DEPARTMENTAL BYLAWS
Department of Biomedical and Diagnostic Sciences
College of Veterinary Medicine
University of Tennessee
(Passed by Faculty Vote: 11-5-13)

PURPOSE
Bylaws are essential for successfully conducting the business of the department. This document, together with the departmental strategic plan, helps to guide the day-to-day decisions and management of the department. Faculty members are responsible for participating constructively in the creation of these documents, which together should represent a strong departmental consensus.

The Department of Biomedical and Diagnostic Sciences bylaws supplement but also adhere to the: Faculty Handbook (FH), The Manual for Faculty Evaluation (MFE), The College of Veterinary Medicine Faculty Bylaws (CVM Bylaws), UTCVM Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (UTCVM P&T Guidelines), UTCVM Procedures and Instructions for Promotion and Tenure, The University of Tennessee Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure and the UTCVM Guidelines for Peer Evaluation. Furthermore, the departmental bylaws are subject to the rules and regulations of the State of Tennessee, The University of Tennessee and the Institute of Agriculture. Any provision in this document that is in disagreement with these documents is automatically null and void. Matters that are important to the business of the department but are not covered in this document are addressed in the college bylaws or other documents listed above.

ARTICLE I. THE DEPARTMENT

Section 1: Vision of the Department
The Department of Biomedical and Diagnostic Sciences is an institutional, regional and national resource for veterinary laboratory diagnostics, biomedical discovery, public health and social service in veterinary medicine and the human-animal bond.

Section 2: Mission of the Department
The departmental mission is to: (1) educate veterinary, graduate, and post-graduate veterinary students, (2) advance diagnostic, basic and translational research, (3) provide high quality diagnostic laboratory services, (4) serve as a primary resource in continuing education, (5) promote the understanding and application of human-animal interactions, and (6) disseminate accurate and current information on the disciplines represented in the department.

Section 3: Administration of the Department
The department is administered by faculty (and where appropriate, staff) consensus as often as possible, and through active collaboration between faculty, staff and administrators. Any constituent who has concerns that have not or cannot be addressed by their immediate supervisor is encouraged to seek further guidance and help with the administrator for that group or the department head. If the problem remains unresolved with departmental administrators up through the head, advice should be sought through the college’s dean or other institutional/university office(s) established to address the specific concern.
**A. Faculty**

Faculty members are expected to participate in departmental planning and governance through active and constructive discussion and in providing an opinion through departmental voting when requested. Voting faculty will include all those with a greater than 50% appointment in the department, but not research-track faculty primarily supported as a co-investigator on extramural grant(s). Unless otherwise stipulated, a positive vote will require a simple majority of voting faculty. Faculty members may be granted departmental voting privileges if supported by two-thirds of the voting faculty. In general, a call for votes will follow discussions held during regular or *ad hoc* faculty meetings, and may be offered by a show of hands, anonymous paper ballot, and/or electronically by email.

**B. Administrators**

The administrative structure of the department is generally represented by the following flow chart:

- The head is assisted in administering the various departmental academic mission areas by an associate head, and directors for diagnostic services, research, public health and veterinary social work. The director of the Center for Agriculture and Food Security and Preparedness (CAFSP) is responsible for that program and all incorporated personnel. The department head, with faculty and staff input, appoints individuals to these administrative positions with responsibilities that include:

**C. Associate Head**

- Establishment and oversight of committees for faculty peer-teaching evaluation
- Coordination in obtaining faculty departmental input for faculty annual evaluations, and in consideration of promotion and tenure decisions
- Administration/coordination of other departmental operations/initiatives on an as needed basis
- Signatory approval of various departmental requests/documents, in the absence of department head
D. Director of Diagnostic Laboratory Services (DLS)
- Coordinate and develop overarching diagnostic functions working closely with individual laboratory directors and administrative staff members
- Overall administration of diagnostic services, including development of new initiatives and adaptation of services to meet the needs of the Veterinary Medical Center (VMC), regional practices, and Tennessee stakeholders
- Represent diagnostic laboratory services as an ex officio member of the College’s Hospital Board
- Approve leave requests from faculty and administrative staff with diagnostic laboratory responsibilities
- Annual evaluation of administrative staff aligned with diagnostic services
- Budget oversight for all diagnostic service laboratories, including new expenditures
- Keeping the department head well informed of all issues and initiatives within the diagnostic laboratory group, and working closely with head to help manage departmental operations and budgets
- Signatory approval of various departmental requests/documents as needed, in the absence of department head

E. Director of Veterinary Public Health
- Coordination of the Veterinary Masters of Public Health (MPH) program and liaison to the Department of Public Health and related programs on the Knoxville Campus, as well as local/state agencies
- Oversight of public health outreach programs
- Annual evaluation of associated administrative staff
- Approval of leave requests for administrative staff members

F. Director of Veterinary Social Work
- Administration of teaching and service program activities and initiatives
- Approval of leave requests for associated staff members
- Liaison to UTK College of Social Work

G. Director of Departmental Research
- Coordination of research programs and new initiatives within the department
- Identification and facilitation of collaborative research opportunities between departmental faculty members and outside investigators and programs
- Coordination/provision of assistance in grantsmanship to all departmental faculty members
- Compilation of departmental research metrics

H. Directors of Individual Diagnostic Laboratories
- Day-to-day management of laboratory operations and staff
- Oversight of laboratory operating expenses and revenues
- Annual evaluation of laboratory and associated administrative staff
- Interfacing with clients as needed
- Approval of leave requests for associated staff members
- Scheduling personnel to maintain regular and holiday laboratory operations
Section 4: Department Meetings

A. Frequency.

Departmental meetings generally occur once monthly. The times and dates are determined by the departmental head in consultation with the faculty. Special meetings may be called by the department head as needed with advanced notice.

B. Procedure.

The procedure for a meeting will include an agenda prepared by the department head for informal discussion. The department head or faculty may invite other individuals to specific meetings for agenda items that are of concern to departmental faculty. At the discretion of the department head, a staff member may be present to record the minutes of the meeting. The minutes from each meeting will be circulated to the departmental faculty and staff, the dean and also electronically posted by meeting dates.

C. Participation, Quorum and Voting.

Faculty members are expected to attend departmental meetings and eligible faculty are expected to vote on departmental issues. Roberts Rules may be invoked per majority vote of faculty present.

For matters of departmental business, a quorum is a simple majority of the departmental faculty and is required for a vote on a formal motion. If a quorum is present at the beginning of a meeting but voting members leave during the meeting, the business of the meeting may continue. If a quorum is not present for a meeting, ballots may be distributed and returned to complete a vote within 5 working days after the meeting. If a motion has been published prior to a meeting, then absentee ballots may be submitted prior to the meeting and counted towards a quorum as long as the motion is not altered during the meeting.

In addition to departmental business and bylaws, faculty members may vote on appointment renewal of non-tenure track faculty, annual retention of tenure track faculty during their probationary period, and faculty who have prepared promotion and/or tenure dossiers (see Articles II and III). The department head and two standing committees in the department have responsibilities in evaluating faculty members for these purposes.

The Retention and Tenure Review Committee consists of tenured faculty in the department whereas the Promotion Advisory Committee consists of tenured, tenure track and non-tenure track faculty at a rank higher than that of the faculty member under consideration. When voting for promotion, all faculty members at a rank higher than the candidate are eligible to vote. When voting for retention or tenure, only tenured faculty members are eligible to vote. When promotion and tenure are being considered simultaneously for an individual, there is only one vote and only tenured faculty of higher rank are eligible to vote. When voting for retention, promotion and/or tenure, a simple majority is considered to be a formal recommendation to the department head. A recusant will not be counted towards the total number of voting faculty and the recusant must also provide a reason for the conflict. A negative vote will not be counted unless it is accompanied by a written reason(s). Although a vote of “abstention” is allowed, it is strongly discouraged.

The bylaws in this document were adopted by the faculty members of the Department of Biomedical and Diagnostic Services in accordance with the policies and procedures of the University of Tennessee system, the Faculty Handbook and Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual. Departmental bylaws will be adopted and amended by a vote of the departmental faculty. The vote will occur after two readings of the bylaws or bylaw amendment(s) at two different department faculty meetings or through electronic distribution to the faculty, unless the requirement for a second reading or electronic
submission is waived by a two thirds majority vote of the faculty. Meetings must be
announced at least five (5) working days prior to the actual meeting or the document
distributed electronically at least five (5) working days prior to the actual vote. (CVM
Bylaws, 1.8)

Adoption and amendment of departmental bylaws will be successful if supported by
two-thirds of the voting members of the department. Any department faculty member
eligible to vote may submit a proposed amendment to the department head. The
department head will review the proposed amendment(s) for any conflict that might exist
with the UT Faculty Handbook, state laws, and other rules and regulations. Following
review by the department head the proposed amendment will be distributed to the
faculty for review, discussed in a department faculty meeting(s), and submitted for a vote
as described in this paragraph.

Section 5: Departmental Committees

The department may have standing and ad hoc committees as needed and appointed by
the department head in consultation with the faculty. Each committee will be given a charge
(consisting of specific goals) by the department head and/or the chair of the committee.
When appropriate, students and others outside the department may serve on committees.
The department head should be consulted for committee appointments outside of the
department. Committees will report periodically to the faculty at regularly scheduled
meetings. There will be an annual review of departmental committees by the department
head to determine if they will continue.

ARTICLE II. APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY

Section 1 - Job Title, Description and Effort Allocation

Given authorization to search for a position, the department head will appoint a search
committee consisting of at least two faculty members from within the department, one of
which will be named as the chair of the committee. These members, together with the
department head, will determine the composition of the remainder of the committee. The
committee will report their findings to the department head who, with input from the faculty,
will make a recommendation to the dean. (CVM Bylaws, 3.1.1)

For newly hired faculty members, the department head, with input from the faculty, will
draft a letter of expectations and responsibilities for the job title defined by the appointment.
In order to ensure a high quality of its disciplines, the department will encourage teaching,
research and service of a given faculty member within or related to their disciplines. The
total of the percentages of responsibilities assigned to the individual is referred to as the
“Effort Allocation.” The letter will specify the expectations and goals for the position
throughout the probationary period and provide benchmarks for achieving professional
excellence. The letter shall include performance expectations for activities such as
teaching, research, service, and extent of hospital duties and governance.

If there are subsequent changes in the assignment based on faculty or departmental
needs and directions, the department head should draft a new letter outlining the changes
and reasons. (CVM, 3.1.1) The actual effort accomplished by the faculty member shall be
documented by the faculty member annually in the “Effort Allocation Form” approved by the
Executive Committee. The effort allocation form can be annotated by the department head
in order to better describe the faculty member’s duties and expectations. Every faculty
member shall have on file a current detailed assignment/job description written by the
department head and understood by the faculty member.

If a non-tenure track faculty member requests a change to a tenure track position, the
department head in consultation with the faculty will evaluate the request. If it is decided (by
a two-thirds majority vote of the tenured and tenure track faculty) that the change will benefit
and meet the needs of the department and the college, the department head will initiate the
search procedures for a tenure track position. (CVM Bylaws, 3.1.2) The faculty member will
compete with other applicants as a part of an open search. The change from a tenure track
faculty position to a non-tenure track position is not normally allowed in UTCVM except
under unique circumstances. Such requests will be reviewed by the department head, dean
and chief academic officer.

Adjunct faculty are those individuals who provide uncompensated or part time
compensated service to the teaching, research, or clinical service programs of the college
as described in the UTCVM Bylaws. (CVM Bylaws, 5.4.1) These appointments will require a
simple majority departmental faculty vote based on the individual’s qualifications and
planned or ongoing contributions to the College. Qualifications for rank will be
commensurate with regular appointments in the College. This recommendation will then
require approval by the College administration. The appointment will require annual renewal
based on continued faculty support.

Section 2 – Evaluation by Assignment

Faculty members have Effort Allocations that consist of different percentages for
teaching, research, service, governance and administrative duties. Evaluations of faculty
members rely heavily on the composition of the individual’s Effort Allocation. All tenure
track, non-tenure track and tenured faculty members are expected to produce scholarly
works. Regardless of how responsibility allocations are proportioned, faculty members
should at least meet expectations for each assignment.

Section 3 – Names and Frequency of Reviews and Evaluations.

All Annual Reviews and/or dossier entries are based on calendar year(s). The
departmental faculty and the department head assume responsibility for the following
reviews:

A. Annual Performance Reviews.

All faculty members shall be evaluated annually by the department head using the
Online Performance Review System and considering comments provided during the Annual
Departmental Faculty Review.

B. Annual Departmental Faculty Reviews.

All assistant and associate professors are evaluated annually by senior faculty
members. A team of at least three faculty members, who are senior to the person being
evaluated, is assigned to each junior faculty member. The team provides a written report to
all senior faculty members who are also encouraged to provide input before, during or after
faculty meetings called for this purpose. A final written evaluation is forwarded to the
department head. Evaluative comments will be relayed to the faculty member with the
department head’s review. For those faculty members in tenure track positions, these
reviews should be conducted to also satisfy the review for retention (Annual Retention
Review).
C. Annual Retention Reviews.
Tenure track faculty shall be evaluated annually by the Promotion Advisory Committee during the probationary period specified in the appointment letter for tenure. This procedure must culminate in a formal vote by the Retention and Tenure Review Committee.

D. Review of Dossiers.
At designated times tenure track, non-tenure track and tenured assistant and associate professors will prepare a dossier and be evaluated and considered for tenure and/or promotion. The Enhanced Retention Review process occurs at a time that is approximately half way through the probationary period for tenure track faculty. A similar review may be requested by non-tenure track faculty. Although a dossier is required, there is no formal vote for this review. Completed dossiers are given to the college Promotion and Tenure Committee for review and feedback is provided through the dean, to the department head and faculty member.

E. Cumulative Performance/Retention Reviews.
When necessary, tenured faculty shall undergo Cumulative Performance/Retention Review as described in Part V in the University of Tennessee Manual for Faculty Evaluation.

Section 4 – Annual Performance Review by the Department Head
All departmental faculty members receive an Annual Performance Review by the department head. When possible, the actual period of review will encompass the three preceding years to better capture the long-term nature of many faculty members’ scholarly activities, but there is an emphasis on the immediate preceding calendar year. A mid-year progress review may also be requested by the department head. The purpose of the Annual Performance Review is to provide constructive feedback to guide the individual’s professional development and support the programs of the department, college and institute. The results of the annual evaluation will be used for multiple purposes including retention, tenure track progress review, promotion, merit awards, post-tenure review, and updating of professional development plans. (CVM Bylaws, 4.1.1).

The department head’s Annual Performance Review shall be done using the Online Performance Review System after a face-to-face meeting with the faculty member. When appropriate, it may include a summary of comments from the Departmental Faculty Review summary. The department head shall review effort allocation forms, score all performance categories within assignments and summarize the strengths and weaknesses of each faculty member. The faculty member reviews the document electronically and acknowledges having received it. Following review by the Dean and Chancellor, this evaluation shall become a permanent record in the department and a copy shall be placed in the candidate’s dossier for promotion and/or tenure. (CVM Bylaws, 4.1.1)

An Annual Performance Review outcome of “needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory” may require a written plan for improvement and six-month progress reports submitted by the faculty member to the department head for approval. A Cumulative Performance Review for tenured faculty is triggered by evaluations in which: a.) a faculty member whose annual evaluation results in a rating of unsatisfactory in any two of five consecutive years; b.) a faculty member whose annual evaluation results in any combination of unsatisfactory or needs improvement ratings in any three of five consecutive years.

Section 5. Annual Department Faculty Reviews
The procedures for promotion and for tenure are the same and annual reviews should provide the foundations for success. Careful professional judgment of the accomplishments, productivity, and potential of each candidate is expected at each level of review. For most
academic units this includes peer review by the department, review by the department head, review by the college, and review by the University (Institute). Evaluative statements assessing the candidate’s case for tenure and/or promotion shall be provided at the department, college, and university levels (MFE, III).

Departmental peer review will focus on criteria for promotion and/or tenure established for the department and as set forth in the Faculty Handbook. The department head or a designated person will be responsible for organizing the reviews.

When conducting the departmental review, both tenured faculty members and non-tenure track faculty members of higher rank than the person being evaluated will make recommendations about a candidate’s progress. The Annual Department Faculty Review will satisfy the required Annual Retention Review for tenure track faculty. Only tenured faculty members participate in the formal retention vote for tenure track faculty.

The department may use subcommittees to facilitate the reviews. Each subcommittee should consist of at least three members and not more than five. For each subcommittee, there will be a chair designated to prepare the final summary that is approved by each member and forwarded to the department head. The department head will distribute summaries to appropriate faculty to review and send additional comments to the subcommittee chair. A meeting will be called and opportunities provided for additional discussion for each candidate. The subcommittee chair or designated member should be present to provide information or clarification if needed for each candidate. Paper ballots will be distributed for voting on retention for tenure track faculty. Signed absentee ballots will be accepted for 5 business days following the meeting.

The supporting materials for the Annual Performance Review, Retention Review and the Annual Departmental Faculty Reviews are the same. Faculty members are expected to provide the materials listed in a timely manner to observe University requirements and compliance is part of a faculty member’s duties. The required materials consist of:

1. Original statement of expectations and responsibilities containing job description/assignment by the department head covering the probationary period (or since previous renewal). If there have been significant changes in the appointment, new letters should also be included.
2. Completed Effort Allocation Form for the previous year
3. A quantitative summary of student teaching evaluations (including individual comments) provided by the Office of Assessment or the Office of Research and Graduate Studies for the most recent two semesters that are available
4. Section A-1 (Dossier Template) completed for most recent three calendar years or since the last promotion.
5. Most recent formative and/or summative report(s) for Peer Review of Teaching
6. A separate detailed curriculum vitae
7. Summary of accomplishments not adequately represented in above documents, to include goals established for the previous year and progress towards meeting these. May also include a Candidate’s Statement on Research, Creative Activity and Scholarship (i.e., section C-1 of dossier) and/or the Candidate’s Statement on Institutional, Disciplinary and Professional Service (section D-2).

Section 6 – Annual Retention Review of Tenure Track Faculty

A. The Probationary Period

A tenure-track faculty member must serve a probationary period prior to being considered for tenure. The original appointment letter shall state the length of the faculty member’s probationary period and the last academic year in which he or she may be considered for tenure. The stipulation in the original appointment letter of the length of the probationary period and the year of mandatory tenure consideration does not guarantee
retention until that time. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the department head, dean, and chancellor. A tenure-track faculty member with an extraordinary record of accomplishment may request to be reviewed early for tenure and promotion. This request must be approved by the department head, dean, and chancellor. (FH, 3.11.3.1)

B. Annual Review

Tenure track faculty members are required to have two types of evaluations during their probationary period: (1) Annual Performance Review by the department head. This evaluation will be similar to Annual Performance Reviews of all faculty by the department head with the exception of the formal procedures outlined in The Manual for Faculty Evaluation, Section III C, 2010, which concludes with an independent evaluation recorded on the Faculty Annual Review Report – Retention Review (MFE). (2) Annual Retention Reviews by the faculty with a higher rank. This evaluation concludes with a formal vote by the Departmental Retention and Tenure Review Committee.

C. Annual Retention Review

The Annual Retention Review of tenure-track faculty is conducted by the department head or a designated person in consultation with the faculty. Accordingly, faculty members play an important role in the retention process and are responsible for providing the faculty member with a clear, thoughtful, and professional consideration of both (a) the faculty member’s ability to sustain a level of activity that comports with the department’s expectations for faculty members at the rank of the faculty member under review and (b) the faculty member’s progress toward promotion and tenure in the context of the Faculty Handbook, the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, his or her appointment, and departmental bylaws. (MFE, 3.11.3.4)

The procedure and vote are described in Article II, Section 5 of this document. The vote for retention will be recorded as a component of the annual review.

D. Enhanced Retention Review

In the year in which an enhanced retention review occurs (spring, third calendar year), the faculty member shall, with the guidance and counsel of the department head, prepare and submit to the department head a dossier detailing their progress in satisfying the requirements for tenure in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service. (MFE, IB1A) The file (which shall be prepared by the faculty member as a preliminary draft of the faculty member’s file in support of a tenure dossier) shall contain those items that are specified in the UTCVM Dossier Template through section D-6. The department head will add other required items (i.e., section G-1) and make the completed dossier available to the Dean and the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. The purpose of this review is to provide the faculty member a broader college perspective on their progress towards promotion and tenure.

Section 7 – Procedure for Appointment Renewal of Non-tenure Track Faculty

Non-tenure-track appointments are typically made for a term of one year for assistant professors, with longer duration appointments potentially provided for higher ranks.

All non-tenure-track faculty members will be evaluated annually as for tenure track faculty. The performance review for appointment renewal will be based on the guidelines for the retention of tenure track faculty. Renewal recommendations will be provided to the dean by the head based on departmental needs, satisfactory performance and availability of funds. In the case of non-renewal, every effort will be made to notify the faculty member as soon as possible.
Enhanced Retention Reviews for non-tenure track faculty members will follow the same general guidelines as for tenure track faculty.

ARTICLE III – PROMOTION AND TENURE

Promotion and Tenure on the UT-Knoxville campus is coordinated by the Provost’s Office. The Chancellor for The Institute of Agriculture has the final authority in evaluating CVM candidates and providing recommendations to the Board of Trustees. The Chancellor also sets and approves procedures and guidelines not explicitly established by the University of Tennessee. The Promotion and Tenure calendar posted annually on the Provost's website will be followed unless the Chancellor indicates otherwise. The following sections are based on reference sources noted below and these sources may be consulted for clarification if questions arise. Future revisions to these documents will be followed as dominant institutional policy/procedure.

Section 1. Reference Documents

University evaluation calendar and policies are available at http://provost.utk.edu/tenure/ and college and departmental resources are available on VetNet. The following documents are referenced in this article.
1. Board of Trustees Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure
2. Faculty Handbook
3. Manual for Faculty Evaluation
4. UTCVM Faculty Bylaws; UTCVM Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (2007); UTCVM Guidelines for Effective Peer Teaching Review
5. CVM P&T Dossier, and Effort Allocation Form (Excel file for effort calculations) templates

Section 2. Preparation for Promotion and/or Tenure

A statement of faculty responsibilities will be developed within the first six months of employment and updated annually if necessary to indicate changes in expected effort distribution across teaching, research, service and administration. This will be inserted in the dossier by the department head. "The statement should be descriptive, not evaluative, and should clarify the areas of responsibility assigned to the faculty member in regard to the criteria used in promotion and tenure reviews.” (MFE)

Appointment letters for tenure track faculty must provide the latest date for tenure review. The candidate's dossier is prepared during the fifth calendar year of probation and acted upon by the Board of Trustees in the sixth year. "A tenure-track faculty member with an extraordinary record of accomplishment may request to be reviewed early for tenure and promotion. This request must be approved by the department head, dean, and chief academic officer [UTIA Chancellor].” (MFE) If tenure is sought before the stipulated date, it must be accompanied by a copy of permission attached to the dossier summary sheet.

The Annual Review by the department head, in consultation with senior faculty members, will include a written assessment of progress toward promotion together with a completed end-of-year report on effort allocation (CVM Excel workbook) for the past calendar year. Both documents should be retained in the faculty member's departmental folder for inclusion in the promotion and tenure dossier.

Associate professors serve at least five years in rank before promotion to full professor. Exceptions to this policy require approval by the UTIA chancellor.
A. Teaching

The department has adopted the “Guideline for Effective Peer Review of Teaching.”

Internal peer evaluations will be conducted for most faculty members who are involved in presenting organized instructional activities. The faculty member, together with the department head, will decide if a small teaching allocation warrants a peer review. These evaluations will be conducted at least twice (one formative and one summative) for assistant professors seeking promotion and/or tenure, and once for associate professors seeking promotion. Laboratory instruction of individual students may not lend itself to observational peer evaluation, but approaches, philosophy and outcomes may be provided to the review team for consideration.

External review can be particularly useful in assessing innovative work, especially if there are no other individuals at the candidate’s institution familiar with innovative practices. The practice of external peer review of teaching can raise the bar for teaching performance and increase the perceived value of teaching in the institution (Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success, 2013). Individuals seeking promotion to full professor will generally have at least one peer evaluation and those with > 50% teaching effort must also have an external teaching evaluation. (UTCVM P&T Guidelines) The department head will determine the scope and means for conducting this evaluation, which may encompass assessment in both didactic and/or clinical settings. (UTCVM P&T Guidelines)

External reviewer(s) will be selected in consultation with the department head and should be an individual with recognized expertise in the field. The candidate will provide a portfolio and other materials to the reviewer well in advance of the review. The review may, but not necessarily take place on campus. Videoconference or other techniques may be used to enhance the review. A final written review must be provided to the faculty member and the department head.

B. Service

Means of documenting the quality of clinical/diagnostic services provided by individual faculty members to the Veterinary Medical Center and extramural community will vary between services and laboratories. This may be distinct from broader contributions to the field, such as provided through scholarship, and will be valuable in providing recognition of contributions to the departmental and college mission.

C. Research

Faculty members for whom research comprises a majority of effort allocation are expected to engage in scientific discovery as primary investigators, and to establish the necessary resources and initiate their independent research program as early as possible after the start of employment. They are expected to submit their own applications for extramural funding and obtain the necessary financial resources to support the majority of their activities. Within the first few years of appointment the faculty member should obtain extramural funding to support their program, and show progress toward establishing a national/international reputation in a specific area of investigation. Collaborative research is also strongly encouraged. Associate professors will sustain the extramural funding necessary to support their research program and full professors are additionally expected to seek concurrent nationally competitive awards (i.e. NIH, American Heart Association, Department of Defense, etc). The successful training of graduate students as a major advisor, with completion of degrees awarded by the University of Tennessee Graduate School through the Comparative and Experimental Medicine program in an appropriate period of time, is an essential part of the department’s research mission, and expected of those with independent research programs. Faculty members are also encouraged to
engage postdoctoral investigators to support the faculty research program, and to further
develop the careers of these nascent scientists.

Faculty members for whom research comprises a minority of their effort allocation are
also expected to engage in scientific advancement but this may be accomplished without
extramural funding and through collaboration. Application for intramural and extramural
grant funding as a primary investigator and/or co-investigator, and participation on graduate
student committees, is encouraged but not required.

Section 3. Scholarship

Scholarly activity must be demonstrated by all faculty members, particularly those with a
significant research effort allocation and/or those seeking promotion to full professor. Full
professors should have established an area of expertise and their scholarship recognized in
aggregate as a contribution to their field of study or discipline. “Scholarship of Teaching” and
“Scholarship in Service” are two documents have been approved by the Executive
Committee in the College of Veterinary Medicine.

National/international recognition for promotion to full professor may come in the form of,
but is not limited to:

a. Testimonials, citations or publications indicating adoption/use of candidate’s
   concept, discovery, tool, or method of teaching, clinical procedure, etc. by
   others and broad incorporation into the field
b. Position of leadership in a pertinent national and/or international organization(s)
c. Prestigious national and international awards or citations
d. Outstanding alumnus awards
e. Invitations to speak at prominent national and international meetings
f. Appointment as an editor of textbooks or journals
g. Appointment on NIH study section(s), particularly as a permanent member
h. Requests for consultation/advice from individuals and institutions outside the
candidate’s personal sphere of influence
i. National and international public media coverage

A. Benchmarks in Scholarship

Regarding benchmarks for tenure and/or promotion, the department has adopted the
document entitled “Promotion and Tenure Guidelines,” University of Tennessee College of
Veterinary Medicine.

Faculty members of the department make intellectual and creative contributions through
the scholarship of discovery (new knowledge and research), application (service and
outreach), integration (interdisciplinary research) and education/pedagogy (teaching and
learning). Faculty contributions may come from, but are not limited to, traditional laboratory
investigation, clinical studies, case studies, novel clinical practices, teaching practices, and
academic program development. (CVM Bylaws, 2.2.2) Generally speaking, scholarship can be
demonstrated by:

1. Significance and number of peer-reviewed publications in refereed journals
2. Presentation of peer-reviewed abstracts at meetings/conferences
3. External funding
4. Contributions to scientific monographs and textbooks
5. Invited presentations at scientific meetings
6. Service to specialty areas as an editor or by participating on editorial boards

Faculty members should consider documenting the impact of their scholarship.
Section 4. Reviews Required for Tenure and/or Promotion

The procedures for promotion and for tenure are generally the same. The exceptions are, a) non-tenure track faculty do not have a formally established timeline that specifies when promotion must be pursued, and b) non-tenure track faculty members who hold a position at a higher level than the candidate seeking tenure do not vote on tenure. Because the vote for tenure and promotion are considered to be one vote, non-tenure track faculty members do not vote on promotion, but are invited to join the discussion on promotion.

In the list below, each level of review is advisory to that which follows.

- Department faculty
- Department head
- College committee
- Dean of the college
- Chancellor for the Institute of Agriculture
- Board of Trustees

The department head is responsible for keeping the candidate informed throughout the review process. Candidates have the option of withdrawing their dossier from consideration if they receive a negative evaluation at any level up through the dean. If a dossier is withdrawn by the candidate after it enters the review process, which begins with the departmental faculty review, or receives a final negative evaluation by the Chancellor, it may not be re-submitted the following year. The exception to this would be candidates applying for early promotion and tenure. Tenure track faculty members who pursue an early review for tenure and promotion and withdraw their dossier before it goes to the Chancellor will have an additional opportunity for review at the time specified in the appointment letter.

Section 5. Sequence of Events Required for Tenure and/or Promotion

A. Departmental Faculty Review

1. The decision to pursue tenure and/or promotion will usually be made during the candidate’s annual review. By September 1st, a candidate should provide a comprehensive CV (which will also be included in their dossier) and a list of potential external reviewers to the department head, who will solicit letters.

2. The candidate has the responsibility for the assembly of the dossier using the CVM template and completing sections indicated on the contents page. This must be submitted electronically to the department head by mid-October together with any separate supplemental items (i.e., papers, videos, tapes, etc. in digital/electronic format) the candidate believes might be helpful in evaluating their accomplishments.

3. The department head will add the following:
   - Statement of the candidate’s responsibilities
   - Candidate’s CV (the CV provided earlier to obtain letters of evaluation from external reviewers).
   - Summary of student evaluations with cohort means.
   - Annual evaluation/review reports and end-of-year reports for effort allocation
   - Internal and external peer evaluations of teaching or other activities

4. The candidate then reviews this document and signs a statement indicating she/he certifies that the contents of the dossier are complete and accurate, before external assessment letters are inserted. Candidates are strongly discouraged from viewing external letters (as detrimental to the candidate and the process) but may obtain access to them with a written request to the department head and copied to the dean. (MFE, 2010)

5. The dossier, containing external letters of assessment and supplemental materials, is presented to the Promotion Advisory Committee for review and discussion. If tenure is being sought, a vote is conducted by the Retention and Tenure Review Committee. Otherwise, the evaluation and vote is conducted by the Promotion Advisory Committee.
In either case, only those faculty members with a rank higher than the candidate may vote. "Department heads may attend the discussion of a tenure and/or promotion candidate by the departmental review committee; however, since the department head has an independent review to make, the department head shall not participate in the discussion except to clarify issues and assure that proper procedure is followed." (MFE)

6. Members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee vote on a candidate from their department during the departmental review because they are not permitted to vote on these candidates with the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

7. A representative of the deliberating departmental faculty members will provide the results of the vote and a summary of the review to the department head and faculty members who evaluated the candidate. If a candidate has not received a unanimous vote from the faculty, the summary statement must include a discussion of the reasons for the divergent opinions. The candidate will also be provided a summary of the outcome of departmental deliberations.

8. Any faculty member who was eligible to vote may prepare a dissenting statement, which will be forwarded to the department head and made available to the candidate and voting faculty members. Such statements will also be included in the dossier.

B. Department Head’s Review

1. The dossier goes to the department head for an independent evaluation. The department head then "prepares a letter that addresses the candidate's employment history and responsibilities as they relate to the departmental and collegiate criteria for the rank being sought by the candidate. The department head's letter will also provide an independent recommendation based on the department head's review and evaluation of materials in the dossier." (MFE)

2. This letter must be made available to the voting faculty and to the candidate.

3. Faculty members who voted may individually or collectively submit dissenting statements to the department head’s recommendation. These statements are to be included in the dossier and must be available to the candidate, the department head, the departmental review committee, the college Promotion and Tenure Committee, the dean and the chief academic officer. (MFE)

4. Candidates may prepare a written response to the recommendation and vote from the faculty, the department head’s recommendations or dissenting statements.

5. The department head sends the dossier (hardcopy, with signatures) and an electronic version complete with all dissenting statements, to the dean's office along with any supplemental materials the candidate submits. Dossiers are reviewed for order/completeness and all materials delivered to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. An electronic copy of the dossier is retained in the department.

C. College Promotion and Tenure Committee and Dean’s Review

1. The College Promotion and Tenure Committee members review dossiers before meeting to discuss and vote on each candidate. The committee's evaluative statement, recommendation and vote are included in the original dossier, which goes to the dean with any supplementary materials provided by the candidate.

2. The dean, after reviewing the completed original dossier and independently evaluating the candidate, provides a recommendation on tenure and/or promotion. The recommendation is added to the dossier and the package is sent to the Chancellor (without supplementary materials). The original hardcopy dossier will be archived by Human Resources and available indefinitely through that office after the review process has been completed.
D. Review by The Chief Academic Officer and Approval by UT Board of Trustees

The Chancellor of The Institute of Agriculture is the final authority in evaluating CVM candidates and provides a recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

The Board of Trustees meets in June and votes on promotion and tenure recommendations. Written notification of tenure and/or promotion comes from the Chancellor, effective July.

- “The candidate for tenure and/or promotion has the right to review and respond to any statements, reports, summaries, or recommendations added to the dossier by faculty, administrators, or peer review committees.” (MFE)

Section 6 - Collegiality

Collegiality is defined as respect for one’s colleagues and for their professional endeavors. Therefore, faculty members are expected to have good interpersonal skills to promote interaction with other faculty members. This attribute becomes a factor in promotion and tenure evaluations if personality characteristics interfere with job performance and collaboration with others. Deficiencies in interpersonal skills shall be specifically documented.