (as described above) and provide to the peer committee a list of these outcomes and the total of the points earned by those outcomes.

With respect to peer assessment, the faculty member will produce appropriate review materials, addressing the following items for the previous three years:

- a. A written philosophy of research, scholarship, and creative activity and evidence of implementing that philosophy.
- b. Evidence of a presence in journals acknowledged as influential in the faculty member’s topical area.
- c. Evidence of an on-going, distinctive program of research, scholarship, and creative activity.

Assistant and Associate Professors are also required by the *College of Business Administration Faculty Evaluation Policy Document and Procedures* to address the following item:

- d. Evidence of participation in leading academic and practitioner conferences (e.g., presentations, panel member, proceedings, etc.).

Senior faculty members are encouraged to also the following additional items listed in the *College of Business Administration Faculty Evaluation Policy Document and Procedures* as ways to demonstrate expanded RS&CA contributions:

¹⁵ There is no distinction in points for coauthored papers vs. single authored papers, and no distinction between the faculty member presenting the paper vs. a coauthor presenting the paper.

- e. Evidence of authoring books that impact the body of new knowledge in the relevant discipline.
- f. Evidence of efforts to secure external funding for a research, scholarship, and creative activity program; such funding may be used as an indication of research, scholarship, and creative activity relevance and potential for contribution.
- g. Evidence of collaborative research, scholarship, and creative activity within and across disciplines.
- h. Evidence of mentoring other faculty in their research, scholarship, and creative activity and career growth.
- i. Evidence of mentoring and supervising graduate students in their research and career growth.
- j. A description of all research awards and recognition of scholarly stature by election as fellows of professional organizations and selection to research-based leadership roles (e.g., editor) of recognized national academies.

While a department's reputation depends primarily upon peer-reviewed publications in academic journals, the publication itself is the culmination of a scholarly process that begins with learning, moves on to writing, and proceeds through a series of peer reviews. Therefore, the annual faculty evaluation will include an assessment of the faculty member's research process activities. In particular, the review materials should provide specific evidence concerning research process activities related to learning and writing. Learning activities include attending conferences, taking additional coursework, discussing a paper at conference, reviewing a paper for a journal, providing written feedback for a colleague's working paper, chairing a dissertation committee, serving on a dissertation committee, etc. Writing activities include presenting a draft of working paper at an in-house workshop, submitting a manuscript to a conference, having papers under review at journals, invited research presentations at another university or conference, etc.

Member of the peer committee for RS&CA evaluation will review the dossier annual review materials relating to research submitted by each faculty member . After discussion, the committee will assign scores (between 0 and 100) for the cells for peer evaluation of: (1) scholarship of discovery, (2) research process: learning activities, and (3) research process:

writing activities.¹⁶ When making this determination, members should apply the same standard to all faculty of the same rank, although they may apply different standard to faculty members of different ranks, as indicated in the *College of Business Administration Faculty Evaluation Policy Document and Procedures* and the *UTK Faculty Handbook*. Members of the committee should also take into consideration the values espoused in the *College of Business Administration Faculty Evaluation Policy Document and Procedures*.

The faculty evaluation system also has a provision for recognizing outstanding accomplishments and those that are not expected for all faculty members. For example, publications in the *Journal of Financial Economics*, the *Journal of Finance*, the *Review of Financial Studies* and the *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* have the most impact on the body of financial literature. (These are the finance journals listed in the *Financial Times* Top 40 business journals.) Therefore, an additional 30 points will be assigned for publications in these journals (this is in addition to the points assigned above in the cell for scholarship of discovery) during the previous three years. In addition, a faculty member will be rewarded 10 points for all College research awards received during the review period, 20 points for all University research awards received during the review period, 7 points for non-textbooks published during the review period, and 2 points for non-textbook chapters published during the review period.¹⁷ A faculty member shall be awarded 15 points for serving as the editor of a journal during the review period and 5 points for serving as an associate editor of a journal during the review period.¹⁸ If a faculty member wins a “best paper” award at a meeting during the review period, the faculty member shall receive twice as many points as for having a paper presented at that meeting. For example, if the award is at a Premium meeting, then the faculty member shall be awarded $2(6)=12$ points. If a faculty member wins a “best paper” award at a

¹⁶ Some committees may choose to assign the score by consensus, others might ask each committee member to submit a score and then average those scores.

¹⁷ The category “research awards” is intended to include recognition for accomplishments. As such it does not include the receipt of any financial grants made to support research projects made by the Department, the College, the University, or from agencies external from the University, since these are awarded to support new research rather than as explicit recognition for research accomplishments. The peer committee shall take any such grants into consideration when evaluating the faculty member.

¹⁸ For example, suppose a faculty member was the editor of a journal during the review period. The faculty member would receive 15 points, regardless of whether the faculty member served as editor for one, two, or three of the three years of the review period. Also, these points shall be awarded for each unique journal for which the faculty member was an editor during the review period. For example, if a faculty member served as the editor of one journal for three years during the review period and also served as editor of a second journal during one year of the review period, the faculty member shall be awarded 15 points for each journal editorship, for a total of 30 points.

journal during the previous three years, the faculty member shall receive twice as many points as for having a paper published at that journal. For example, if the award is for a paper in a Premium journal, then the faculty member shall be awarded $2(48)=96$ points. These points shall be added to the previously calculated weighted average when determining the total numerical score for RS&CA.

The faculty member being evaluated should identify all outstanding accomplishments (as described above) and provide to the department a list of these accomplishments and the total of the extra points earned by those accomplishments. [The department shall be responsible for making the appropriate review materials available to any review committees]. The committee shall add these points to the weighted average when determining the total numerical score for RS&CA. The chair of the committee will then submit the completed matrix (including extra points) to the Department Head. Points for outstanding achievements are capped so that these points will not cause a faculty member's research score to exceed 100.

Determination of the Numerical Scores for Service

Service will be assessed by peers and/or the department based on information provided by the faculty member.

Following is a matrix, with the row showing the components of the service area of responsibility and the column showing the peer assessors. The evaluation by the assessors will result in a numerical score entered in the cell.

Service	Peers
Departmental, College, and University Service Leadership and Contribution; Departmental, College, and University Service Membership and Contribution; and Service to the Profession.	100%
Total	100%

A detailed explanation of how the individual cell score is determined is explained later, but for now suppose that a faculty member received the following score, as shown below. Using the weights above, the weighted average is 70. This weighted average will be augmented by any

special service-related accomplishments that are above and beyond the normal service-related requirements placed upon all faculty; these are explained in detail later.¹⁹ In this example, suppose the faculty member received 5 points for special service-related accomplishments. The total score for service would be 75.

Example

Service	Peers
Departmental, College, and University Service Leadership and Contribution; Departmental, College, and University Service Membership and Contribution; and Service to the Profession.	70
Total	70
Weighted score:	70
Extra points (college service awards, university service awards, professional association service awards, etc.)	5
Total service score:	75

In the interests of transparency/visibility, the table above for each faculty member shall be made available to all faculty members.

With respect to peer or department assessment, the faculty members will produce appropriate review materials addressing accomplishments during the review period.²⁰ This list of accomplishments should address the following indicators listed in the *College of Business Administration Faculty Evaluation Policy Document and Procedures*. Note that this list is not meant to be all-inclusive, nor does it imply that all faculty members of all ranks must participate in all activities. See the *College of Business Administration Faculty Evaluation Policy*

¹⁹ The rationale for including such extra points outside of the weighted average is that including such accomplishments within the weighted average would have the effect of punishing faculty members who do not have such achievements. For example, it seems appropriate to recognize a faculty member who receives a university service award, but it seems inappropriate to penalize other faculty members who do not receive such an award. A detailed explanation of these special points comes later in this section.

²⁰ Time spent on professional leave does not count a part of the calendar years being evaluated. For those faculty on professional leave, the relevant time period for evaluation shall be the most recent 36 calendar months for which the faculty member was not on leave.

Document and Procedures for the suggestions regarding the appropriate scope for different ranks:

- a. Institutional strategic planning.
- b. Curricula design and evaluation.
- c. Other decision making and implementation efforts that govern the business of the Department, College, and University.
- d. Department, College and University committee memberships and chairpersonships.
- e. Reviewing the teaching and research of peers.
- f. Mentoring a probationary faculty member.
- g. Professional association service.
- h. Service on the editorial board of journals.
- i. Serving on accreditation or certification boards.
- j. Journal reviewing.

Members of the peer committee for service evaluation or the department head will assess the annual review material. A high score (evaluation) for service reflects both the level of service and the quality of service performed by that faculty member. For example, being on a large number of committees, by itself, is not indicative of a high level of service. The quality of service performed as well as the level of service are both important service dimensions and are important to the conduct of the Finance Department.

A score between 0 and 100 shall be assigned for service and the same standard shall be applied to all faculty of the same rank, although different standards may be applied to faculty members of different rank, as described in the *College of Business Administration Faculty Evaluation Policy Document and Procedures* and the *UTK Faculty Handbook*. Consideration shall also be given to the values espoused in the *College of Business Administration Faculty Evaluation Policy Document and Procedures*.

The faculty evaluation system also has a provision for recognizing outstanding and unusual accomplishments. In particular, a faculty member will be rewarded 10 points for all College service awards received during the review period, 20 points for all University service awards received during the review period, and 20 points professional association service awards

during the review period. These points shall be added to the previously calculated weighted average when determining the total numerical score for service. Points for outstanding achievements are capped so that these points will not cause a faculty member's score to exceed 100.

The faculty member being evaluated should identify all outstanding accomplishments (as described above) and provide a list of these accomplishments and the total of the extra points earned by those accomplishments. These points shall be added to the weighted average when determining the total numerical score for service.

Assessing Professionalism

Consistent with the College of Business Faculty Evaluation Policy Document, professionalism is also evaluated, either by a peer review committee or by the department head.

Each faculty member will produce a review document addressing the evidence of accomplishments during the review period in the following points:

- a. Demonstrating an ability to work appropriately and effectively with colleagues, staff, and students, in accordance with University Diversity Guidelines.
- b. Interactions and contributions consistent with the College and Department's mission, values, and strategic initiatives.
- c. Positive contributions to the Departmental missions and image.

When evaluating professionalism, one consideration will be the standards described in Section 2.2 of the *Faculty Handbook*: "Within the University, faculty members treat colleagues, staff, and students with respect and fairness. They listen to the views of others, work constructively as members of the diverse academic community, and safeguard the recognition of achievements of others, including those in subordinate positions. Faculty honesty in financial and personnel matters is expected. Beyond the University, individual faculty members are representatives to the wider community, which they treat with respect and fairness."

Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty Members who are not on a "Standard" Load

A standard work load is defined as one with the equivalent of teaching two three-hour courses each semester, with the remaining time allocated to research and service. Faculty not on such a standard teaching load shall be evaluated within each of the areas of responsibility in the same manner as faculty who are on a standard load. However, the Department Head shall take into account any difference in work load when determining the weights to be applied to each area of responsibility (with no minimum required weight applied to any area) and in determining the overall categorical rating (i.e., Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, etc.).

Evaluation of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members

The Department Head shall assign specific areas of responsibility to each non-tenure-track faculty member each year. For example, non-tenure-track faculty member might be required to perform teaching and service duties but not required to conduct research. The non-tenure-track faculty member shall be evaluated within each of the assigned areas of responsibility in the same manner as faculty who are on a standard load. However, the Department Head shall take into account the specific assigned areas of responsibility when determining the weights to be applied to each area of responsibility (with no minimum required weight applied to any area) and in determining the overall numerical and categorical rating (i.e., 1-5 and EE, ME, NI, UN, etc.).

Dates and Deadlines for the Annual Faculty Evaluation Process

The dates and deadlines for the promotion and tenure decision are described in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*. The remainder of this section describes the relevant dates and deadlines for the annual faculty retention review.

Each faculty member will submit relevant review materials (as described earlier in this document) to the department in a time frame consistent with a published calendar from the department, College or University. Likewise, the peer committees will submit their completed reviews, including the completed spreadsheets, to the Department Head within a time frame consistent with overall evaluation process. The Department Head will make the completed peer reviews available to faculty members prior to the annual planning and performance evaluation meeting between the Department Head and the faculty member. The Department Head shall complete the reviews within the time frame published by the university or College of Business.

Appendix A1: Journal Classifications

Journal list is separate.