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I. Effective Departmental Governance

The Department of Business Analytics and Statistics of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, shall be governed by these bylaws. These bylaws are subject to all provisions of faculty governance that appear in the University Faculty Handbook and the bylaws of the Haslam College of Business. In areas not specified in the departmental bylaws, relevant sections of the University Faculty Handbook and the bylaws of the Haslam College of Business shall apply.

II. Departmental Membership and Voting Rights

Voting membership in the department shall consist of all those faculty members who are tenured or have been appointed to tenure or tenure-track positions. In addition, non-tenure track hires with greater or equal to 75% assignment may be granted voting rights through a 2/3 vote of the existing voting faculty. Joint appointments with other research, administrative or teaching departments, bureaus, or offices within the university with department assignment of greater than 50% may through a 2/3 approval of voting faculty be granted voting rights. If a non-voting member is on a committee, that member will automatically enjoy voting privileges within the scope of the committee meetings only.

Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty (lecturers) who have less than 75% assignment (or “Supporting Faculty” in AACSB terminology) may not be considered voting faculty members.

Faculty members who are on full or part-time leaves of absence (or reduced time) still enjoy the voting status that would be available to them were they not on leave.

Special voting requirements for hiring of tenure track faculty, promotions in academic rank and granting of tenure are specified in the Faculty Handbook and take precedence over this document. In particular, only tenured and tenure-track faculty will evaluate and vote on the candidates for tenure track and tenured positions and make a recommendation to the department head. Departmental Emeritus Professors are departmental nonvoting faculty members.

In the event that a voting member is unable to attend a meeting where a vote will take place, if they wish to, they may inform the faculty of a proxy to cast their vote.

III. The Department Head

The department head is appointed by the Chancellor of the University but serves at the pleasure of the dean of the Haslam College of Business. The Faculty Handbook describes the responsibilities, selection, and evaluation procedures for the department head. Selection of the department head shall proceed under the rules of the Faculty Handbook. In accordance with the departmental voting rights as laid out in section II, all tenured track faculty and non-
tenured track faculty with voting rights shall participate in the voting for the recommendation for department head.

A. The department head is first and foremost a member of the Business Analytics and Statistics faculty, with responsibility for teaching, research and service. The department head is responsible for communication with the faculty, program directors, and committees on matters of importance at the departmental, College, and University levels. The department head is also responsible for constituting the standing committees of the department and seeing to it that the committees are operational.

B. The department head is responsible for providing leadership to the department in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

C. The department head is to provide leadership and support for the departmental academic programs by:
   i. Recruiting faculty and staff
   ii. Working with faculty to plan, execute and review curriculum
   iii. Encouraging and supporting faculty teaching, research and creative activity and public service
   iv. Representing the department to the public, the other faculty and administration, colleagues at other universities and institutions, and the constituency supporting the university
   v. Employment of support personnel
   vi. Management of department physical facilities and planning for space and equipment needs
   vii. Resource enhancement
   viii. Authorization of all expenditures from the department budget

D. As required in Section 1.4.3 of the Faculty Handbook, the department head will be responsible, with the input of the departmental faculty, of creating or revising the departmental strategic plan within the first 18 months of their tenure.

E. The department head is responsible for annual performance reviews of faculty and staff.

F. The department head is responsible for hiring part-time instructional (non-faculty) personnel to fill temporary needs that may arise. The department head shall have the discretion, subject to university guidelines, to hire qualified personnel to fulfill the departmental mission.

G. The department head is appointed to a five-year term and can be reappointed by the dean of the Haslam College of Business. The appointment is made following the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

H. The department head is responsible to present an annual budget report for the faculty. Any major changes should be reported to the faculty in a timely manner.

I. Annual Evaluation of the Department Head

Annual Evaluation: As specified in the Faculty Handbook, the departmental faculty provides annual objective and systematic evaluation of the department head to the dean of the College.
Reappointment: Near the end of the five-year term, the voting membership of the department and the dean perform a special evaluation of the department head’s performance, as specified in the Faculty Handbook. A favorable evaluation by the faculty and the dean could result in a second term that extends as long as five years. The decision to reappoint to a second term is made by the dean and requires approval by the provost.

IV. Departmental Responsibilities
   a. Faculty Responsibilities

All faculty members bear responsibility for research, teaching, service, and professional conduct. The distribution of effort across these four functions, however, may vary significantly, depending on the terms stipulated in a faculty member’s appointment letter as well as a faculty member’s rank, tenure, and administrative assignments. The Faculty Handbook describes the general responsibilities of faculty members.

   b. Departmental Business
      i. Academic Policy

Generally, academic policy matters concerning the BAS 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.

      ii. Routine Decisions

Routine items of business affecting the day-to-day operations such as teaching assignments, class schedules, committee appointments, budgetary decisions, assignment of office space, personnel matters, and representing the department to the College and University 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 might unduly delay moving forward with regard to the specific action. In such instances, at the discretion of the department head, a vote of the faculty may be taken by email and must be completed within five (5) business days. For votes taken in this manner, the decision will be based on a 2/3 approval of voting faculty. 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 faculty meeting. Deferral will occur if 20% or more of the faculty members who cast a vote so request.

      iii. Departmental Meetings
         1. Frequency
Department meetings shall be held at least twice per semester during the academic year and should be announced at least 10 days in advance. Additional meetings may be called by the department head or at the written request of a simple majority of the voting faculty. Meetings can be informational and/or voting meetings. Three-quarters of the voting membership of the faculty shall constitute a quorum. If a quorum is present, unless otherwise stipulated in the bylaws, a motion or vote will be deemed to have passed if at least 2/3 of the voting faculty present vote in agreement. If a 2/3 vote cannot be reached, the issue may be brought to the next meeting of the faculty for a vote. In all matters, the department head’s presence, vote, and proxy shall be counted on par with any other voting member.

2. Attendance

Voting members who cannot attend should inform the department head that they will not be present. They are encouraged to attend electronically and the department head should plan for this contingency in all meetings. Voting members who cannot attend or vote during the meeting may submit their vote prior to their meeting or name a proxy. The vote should be submitted electronically to the department head and BAS Staff/minute recorders.

3. Electronic Voting

The department head may request an electronic vote (email) for time sensitive non-critical issues. In such instances, at the discretion of the department head, a vote must be completed within a maximum of five (5) business days, but no less than two (2) business days. Deferral will automatically occur if 20% or more of the faculty members who cast a vote so request.

4. Secret Ballot

Any voting member on any issue can ask for a vote using a secret ballot vote.

5. Meeting Chairman

The department head, or his/her designate, shall serve as chair of the departmental meetings. The department will designate someone to record the minutes. Minutes of the meeting shall be made available to the faculty.

6. Agenda

The initial agenda for regular department meetings shall be prepared by the department head and distributed in writing to the faculty at least five calendar days prior to the meeting. Additional items may be suggested by individual faculty and, at the discretion of the department head, be added to the agenda. Alternately, item may be placed on the agenda by petition of 20% of the voting faculty. All additions
to the department head’s initial agenda must occur at least three days prior to the meeting.

7. New Motions

If, during the meeting, a matter not on the agenda evolves into a formal motion, that motion must be tabled until the next meeting if so requested by any voting member. If no such request is made and a vote is taken, that vote is binding only if 75% of all eligible voters, including those not present at the meeting, vote in favor of the motion.

iv. Ad Hoc Committees

Additional committees may be formed by either the head (e.g., search committees) or by the faculty at a departmental faculty meeting. Committees formed by the faculty may be dissolved only by the faculty at a faculty meeting. The members and chairs of committees formed by the head shall be designated by the head after consultation with the faculty, and such committees can be dissolved by the head. The chair of such a committee shall be a voting member of the departmental faculty. The head shall have the authority to remove or replace appointed members, or to appoint new members to fill vacancies when they occur. Committees formed by the head report directly to the head unless the head specifies that they report directly to the faculty.

A membership of a committee formed by the faculty shall be drawn by election from among the voting members of the departmental voting faculty. The chair of such a committee shall be determined by a majority vote of the members of that committee. Vacancies on elected committees shall be filled by special elections. Committees formed by the faculty shall report directly to the faculty during departmental faculty meetings. Committee membership shall be considered a duty of a faculty member.

The head shall not assign an excessive amount of committee work to a faculty member.

V. Departmental Standing Committees

1. The department head shall appoint the chair of all standing committees. The committees shall consist of at least three faculty members in addition to the chair and the department head. All committee members shall have voting rights for committee decisions. There shall be at least one tenured or tenure track member, not including the chair, on each committee. The chair does not have to be tenured or tenure track. The department head will be an ex officio member of all standing committees.

Decisions within that program that are time sensitive and limited in scope (ad hoc) should be addressed by the chairman and a subcommittee containing a minimum of two other members of the full committee. If any objections arise within the subcommittee the matter should be taken to the full committee for discussion. All
decisions made in this format must be communicated to the rest of the committee in a timely manner.

2. All committee members, regardless of departmental level voting rights status, shall be considered voting members for all committee level decisions. A quorum shall consist of 75% of the members of record. Resolutions and recommendations agreed upon by 75% or more of the full committee (excluding ex-officio) through a vote of its members will be deemed valid and approved. Voting polled through standard balloting or email balloting will be considered valid. All email balloting must be concluded within five (5) business days. If necessary, a committee member may call for a secret ballot on any issue. In the event that a committee member is unavailable or unwilling to vote in a timely manner, the ex-officio may be called to cast a vote in place of the absentee. If two or more members are unavailable a vote may not be taken.

3. All approved proposals and recommendations should be documented in the minutes and distributed to the full faculty. Any supporting documents relevant to the decision should also be distributed.

a. Undergraduate Committee

The Undergraduate Committee provides oversight of departmental undergraduate program and courses. The committee makes recommendations about academic policy and provides guidance on curriculum matters for undergraduate courses taught by departmental faculty. The committee may address issues that include, but are not limited to, student recruitment, admissions, advising, retention, and placement. The ultimate goal of the committee is to ensure the delivery of a high-quality academic program.

The committee shall meet as often as necessary to ensure timely action on matters under its domain. The time and place of meetings shall be made known to the entire faculty, who shall have the right to attend and be heard. The committee will present any proposals to the whole faculty for a vote.

The committee, through its chairperson, shall be responsible for the coordination of student advising, monitoring student progress/ongoing evaluations within standards and guidelines (as established by the University, the Haslam College of Business, and the Department of BAS), as well as recruiting, academic dishonesty, academic performance issues, and playing the role of liaison between the department and the Haslam College of Business.
The committee is also responsible to monitor teaching performance within the program and give instructors feedback where appropriate. Evaluations and recommendations regarding teaching should be made to the department head on a regular basis. The chair of the undergraduate committee shall be the director of the program. The committee shall make recommendations to the department head concerning graduate assistantships and other forms of financial aid to be granted.

b. MSBA Program Committee

The MSBA Committee manages the department's master's level programs and courses. The committee makes recommendations about academic policy and provides guidance on curriculum matters for master's courses taught by departmental faculty. The committee will address issues that include, but are not limited to, student recruitment, admissions, advising, retention, and placement. The ultimate goal of the committee is to ensure the delivery of a high-quality academic program.

The committee shall meet as often as necessary to ensure timely action on matters under its domain. The time and place of meetings shall be made known to the entire faculty, who shall have the right to attend and be heard. Any proposals that impact the program structure, curriculum structure, or require catalog changes will be brought to the entire faculty for a vote.

The committee, through its chairperson, shall be responsible for the coordination of student advising, acceptance of prospective MSBA/Dual Degree MBA students to the program, maintaining student records, monitoring student progress/ongoing evaluations within standards and guidelines (as established by the University, the Haslam College of Business, and the Department of BAS), as well as recruiting, academic dishonesty, academic performance issues, and playing the role of liaison between the department and the graduate school.

The committee is also responsible to monitor teaching performance within the program and give instructors feedback where appropriate. Evaluations and recommendations regarding teaching should be made to the department head on a regular basis. The chair of the MSBA Committee shall be the director of the program. The committee shall make recommendations to the department head concerning graduate assistantships and other forms of financial aid to be granted.
c. IGSP Committee

The IGSP Committee provides oversight of the IGSP program and courses, and input to the IGSP board. The committee makes recommendations about academic policy and provides guidance on curriculum matters for master’s courses taught by departmental faculty. The committee may address issues that include, but are not limited to, student recruitment, admissions, advising, retention, and placement. The ultimate goal of the committee is to ensure the delivery of a high-quality academic program.

The committee shall meet as often as necessary to ensure timely action on matters under its domain. The time and place of meetings shall be made known to the entire faculty, who shall have the right to attend and be heard. The committee will present any proposals to the whole faculty for a vote.

The committee, through its chairperson, shall be responsible for the coordination of student advising, acceptance of prospective IGSP students to the program, maintaining student records, monitoring student progress/ongoing evaluations within standards and guidelines (as established by the University, the Haslam College of Business, and the Department of BAS), as well as recruiting, academic dishonesty, academic performance issues, and playing the role of liaison between the department and the graduate school. The committee is also responsible to monitor teaching performance within the program and give instructors feedback where appropriate. Evaluations and recommendations regarding teaching should be made to the department head on a regular basis. The chair of the IGSP Committee shall be the director of the program.

d. PhD Committee

The Ph.D. Committee manages the department’s Ph.D. programs and courses. The committee makes recommendations about academic policy and provides guidance on curriculum matters for Ph.D. courses taught by departmental faculty. The committee is responsible for issues that include, but are not limited to, student recruitment, admissions, advising, retention, and placement. The committee will provide a yearly status report to the faculty regarding admissions, student progress, placement and other program operations. The ultimate goal of the committee is to ensure the delivery of a high-quality academic program.

The committee shall meet as often as necessary to ensure timely action on matters under its domain. The time and place of meetings shall be made known to the entire faculty, who shall have the right to attend and
be heard. The committee will present any proposals to the whole faculty for a vote.

The committee, through its chairperson, shall be responsible for the coordination of student advising, acceptance of prospective Ph.D. students to the Program, maintaining student records, monitoring student progress/ongoing evaluations within standards and guidelines (as established by the University, the Haslam College of Business, and the Department of BAS), as well as recruiting, academic dishonesty, academic performance issues, and playing the role of liaison between the department and the graduate school.

The committee is also responsible to monitor teaching performance within the program and give instructors feedback where appropriate. Evaluations and recommendations regarding teaching should be made to the department head on a regular basis. The chair of the Ph.D. committee shall be the director of the program. The committee shall make recommendations to the department head concerning graduate assistantships and other forms of financial aid to be granted.

e. Bylaws Committee

A three person committee of voting faculty members will oversee and document any amendments or changes to the bylaws. The committee will operate in accordance with the amendment rules provided in Section IX of this document. The committee will be responsible to be knowledgeable and provide input as to proper procedures as set forth in the bylaws.

VI. Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

a. Committee on Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

i. This committee shall consist of all professors and associate professors who hold tenure in the Department of Business Analytics and Statistics, with the exception of the department head. The chair of the committee will be selected by the department head in consultation with the candidate. Its purpose shall be to deliberate the candidate’s promotion and report to the department head and to all professors and associate professors with regard to the candidate’s promotion to the rank of associate professor. A vote shall be taken on the candidate’s dossier at a meeting of the tenured faculty and the results made part of the submitted report. The committee chair shall call the meetings. The time and place of meetings shall be
made known to committee members seven calendar days in advance.

ii. Subcommittees must be convened to consider in depth the teaching, research/creative achievement, and public and institutional service effectiveness (as defined in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation and HCB Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Guidelines document) of individual candidates and to render a report to the committee as a whole. The subcommittee shall be appointed by the department head and must contain at least three members of the committee. In no instance will the subcommittee make a recommendation to the review committee on tenure and/or promotion of the candidate, rather the subcommittee presents objective data.

iii. Seventy-five percent of the committee membership being in attendance shall constitute a quorum for conducting business. Issues shall be decided in the same manner as described above in Part II. If a vote is necessary, it shall be by secret ballot, with votes to be counted independently by two committee members designated by the presiding officer.

iv. All faculty members shall be polled for the vote and 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 vote must be delivered in writing to each of the two committee members discharging this responsibility. There shall be, however, no further disclosure of the nature of the vote.

b. Committee on Promotion to Rank of Professor

This committee shall consist of all tenured faculty who hold the rank of professor in the Department Business Analytics and Statistics. Its purpose shall be to make recommendations to the department head with regard to candidates for promotion to the rank of professor. Operational rules for this committee shall be equivalent to those of the committee on promotion to rank of associate professor.

c. Tenure Committee

This committee shall consist of all tenured members of the departmental faculty. Its purpose shall be to make tenure recommendations to the department head in situations in which tenure decisions must be made separate and apart from promotion recommendations and decisions. Operational rules for this committee shall be equivalent to those of the committee on promotion to rank of associate professor.
d. Committee on Hiring Tenure-Track Faculty

When the department determines that there is the need for a new member of the faculty, and the department has received permission from the university to do so, the department head will schedule a faculty meeting, or provide an online forum, to discuss the goals of the search. Based on input from the faculty, the department head will name search committee members and a chair. This committee shall be comprised of no less than three faculty members from the department, and may include one or more faculty members from outside the department as long as voting department members remain a majority. The search committee shall follow university and college guidelines appropriate to the type of search as outlined in the faculty handbook. The tenured and tenure-track faculty will vote to approve the position description. If 2/3 or more of the voting faculty are in agreement a favorable vote occurs, the description is approved, and the search can commence.

The committee shall recruit and screen candidates according to the agreed position description and present principal and alternate pools of candidates to the department faculty. Once pools have been approved by College, Provost, and OED, all candidates in primary pool are brought to campus for interviews. Upon completion of the primary interviews, the faculty should meet. If the department is satisfied with the candidates in the principal pool, then the candidates in the alternate pool need not be brought to campus for an interview, otherwise the department may decide to bring additional candidates from the secondary pool. Subsequent to the interviews, the search committee chair will organize a meeting, summarize the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses, and moderate discussion by the faculty. The tenured and tenure-track faculty will evaluate and vote on the candidates and make a recommendation to the department head. Each voting member identifies the candidate(s) he or she feels are acceptable and then provides a ranking of the candidate(s) he or she feels are acceptable. The individual votes are then provided to the department head. Voting should be accomplished using secret ballot. In the event that it is not possible to hold a physical meeting due to constraints on the candidates, the search chair is allowed to manage an electronic discussion process.

The department head will make an independent recommendation to the dean of the college for approval before extending a formal offer. If the department head’s recommendation diverges from that of the faculty, the head must explain his or her reasons in detail to the faculty. In this case the faculty handbook gives the faculty the right to meet with the dean and chief academic officer about the recommendation.

e. Hiring Non-Tenure Track Faculty

When the need for non-tenure-track teaching faculty is identified, departments should initiate the hiring process as soon as possible. A departmentally designated group of faculty will review applications in accordance with departmental and college bylaws, if multiple applications are necessary. The department head will then recommend appointments to the Office of the Chancellor, after obtaining approval of the dean and chief academic officer. In those cases where immediate replacements of faculty are required, the department head may recommend appointments without
prior faculty review. However, in such cases, departmental faculty should be notified of the appointment as soon as possible.

VII. Faculty Evaluation

“Every tenure-track and tenured faculty member at the University of Tennessee who is not on leave is reviewed annually.” (cf. Faculty Handbook, Section 3.8)

Criteria for evaluation and retention of tenure-track and tenured faculty members are as set forth in the Faculty Handbook, UT Manual for Faculty Evaluation, and HCB Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Guidelines.

a. Faculty duties and workload will be set forth by the department head in accordance by the HCB faculty workload policies as approved by the College.

b. Performance Evaluation Process

The department head performs the annual performance evaluation and workload assignment for departmental faculty following the guidelines of the Faculty Handbook, Manual for Faculty Evaluation and the HCB Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Guidelines.

1. Evaluation of untenured faculty will be as described in the UT Faculty Handbook (cf. Chapter 4, Sections 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3)

2. Peer Review of Teaching

BAS Department values a wide variety of outlets for teaching, all of which contribute to the departmental mission. Peer review of teaching as outlined in the faculty handbook shall be followed.

The department head is responsible for requesting a teaching evaluation of a faculty at any time as deemed necessary by forming an impartial review committee to objectively and fairly evaluate a faculty member’s teaching.

VIII. Miscellanea

a. Other Department Offices or 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 Haslam College of Business.

b. Termination of Tenure

The general termination of the employment of tenured faculty is outlined in the UT Faculty Handbook Section 3.11.7.

c. Leave of Absences

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 department head a ranking of the requests and an independent recommendation of whether or not 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 described below:

i. College funded Leave of Absence

1. Evaluation of Proposals

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. Eligibility

Full-time tenured faculty with a minimum of six years full-time campus service since any previously granted professional leave (or six years at the time of an initial 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 faculty participation in the program. Since Faculty Development Leave is a paid leave of absence, the terms of the previous paragraph apply.
3. Reporting of Activities

Within three months of returning from paid leave, the faculty member shall submit to the department head and to the faculty 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.

ii. Non-College Sponsored Leave 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.

d. 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 nontenure-track faculty have a right to bring complaints or grievances as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

e. Professional Conduct

Faculty members are expected to conform to appropriate behavior as described in the HCB Faculty Evaluation Document, the UT Faculty Handbook and the HCB Statement of Professionalism.

IX. Ratification and Amendment of these bylaws

Ratification of these bylaws may be accomplished by vote of two thirds (66 %) or greater of the voting membership of the departmental faculty.

The faculty will have the power to amend these bylaws according to the following procedures.
1. Amendment proposals will originate through a petition to the department head signed by at least half of the Voting Faculty.
2. The bylaws committee will present proposed amendments to the faculty in writing at least 14 days before the next regular faculty meeting following receipt of a petition.
3. At that faculty meeting (or subsequent meetings when in order) a motion to poll the faculty for the purpose of adopting the prospective amendment may be made and voted upon according to the usual rules of parliamentary procedure, a majority vote being sufficient to carry the motion.
4. After a motion to poll the faculty has carried, a ballot will be distributed immediately to all Voting Faculty and, after seven days, votes will be counted under the direction of the Bylaws committee. An affirmative vote by at least two-thirds of the faculty who do vote will constitute an enactment of the amendment, provided at least two-thirds of the tenured and tenure-track faculty do vote.
Amendments will become effective immediately following the vote of enactment, and the Voting Faculty will be informed in writing.

X. Archiving and Documenting Amendments of the Bylaws

The bylaws committee will be responsible to document all changes to the bylaws along with maintaining previous copies of the bylaws on the departmental website or through an archive accessible to all departmental members.
Department of Business Analytics and Statistics  
Bylaws Addendum on Annual Faculty Performance Review  

All full-time faculty are evaluated on an annual basis\(^1\). This includes tenured/tenure-track faculty, who are evaluated subsequent to each academic year, and non-tenure-track faculty, who (beginning in 2017) are evaluated subsequent to each calendar year. Following the timeline determined by the Provost’s Office, faculty submit a Faculty Accomplishment Form (FAF) and/or any other requested documents for review by the Department Head. Once the Department Head has completed his/her review, the faculty member has the opportunity to review his/her performance scores and any narrative comments, and then to respond if he or she chooses. The Department Head’s review and recommendation are then forwarded to the Dean, who performs a similar review and recommendation process, with both the faculty member and Department Head retaining the right to respond. The Dean’s office forwards all recommendations and responses to the Chief Academic Officer, who makes the final decision on the review. More details on the evaluation process can be found in the *Faculty Handbook and Manual for Faculty Evaluation* from the Provost’s web site.

The purpose of this departmental bylaws addendum is to provide greater clarity about how the Department Head will make assessments across the various categories of the university’s annual review system. Specifically, the Department Head will consider the following general definitions, principles, and guidelines when performing an annual faculty performance review:

**Teaching**  
Teaching is at the core of the duties for most faculty members. Excellence in the classroom is expected across all ranks, and for both tenured/tenure track and non-tenure track faculty with teaching assignments. While some development in teaching performance is likely over time, the same teaching standards are generally applied to all faculty.

In evaluating teaching, the Department Head may consider not just student-generated evaluation scores, but other factors such as the number of course preparations, new courses created, the ability to teach different levels of students and in different programs, rigor of learning objectives achieved, grade distributions, pedagogical innovation, addressing campus initiatives, teaching awards received, success in supervising student research or organizational action projects, any peer or other reviews performed, and/or other relevant inputs.

The baseline or standard of comparison for all scores is the rating of “meets expectations”. Based on the criteria noted above, a faculty member rated at this level is considered a competent instructor who is teaching the core learning objectives\(^2\), in the course(s) assigned, applying appropriate rigor, experiencing no major problems in the courses taught, and achieving a reasonable student satisfaction level. Performance evaluation scores other than “meets expectations” will be based on evidence that teaching performance exceeds or does not meet this basic standard. The inherent challenge and subjectivity of these assessments is also acknowledged, though the Department Head makes every effort to be rigorous and equitable across all evaluations.

---

1 All reviews are completed via the policies and procedures outlined in the University of Tennessee, Knoxville – *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*.

2 Core learning objectives for a course may be defined based on overall program needs with input from peers.
Research
Research is generally only expected from tenured/tenure-track faculty, as determined by assignments made through the workload policy. While academic journal articles are the central consideration in assessing a research portfolio for most research faculty, other types of contributions are also valued, including competitive grants from prestigious funding organizations, research-oriented books and book chapters, invited conference presentations and other research talks, and other inputs deemed relevant by the Department Head because they provide information for assessing the faculty member’s research/scholarship accomplishments (best paper awards, media coverage, citations, number of authors, etc.).

In keeping with the central focus on academic publications, the greatest weight will be given to articles accepted for publication during the review period in journals listed on the department’s journal list. The weight applied decreases with the journal’s classification, with Premier being the highest quality classification. The following general guidelines are used in determining the evaluation scores for research by faculty level.

Assistant Professors are expected to show promise in developing a program in disciplinary research and scholarship that is gaining external recognition. The probationary (pre-tenure) period is intended to allow time for an Assistant Professor to develop a research portfolio that will show clear achievement of this goal. Thus, the annual reviews should shift focus from “promise” to “accomplishments” over the course of the probationary period. For assistant professors, “meets expectations” in research represents steady progress towards the establishment of a portfolio that establishes a scholarly reputation in their field that would be well regarded by our peer institutions. Consideration of progress relative to peers at other institutions is a valid input for the evaluation of an assistant professor.

Associate Professors are expected to continue to publish in high ranking department-approved journals and produce scholarly output that enhance their professional reputations in their disciplines. A rating of “meets expectations” for research should reflect an appropriate combination of quality journal contributions (per the department-approved journal lists) and other scholarly contributions. Evaluations exceeding “meets expectations” for research are most heavily influenced by the publication of academic journal articles, and most significantly by articles published in the high ranking journals as well as progress towards becoming a highly regarded scholar within their field. Progress relative to faculty at other peer institutions is a valid input for the evaluation of an Associate Professor. The Department Head should also consider other factors that contribute to the overall research mission of the department and college. Examples include activities that enhance the scholarship of the department, such as chairing dissertations, collaborating with doctoral students, and supporting research efforts of junior faculty. The number of workload units assigned to research is highly relevant in these assessments because more units assigned to research yield higher research output expectations.

Full Professors are expected to continue to produce scholarly output that enhances their professional reputations as widely-recognized scholars in their disciplines. However, the mix of scholarly output may change somewhat for some Full Professors with longevity. A rating of “meets expectations” for research should reflect an appropriate combination of quality journal contributions (per the department-approved journal lists) and other scholarly activities that contribute to the overall research mission of the department and college. Examples include
activities that enhance the scholarship of the department, such as chairing dissertations, collaborating with doctoral students, and supporting research efforts of junior faculty. The number of workload units assigned to research is highly relevant in these assessments because more units assigned to research yield higher research output expectations.

Service
Service to the Department, College, University, and discipline is a necessary and important faculty role. Service can take many forms and includes both internal and external roles. Performance evaluation scores for service should reflect the relation between service workload units and service activities. Generally speaking, service expectations for tenure-track faculty are lower during the pre-tenure (probationary) period than for tenured faculty. The mix of service for non-tenure track faculty will likely reflect more internal service. An evaluation score of “meets expectations” for service generally reflects competent participation in service roles in such a way that is respected by peers and adds value to the Department, College, University, or discipline. Faculty assigned additional workload units for specific service roles must perform those roles well to meet expectations.

Professionalism
The Haslam College of Business and Department of Business Analytics and Statistics hold faculty to high standards of professional behavior. The professionalism evaluation criterion reflects a combination of attributes, which we associate with a strong and valued faculty member (regardless of rank or tenure track / non-tenure track status). These include descriptors such as professionalism, collegiality, supportiveness, responsiveness, dependability, honesty, integrity, and so on. A rating of “meets expectations” reflects that the faculty member has achieved these attributes.