The University of Tennessee
Haslam College of Business
Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management

Department By-Laws

Last Amended: January 19, 2018

I.   **Faculty Membership in the Department**

*The purpose of these By-laws is to establish the overall organization of
the Department and to provide for the cooperation, advice and consent
of the Department faculty in the conduct of the Department's affairs, all
within the general framework of the organization and regulations of the
Haslam College of Business and the University of Tennessee.*

A. Membership of the faculty of the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management 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 of the Department are faculty members in tenure-track positions, including those who have not yet earned tenure. This includes persons on joint appointments with other research, administrative or teaching departments, bureaus, or offices within the university. All such persons shall enjoy full voting membership in the Department.

C. Faculty members appointed to full time non-tenure track positions in the Department shall be regarded as voting members of the departmental faculty with the exception of votes regarding tenure, promotion and retention.

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.

E. Departmental Emeritus Professors are a special case of Departmental nonvoting faculty members.

F. The *Faculty Handbook* states that "visiting faculty do not participate in the governance of the department," and as such, are considered nonvoting faculty members.

G. The Department Head and faculty share in the governance of the Department.

II.   **Departmental Meetings**

A. Department meetings shall be held at least twice per semester during the academic year. Additional meetings may be called by the Department Head or at the written request of a simple majority of the voting faculty. A quorum shall exist if at least one half of the voting membership is present, either physically or by electronic connection. Proxies specific to particular items on the agenda may be given by one faculty member to any other voting member. In all matters, the Department Head's presence, vote, and proxy shall be counted on par with any other voting member.

B. In the case of departmental meetings in which questions of hiring tenure-track faculty are decided, two thirds of the voting departmental membership must be in attendance, either physically or through electronic connection, in order to constitute a quorum.

C. A 2/3 majority of those present and those sending proxy votes and/or absentee ballots shall

decide an issue. The Department Head shall ensure that every voting member of the faculty who is present will have the opportunity, although not an obligation, to express an opinion on those issues that come to a vote.

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

E. The Department Head, or his/her designate, shall serve as chair of the department meetings. Minutes of the meeting and reports submitted to the faculty shall be kept and made available to the faculty.

F. 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 Departmental Head, be added to the agenda. Alternately, items may be placed on the agenda by written petition of twenty-five percent of the voting faculty. All additions to the Head's initial agenda must occur at least three days prior to the meeting. Announcements, which are informational items that do not require faculty action, can be added to the agenda at any time.

G. 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.

H. Except for votes taken on tenure-track faculty hiring decisions, at the discretion of the Department Head, a vote of the faculty may be taken electronically. When electronically voting, faculty will have a minimum of five (5) business days to submit their vote after notification of the electronic vote. When voting in this manner, one option available to the faculty will be to request deferral of the vote until discussion is held at the next scheduled faculty meeting. Deferral will automatically occur if 20% or more of the faculty members who cast a vote so request. Decisions on tenure-track faculty hiring will take place following face-to-face discussion of candidates under consideration. For those faculty who are unable to attend these tenure-track faculty hiring discussions in person or via teleconference, proxy votes can be submitted to the department head via e-mail, and these proxy votes will be counted toward the final vote tally for the hiring decision.

III. **Department Committees**

There shall be three types of department committees:
· Promotion and tenure committees
· Standing committees
· Ad hoc committees

A. <u>Promotion and Tenure Committees</u>: Criteria for promotion and tenure are as set forth in the *Faculty Handbook and UT Manual for Faculty Evaluation*.

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

This committee shall consist of all Professors and Associate Professors who hold tenure in the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management. Its purpose shall be to report to the Departmental Head with regard to candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate

Professor. Two thirds of the committee membership being in attendance, either physically or through electronic connection, shall constitute a quorum for conducting business. A vote shall be taken on the candidate's dossier and the results made part of the submitted report. Any committee member may call for a secret ballot vote. One member of the Committee shall be designated by the Department Head to summarize discussion and submit a formal recommendation to the Department Head.

a. The Department Head cannot participate in the vote.

b. The Department Head shall preside at meetings of the full committee and shall be responsible for calling a meeting of the committee. The time and place of meetings shall be made known to committee members at least seven calendar days in advance.

c. Absentee votes shall be allowed if the absentee voter is willing to relinquish any claim to anonymity.

d. In unusual circumstances, operational procedures may be altered by two-thirds vote of the committee membership.

2. *Committee on promotion to Rank of Professor*

This committee shall consist of all Professors who hold tenure in the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management. Its purpose shall be to make recommendations to the Departmental 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. *Committee on Awarding of Tenure*

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 promotion for non-tenure track faculty*

If it is determined by the Department Head that a full-time lecturer is eligible to be considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer, or that a Senior Lecturer is eligible to be considered for promotion to Distinguished Lecturer, the Department Head will form a committee to consider the candidate's dossier and make recommendation to the Department Head. This committee should consist of a minimum of three faculty members, two of whom should be tenured faculty. If a non-tenure faculty member is included on the committee, that individual should be at a higher rank than the current rank of the candidate under review.

B. Standing Committees

There are four standing Department committees:
· Undergraduate Studies Committee

- o Two subcommittees: Marketing and Supply Chain Management
- · Graduate Studies Committee
    - o Two subcommittees: Marketing and Supply Chain Management
- · Peer Teaching Review Committee
- · Strategy Advisory Committee

1. *The Undergraduate Studies Committee* will consist of two subcommittees: one that focuses on undergraduate studies issues in Marketing, and one that focuses on undergraduate studies issues in Supply Chain Management. Appointment to these subcommittees will be made by the Department Head. Each subcommittee will consist of a minimum of three members, and should include at least one tenured faculty members. Each subcommittee should meet at least once per semester to consider issues such as SACS Assurance of Learning processes, major field tests, possible curriculum changes, and any other issues as assigned by the Department Head.

2. *The Graduate Studies Committee* will consist of two subcommittees: one that focuses on graduate issues in Marketing, and one that focuses on graduate issues in Supply Chain Management. Appointment to these subcommittees will be made by the Department Head. Each subcommittee will consist of a minimum of three members, all of whom should be tenured or tenure-track. One of the members of each subcommittee should be the Director of the Ph.D. program in each of the departmental disciplines. Each subcommittee should meet at least once per academic year to consider issues involving graduate curriculum, Ph.D. program concerns, other relevant topics, and any other issues as assigned by the Department Head.

3. *The Peer Teaching Review Committee* shall consist of two or three faculty members from the department, making sure that both Marketing and Supply Chain are represented. 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 chair of the team is selected by the department head. Team members may hold tenure-track or non-tenure track positions, but at least one member of each committee 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.

4. *The Strategy Advisory Committee* will consist of the Department Head as chair, and two individuals from each side of the Department (Marketing and Supply Chain Management) to be elected by each side of the Department. At least one elected member from each side of the Department should be a full professor who holds a chair or professorship. At least one elected member should be a non-tenure track faculty member. Elected members shall serve a three-year term.

Additional standing committees may be formed at the discretion of the Department Head or by consensus action of the faculty. Within ninety days of its creation each additional standing committee is required to submit to the entire voting faculty a written statement concerning its scope or responsibilities. Approval of the statement shall require a 2/3 majority vote of the faculty and the statement will then be attached to the minutes of the meeting. If a committee's

scope of responsibility changes at some later date, a new statement must be submitted and approved in the same manner.

Standing committees have the right and the responsibility to make motions to the faculty. Such motions do not require a second.

C. Faculty Search Committee

During periods when faculty searches are active, a search committee shall be appointed, in accordance with Haslam College and University policies.

Search committees for tenure track positions shall be comprised of a subset of departmental faculty selected by the department head (including a committee chair), as well as one faculty member from outside the department (nominated by the search committee and approved by the department head), and a representative from the Haslam College Office of Diversity and Community Relations.

Search committees for non-tenure track positions shall be comprised only of a subset of departmental faculty selected by the department head (including a committee chair), which will continuously coordinate with the Haslam College Office of Diversity and Community Relations, and engage with that office's personnel as requested.

In MSCM, search committees are not standing committees; they are appointed for the purposes of fulfilling the duties related to a single, identified search, and are disbanded at the conclusion of a successful search or at the point at which a search is deemed "failed" or is terminated for any other reason. If a failed search occurs, any subsequent searches would require that a committee be reconvened as specified above.

D. Ad Hoc Committees

Various ad hoc committees may be constituted, under the appointment and direction of the Department Head or by consensus of the faculty to deal with particular matters as they occur.

E. Committee Sunset Requirement

All committees, including any standing committees, will be disbanded at the end of three years unless reviewed and re-approved by the faculty for an additional two-year period.

IV. Department Head

A. Selection and Length of Term
   1. Selection of the Department Head will follow procedures as articulated in the Faculty Handbook. 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 as advisory. The Department Head is appointed by the Dean of the Haslam College of Business. Normal term of office should be five (5) years. Renewal for another term is at the discretion of the Dean, in consultation with the faculty, as described in the Faculty Handbook.

2. In accordance with the Faculty Handbook, the Department Head will be reviewed annually by the Dean.

B. Hiring and Retention of Non-Tenure Track Faculty

1. Non-tenure Track appointments are carried out at the discretion of the Department Head in a manner consistent with established department governance procedures, Haslam College of Business by-laws and the University of Tennessee policies.

2. Evaluation of Non-Tenure Track Faculty is carried out at the discretion of the Department Head. S/he will conduct such evaluations in a manner consistent with the Haslam College of Business by-laws and the University of Tennessee policies.

C. Administration of Faculty Reviews

1. Faculty Responsibilities

a. Each faculty member will contribute fully to the department. Those contributions will be divided into teaching, research and service categories. The proportions that a faculty member will contribute from each category will be established at the discretion of the Department Head, in a manner consistent with the Haslam College of Business by-laws and the University of Tennessee policies. The proportions will be communicated to the faculty member during annual reviews and evaluations.

2. Annual Retention Review

a. The Department Head will follow the guidelines of Haslam College of Business as set forth in the Faculty Handbook, UT Manual for Faculty Evaluation and Haslam College of Business Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Guidelines.

3. Annual Faculty Evaluation

a. The Department Head will follow the guidelines of Haslam College of Business as set forth in the UT Manual for Faculty Evaluation and Haslam College of Business Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Guidelines.

V. Ratification and Amendment of These By-Laws

Ratification of these by-laws may be accomplished by the process defined in Section II above. Subsequent to ratification, it may be also amended by the process defined in Section II above.

Bylaws Addendum on Annual Faculty Performance Review – MSCM
Approved May 2017

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 (beginning in 2017) are evaluated subsequent to each calendar year. Following the timeline determined by the Provost's Office, faculty submit a Faculty Accomplishment Form (FAF) and/or any other requested documents for review by the Department Head. Once the Department Head has completed his/her review, the faculty member has 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 department head retaining the right to respond. The Dean's office forwards all recommendations and responses to the Chief Academic Officer, who makes the final decision on the review. More details on the evaluation process can be found in the Faculty Handbook and Manual for Faculty Evaluation from the Provost's web site.

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

Teaching
1. Teaching is at the core of the duties for most faculty members. Excellence in the classroom is 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 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 SAIS 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 simply SAIS scores that reflect a faculty member's "deep and sustained commitment" to teaching. Therefore, in addition to SAIS 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 PhD 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 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. 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.
   Other performance evaluation scores 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 generally only 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.
2. Indicators that scholarly activities are having on impact on the external visibility of the faculty member, the Department and the College,
3. Any other inputs deemed relevant by the department head due to their containing valuable information for assessing the faculty member's research/scholarship accomplishments.

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 with journal qualification classification, Premier being the highest quality 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 disciplinary research and scholarship that is gaining external recognition. The probationary (pre-tenure) period is intended to allow time for an Assistant Professor to develop a research portfolio targeted at Premier 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 the establishment of a portfolio that establishes a scholarly reputation in their field, including research published by Premier 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 Premier journals and produce scholarly output that enhances their professional reputation and makes them a widely-recognized contributor 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 deviation from "meets expectations" for research are most heavily influenced by academic journal articles, most significantly by articles published in Premier 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 comes greater output expectations.

Full Professors are expected to continue to produce scholarly output that enhances their professional reputation and makes them a widely-recognized contributor in their discipline. It is acknowledged that the mix of scholarly output may change somewhat for some full professors with longevity. A rating of "meets expectations" for research should reflect an appropriate combination of quality journal contributions (per the department-approved journal lists) and other scholarly activities. 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
Service to the department, college, university, and discipline is a necessary and important element of being a valuable faculty member. 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 professionalism, collegiality, supportiveness, responsiveness, dependability, honesty, integrity, and so on. A rating of "meets expectations" reflects someone with a high level of 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.