



## **Department of Business Analytics and Statistics (BAS)**

### **Department By-Laws**

**Revised: April 13, 2018**

**Faculty Approved: April 13, 2018**

**Performance Addendum Approved, April 13, 2018**

**Enacted as of April 13, 2018**

**Last Updated February 25, 2022**

## 1. Preface: Effective Shared Departmental Governance

The purposes of these by-laws are to establish the overall organization and governance of the Department of Business Analytics and Statistics (hereafter referred to as BAS) and to provide for the cooperation, advice, and consent of the BAS faculty in the conduct of the department's activities within the Haslam College of Business (HCB), and the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (UTK).

Successful governance of BAS is critical to achieving the teaching, research, and service missions of the department. The collaboration of the department head and the BAS faculty is an essential cornerstone of this success. BAS shall be governed by these bylaws.

These bylaws are subject to all provisions of faculty governance that appear in the:

- *The UTK Faculty Handbook 2021* <https://facultyhandbook.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/82/2020/12/Faculty-Handbook-2021-Final-2021-01-01.pdf>
- *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* (<https://provost.utk.edu/faculty-evaluation-manual/>)
- *By-Laws Haslam College of Business (HCB)*, March 1, 2018
- *HCB Faculty Work Load Policy*, 8/20/13
- *HCB Peer Teaching Document*

BAS bylaws address issues such as the governance structure of the department; departmental membership and voting protocols; the search process for new tenure-track faculty; the criteria for promotion, retention and evaluation of tenure-track and tenured faculty members; the selection, evaluation and roles of non-tenure-track faculty members in the department; input into criteria for evaluation of department heads; the application of faculty evaluations to salary adjustments; and the role of the faculty in setting departmental budget priorities. [cf. *UTK Faculty Handbook 2021*].

These bylaws are available in the Faculty Senate Bylaws Directory: <http://senate.utk.edu/bylaws/>.

## 2. Faculty Membership in the Department and Voting Rights

- A. Membership of the faculty of BAS shall consist of all persons holding regular or temporary department appointment to an academic rank as lecturers, senior lecturers, distinguished lecturers, instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors.
- B. Voting membership in the department shall consist of all those faculty members who have been appointed to tenure, tenure-track faculty, who have not yet earned tenure, and "Participating" NTT (non-tenure track) faculty in BAS. Persons on courtesy and joint appointments with BAS and some other research, administrative, or teaching department, bureau, or office within the University are not considered as voting members.
- C. "Participating" faculty (in accordance with AACSB standards) who hold a non-tenured track (NTT) position in the department are considered voting members on all matters brought to the department, with the following provisions:
  1. "Participating" NTT faculty members may vote on all issues except for any issue or procedure involving the hiring or evaluation of tenure track faculty, PhD program,

or PhD curriculum matters and where the UT Faculty Handbook prohibits their participation, e.g., in retention, promotion and tenure decisions.

2. NTT faculty members who have less than a 75% appointment and/or are considered “supporting” faculty (in accordance with AACSB standards) will not be considered voting faculty members.
- D. Faculty members who are on full-or part-time leaves of absence (or reduced-time) shall enjoy the voting status that would be available to them were they not on leave. Departmental emeritus professors are departmental nonvoting faculty members.
- E. 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.

### **3. The Department Head**

- A. Selection: Selection of the department head will follow procedures as articulated in the *UTK Faculty Handbook 2021*.
- B. Prior to initiating a search for a new department head, the departmental faculty will meet and draft a statement, using input from all departmental constituencies including minority opinions, that is sent to the dean, containing their expectations for the position in the context of the departmental vision and their recommendation for an internal or external search. This communication is followed by a meeting of the dean with all departmental faculty members. Typically, the dean’s decision to conduct an external or internal search is a function of departmental, college, and institutional priorities and budget. The dean will communicate a decision to the departmental faculty about the search with allowance for response and discussion, particularly where the decision of the dean disagrees with the departmental expectations. However, the dean's decision is final and must be consistent with the university's diversity and equity policies. For details of selecting the department head [cf. *UTK Faculty Handbook 2021*, 1.6.4, p. 5].
- C. As part of that selection process, the voting members of the department will have the opportunity to vote on preference for department head, and that vote is reported to the dean of the Haslam College of Business (HCB) as advisory. [cf. *UTK Faculty Handbook 2021*].
- D. In accordance with the *UTK Faculty Handbook 2021*, the department head will be reviewed annually by the dean.
- E. General responsibilities of the department head is listed in the *UTK Faculty Handbook 2021*, 1.6.2.

#### **3.1 Annual Evaluation of the Department Head**

- A. Annual Evaluation: As specified in the *UTK Faculty Handbook*, the departmental faculty members provide annual objective and systematic evaluation of the head to the dean of the college. The dean meets with the head annually to discuss job performance. This discussion is based on the review of the departmental faculty and the evaluation of the

dean. The dean provides a summary assessment, including goals established for the coming year, which is available for inspection by departmental faculty. [cf. *UTK Faculty Handbook, 2021*].

- B. 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. 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. [cf. *UTK Faculty Handbook, 2021*].

#### 4. 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 *UTK Faculty Handbook* describes the general responsibilities of faculty members.

##### B. Departmental Business

###### 1. 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.

###### 2. 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 are the responsibility of the department head as outlined in Section 3. 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, an electronic vote of the faculty may be taken as in Section 3.c.

###### 3. Departmental Meetings

###### a. 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.

b. 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 the meeting, or name a proxy. The vote should be submitted electronically to the department head and BAS staff/minute recorders.

c. 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.

d. Secret Ballot

Any voting member on any issue that requires a vote may call for a secret ballot vote.

e. Meeting Chairman

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

f. 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, items 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.

g. 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.

## 5. Department Committees

There shall be three types of department committees:

- Promotion and tenure committees
- Standing committees
- Ad hoc committees

### A. Promotion and Tenure Committees

#### 1. Committee on Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

This committee shall consist of all professors and associate professors who hold tenure in the BAS department, 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.

Subcommittees must be convened to consider, in depth, the effectiveness in teaching, research/creative achievement, and public and institutional service (as defined in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* document) of individual candidates and to render a report to the committee as a whole. Each 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.

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. 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.

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.

2. Committee on Promotion to Rank of Professor

This committee shall consist of all tenured faculty who hold the rank of professor in the BAS department. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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 primary and alternate pools of candidates to the department faculty. Once present primary and alternate pools have been approved by the

college, provost, and the Office of Equity & Diversity (OED), all candidates in the 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 primary 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.

## B. Standing Committees

There are six standing BAS department committees:

- Undergraduate Committee
- Master's of Science in Business Analytics (MSBA) Program Committee
- Intercollegiate Graduate Statistics Program (IGSP) Committee
- Ph.D. Committee
- The Peer Teaching Review Committee
- Faculty Development Committee

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. 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. 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, monitoring student progress/ongoing evaluations within standards and guidelines (as established by the university, the Haslam College of Business, and the BAS department), 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.

- b. Master's of Science in Business Analytics (MSBA) Program Committee

The MSBA Committee manages the department's Masters of Business Analytics programs and courses. The committee makes recommendations about academic policy and provides guidance on curriculum matters for MSBA 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 BAS department), 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. Intercollegiate Graduate Statistics Program (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. 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 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 BAS department), 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. Ph.D. Committee

The Ph.D. Committee manages the department's Ph.D. program 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. 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 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 BAS department), 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. The Peer Teaching Review Committee

*The Peer Teaching Review Committee* shall consist of two or three faculty members from the department. This team will conduct all peer teaching reviews required by the department during the year. The team members are appointed by the department head, and will serve staggered two-year terms for the purposes of providing continuity, i.e., each year at least one person is “new,” and at least one other is in their second and final year of service. The department head selects the chair of the team. Team members may hold tenure-track or non-tenure track positions, but at least one member must hold a tenure-track position. Guidelines for the responsibilities of *The Peer Teaching Review Committee* can be found in the *Haslam College of Business, Peer Teaching Review Procedure* document.

f. Faculty Development Committee

The Faculty Development Committee (FDC) is an advisory committee to the department head on issues relating to faculty mentorship. Reflecting the department’s commitment to fostering an environment that promotes faculty professional success, FDC makes policy recommendations for a structured faculty mentorship program. This includes, but is not limited to, providing guidelines for selection of mentors, outlining responsibilities of mentors and mentees, formalizing the mentorship process, reviewing progress of mentorship activities in the department, and addressing potential mentorship issues as they arise.

C. Ad Hoc Committees

There is one ad hoc BAS department committee:

- Bylaws Committee

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.

The membership of a committee formed by the faculty shall be drawn by election from among the members of the departmental 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.

g. 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 9 of this document. The committee will be responsible to be knowledgeable and provide input as to proper procedures as set forth in the bylaws.

## 6. Appointment, Evaluation, Recruitment, Retention, Promotion, Tenure, & Review for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

- All BAS activities regarding appointment, evaluation, recruitment, retention, promotion, tenure, and promotion in academic rank are carried out in a manner consistent with the *UTK Faculty Handbook 2021*, Section 5.A4 of the BAS bylaws, and policies set forth by the University of Tennessee, Board of Trustees, policies governing academic freedom, responsibility, and tenure.

For specific detailed procedures and policies related to (see section numbers in UTK Faculty Handbook) <https://facultyhandbook.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/82/2020/12/Faculty-Handbook-2021-Final-2021-01-01.pdf>:

- A. Recruitment and Appointment of Tenure-Track Faculty (3.1)
- B. Annual Review & Evaluation of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (3.81)
- C. Annual Review & Evaluation of Non-Tenure Track Faculty (4.3)
- D. Probationary Period & Annual Retention Review of Tenure-Track Faculty (3.11.4)
- E. Promotion and Tenure of Tenure -Track Faculty (3.10-3.11)
- F. Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty - Evaluation of non-tenure track faculty for possible promotion will comply with the requirements and process described by the Office of the Provost in Guidelines for UTK Lecturer Promotion Process. (4.5)
- G. Appointment of Full-Time (at least 75 percent appointment) Non-Tenure Track Faculty (4.0 - 4.2)

refer to *UTK Faculty Handbook 2021*, Section 3.1, 3.81, 4.3, 3.11.4, 3.10-3.11, 4.5, 4.0-4.2

- In addition, all full-time faculty are evaluated on an annual basis based on the guidelines in **APPENDIX I: By-Laws Addendum on Annual Faculty Performance Review-Business Analytics and Statistics.**

## 7. 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. Such committees include: Promotion and Tenure Committee, College Research Council, etc. as examples.

- B. Termination of Tenure

The general termination of the employment of tenured faculty is outlined in the *UTK Faculty Handbook 2021*, Section 3.12.

C. Leave for all Faculty Members and Absences

Policies and procedures of leave for all faculty members is described in *UTK Faculty Handbook 2021*, Chapter 6, Section 6.3, 6.3.1-6.3.11; Section 6.4, 6.4.1-6.4.4.

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 non-tenure-track faculty have a right to bring complaints or grievances as outlined in the *UTK Faculty Handbook 2021*, Chapter 5, Faculty Rights of Appeal.

E. Professional Conduct

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 personal matters is expected. Beyond the university, individual faculty members are representatives to the wider community, which they treat with respect and fairness. [cf. *UTK Faculty Handbook 2021*, Section 2.2.5]

F. Notice of Resignation and Retirement

1. Notice of Resignation [cf. *UTK Faculty Handbook 2021*, Section 3.14.1]
2. Notice of Retirement [cf. *UTK Faculty Handbook 2021*, Section 3.14.2]

G. Rank of Emeritus or Emerita [cf. *UTK Faculty Handbook 2021*, Section 4.2.9]

**8. 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.

- A. Amendment proposals will originate through a petition to the department head signed by at least half of the voting faculty.
- B. 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.
- C. 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.
- D. 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 voting faculty will

constitute an enactment of the amendment, provided at least two-thirds of the tenured and tenure-track faculty vote.

Amendments will become effective immediately following the vote of enactment, and the voting faculty will be informed in writing.

## **9. 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.

## **REFERENCES**

- The UTK Faculty Handbook 2021 <https://facultyhandbook.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/82/2020/12/Faculty-Handbook-2021-Final-2021-01-01.pdf>
- Manual for Faculty Evaluation (<http://provost.utk.edu/evaluation/>),
- By-Laws Haslam College of Business (HCB), March 1, 2018,
- HCB Faculty Work Load Policy, 8/20/13, and
- HCB Peer Teaching Document.

**APPENDIX I: BY-LAWS ADDENDUM ON ANNUAL FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW-  
BUSINESS ANALYTICS AND STATISTICS  
Approved April 13, 2018**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The quality of the university is sustained through the dedicated and creative work of the faculty in teaching, research and scholarly activity and service 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 department, college, and university mission. The *UTK Faculty Handbook* (<https://provost.utk.edu/faculty-handbook/>), *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* (<http://provost.utk.edu/evaluation/>), and the *Haslam College of Business (HCB) Faculty Workload Policy Document* provide expectations of faculty performance. 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 take precedence.

Achieving a fair, systematic, and thorough evaluation process is a primary responsibility of the administrative leadership within the HCB, including the dean and the department heads. The Department of Business Analytics and Statistics (BAS) develops and implements faculty evaluations that are consonant with general university procedures laid out in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*. In the present HCB system, a 9-month faculty member who is at a 100% appointment is assigned an **8-unit workload annually**. In the interest of creating a transparent system that will ensure workloads are calculated fairly and sensibly, based on the college's Work Load Policy [cf. *CBA Faculty Work Load Policy 8/20/13*], it is the responsibility of the department head to announce and share information on faculty workload assignments every year.

In a flexible system, the calculation of faculty workload might change over time. Faculty evaluation will be performed annually, based on cumulative performance during the previous three years, by adopting a rolling-three-year evaluation cycle. In a three-year cycle, a faculty member can request workload adjustments in exceptional situations.

*Samples* of Tenured Faculty workload profiles are:

- **5R, 2T, 1S**

Tenured faculty with research productivity that includes impact in top tier academic journals consistent with that of the leading scholars in the discipline, and engagement in meaningful, highly visible institution building activities.

- **4R, 3T, 1S**

Tenured faculty with research productivity that includes impact in top tier academic journals consistent with that of well-regarded scholars in the discipline.

- **3R, 4T, 1S**

Tenured faculty with moderate research productivity sufficient to be recognized as a continuing quality contributor to knowledge creation in the discipline.

- **2R, 5T, 1S**

Tenured faculty with relatively low but quality research productivity as evidenced by occasional impactful publications.

- **1 or 0R, 6T, 1S**

Tenured faculty with low research productivity as evidenced by occasional publications.



Faculty buy-outs and leaves of absence can change the faculty Workload Profiles and performance expectations. Ramifications of such situations on workload and performance review should be discussed and understood between the faculty member and the Department Head in advance.

*Samples* of Untenured Tenure-track Faculty workload profiles are:

- **3 or 4R, 3 or 4T, 1S**  
Faculty members with research productivity consistent with progression toward tenure.
- **10 Workload units divided between academic and policy research  
4 Academic Research & 4 Policy Research, 1T, and 1S**  
Tenured and tenure-seeking faculty with 12-month joint appointments in a research center:  
Faculty members with a 12-month contract and a joint appointment between an HCB department and a research center. Allocation decisions will involve both the tenure-line department head and the center director.

## 2. ANNUAL FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW

All full-time faculty are evaluated on an annual basis. This includes tenured/ tenure track faculty, who are evaluated subsequent to each academic year, and non-tenure track individuals, who are evaluated subsequent to each calendar year. Following the timeline determined by the Office of the Provost, 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 the scores given and any narrative comments, 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 the 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 the criteria the department head will use to assess faculty performance 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:

1. Teaching is at the core of the duties for most faculty members. Excellence is the goal in the classroom as a basic expectation across all ranks for both tenured/tenure track and non-tenure track faculty when teaching is a job assignment. The criteria for evaluating teaching should be standard across all faculty. However, the extent to which different criteria should be used to evaluate a given faculty member should consider both experience in teaching a course and number/sophistication of course preparations assigned in the total workload.
2. In evaluating teaching, the department head should consider not just student-generated scores, but should also consider other factors that contribute to the overall teaching mission of the department, college, and university, as appropriate for rank. There is much more to the evaluation of teaching than student-generated scores that reflect a faculty member's "*deep and sustained commitment*" to teaching. Therefore, in addition to student-generated scores, department heads should also

consider broader types of mission-directed contributions when evaluating teaching, including, but not limited to:

- a. Willingness and demonstrated ability to teach multiple course preparations, or step in and take new preps when the department is in need, as appropriate to rank.
  - b. Willingness and demonstrated ability to teach in multiple programs (undergraduate, masters and Ph.D. programs) as per departmental and college needs.
  - c. Willingness and demonstrated ability to generate innovative offerings (particularly those that have the ability to impact significant numbers of students).
  - d. Any department, college, or university awards (or nominations and finalists for awards) given for excellence in the classroom.
  - e. The rigor of the course being taught, when considered in light of intended learning goals and/or pedagogy.
  - f. The grade distributions assigned by the instructor when submitting final grades.
  - g. Any peer reviews (or other formal reviews) of teaching performed during the reporting period.
  - h. The strategic importance of the course, as it relates to the overall curriculum.
  - i. The willingness to adequately cover content consistent with the course description and in support of degree programs.
  - j. Any other inputs deemed relevant by the department head due to their containing valuable information for assessing faculty teaching effectiveness.
3. The basis for comparison for all teaching performance review scores is the rating of **“meets expectations.”** The department head shall review teaching performance based on the criteria noted above, such that a faculty member rated at this level is considered:
- a. A competent instructor who is teaching the core learning objectives in the course(s) assigned,
  - b. As applying appropriate rigor,
  - c. Experiencing no major organizational or pedagogical problems in the courses taught,
  - d. Achieving a reasonable student satisfaction level when controlling for the nature of the course and the professor’s experience teaching the course, and
  - e. Is meeting department expectations with respect to grade distributions, topical coverage, rigor, etc.
- Performance evaluation scores other than **“meets expectations”** should be thought of as deviations from the basic standard.
4. The inherent challenge and subjectivity of these assessments is acknowledged, though the department head should make every effort to provide rigorous and equitable evaluations across courses, faculty members, and faculty groups.

### **Research/Scholarship:**

Research is expected from tenured/tenure-track faculty, as determined by assignments made through the workload policy. Research/scholarship is considered from a multifaceted perspective. While academic journal articles published during the three-year review period are the central consideration in assessing a research portfolio for research faculty, other types of contributions during the review period are also recognized as adding value. Examples of other types of contributions recognized as adding value include:

1. Indicators of an active and strong research pipeline. Examples include activities that enhance the scholarship of the department, such as chairing dissertations, collaborating with doctoral students, supporting research efforts of junior faculty, papers accepted for presentation at conferences or chairing and organizing sessions in prestigious conferences or workshops, etc.
2. Indicators that scholarly activities are having an impact on the external visibility of the faculty member, the department and the college. Examples include presentations at prestigious conferences, citations, research awards, etc.
3. 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. Examples include best paper awards, editorship, editorial-board membership, etc.

In keeping with the central focus on academic journal articles, the greatest weight will be given to articles accepted for publication during the review period by journals in the department's journal list, with the weight decreasing consistent with journal classification. The following are general guidelines to be used in the determination of evaluation scores for research for various faculty levels.

**Assistant Professors** are expected to show promise in developing a program in 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 targeted at the department's top journals 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 a portfolio that establishes a scholarly reputation in their field, including research published in the department's top journals, 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 target the department's top journals and produce scholarly output that enhances their professional reputation and makes them widely-recognized contributors in their discipline. 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. Positive deviations from "*meets expectations*" for research are most heavily influenced by academic journal articles, most significantly by articles published in the department's top journals, and progress towards being a recognized scholar within their field. Consideration of progress relative to peers at other institutions is a valid input for the evaluation of an associate professor. Consideration of the workload units assigned to research is highly relevant in all of these assessments since with more units come greater output expectations.

**Full Professors** are expected to continue to target the department's top journals and produce scholarly output that enhances their professional reputation and makes them widely-recognized contributors in their discipline. It is acknowledged that the mix of scholarly output may change somewhat for some full professors. 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 (potentially including refereed practitioner-targeted publications, books, invited book chapters, etc.). Consideration of the workload units assigned to research is highly relevant in all of these assessments since, with more units comes greater output expectations.

### **Service:**

One of the core responsibilities of all faculty is service to their department, the college, the university, and their profession. Service can also take many forms including both internal and external roles. The performance evaluation score for service reflects the relationship 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. 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.

### **Professionalism:**

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 collegiality, supportiveness, responsiveness, dependability, honesty, integrity, and so on. A rating of ***“meets expectations”*** reflects someone who possesses these attributes, demonstrating an attitude of supporting people and initiatives in the department and college even if, at times, this means setting aside personal agendas, goals, and desires. Dissenting opinions are welcomed. This professional, team-oriented overall demeanor, even when communicating dissenting opinions, reflects the fact that we hold ourselves to high standards of professionalism in this college.

In addition, see Section 7.E on Professional Conduct of the bylaws from *UTK Faculty Handbook 2021*, Section 2.2.5.

### **Overall:**

When determining a faculty member’s overall performance, the relative weights for research, teaching, and service should be consistent with the faculty’s workload profile. Additionally, professionalism should be weighted less than research, teaching, and service.