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Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee - Consent Agenda

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

ACTION ITEM

DATE: October 13, 2016

COMMITTEE: Academic Affairs and Student Success

ITEM: Consent Agenda, Academic Affairs and Student Success

RECOMMENDATION: Approval

PRESENTED BY: Brad A. Lampley, Committee Chair Pro Tempore

The items listed below have been placed on the Consent Agenda for the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee:

1. Minutes of the Last Meeting (Committee Action Only);
2. Grant of Tenure to UTHSC Faculty Member under Expedited Procedures;
3. Grant of Tenure to UTIA Faculty Members under Expedited Procedures;
4. Grant of Tenure to UTK Faculty Members under Expedited Procedures; and
5. UTK and UTIA Honorary Doctoral Degrees

These items will not be presented or discussed in the Committee unless a Committee member requests removal of an item from the Consent Agenda. In accordance with the Bylaws, before calling for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda, the Committee Chair will ask if any member of the Committee requests that item be removed from the Consent Agenda. An item will not be removed from the Consent Agenda solely for the purpose of asking questions for clarification. Those questions should be presented to the Secretary before the meeting.

If there are no requests to remove an item from the Consent Agenda, the Committee Chair will call for a single motion to approve the Consent Agenda. If the motion carries, the items requiring Board approval will go forward to the Consent Agenda of the full Board meeting.

MOTION: I move Committee approval of the Minutes of the Last Meeting and further move that the following action items on the October 13, 2016 Consent Agenda of the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee be recommended for approval by the full Board by unanimous consent:

1. Grant of Tenure to UTHSC Faculty Member under Expedited Procedures;
2. Grant of Tenure to UTIA Faculty Members under Expedited Procedures;
3. Grant of Tenure to UTK Faculty Members under Expedited Procedures; and
4. UTK and UTIA Honorary Doctoral Degrees.
I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Gregg called the meeting to order.

II. ROLL CALL

Dr. Katie High called the roll.

The following Trustee members and faculty and student representatives were present:

- Terry Cooper
- Susan Davidson
- Russ Deaton
- Joshua Diltz
- Joe DiPietro
- John Foy*
- Vicky Gregg, Chair*
- Carson Hollingsworth
- Raja Jubran*
- Brad Lampley*
- Bruce MacLennan
- Roberto Mancusi
- Jeff Rogers*
- Miranda Rutan*
- Jai Templeton*
- Julia Wells*
- Charles Wharton*

*Voting members

The following were absent: Candice McQueen, Shikka Patel, Sara Wilkinson, and Kelsey Weaver. Other Trustees, administrative staff, and members of the media were also present.

III. OPENING REMARKS BY COMMITTEE CHAIR

Chair Gregg welcomed all to the meeting and requested that new Trustees, faculty representatives, and student leaders introduce themselves.
Chair Gregg then spoke briefly about academic initiatives of the UT system, including the focus on increased graduation rates and Tennessee Reconnect.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

Hearing no request to remove an item from the Consent Agenda, Chair Gregg called for a motion. Trustee Wells moved approval of the Consent Agenda (Exhibit 1). The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

V. REVISED COMMITTEE CHARTER

Dr. High reviewed several changes made to the Charter for the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee (Exhibit 2) to conform to the Amended and Restated Bylaws and to provisions of Public Chapter 753. Trustee Foy moved that the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee recommend the following Resolution for adoption by the Board of Trustees:

RESOLVED: The revised Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee Charter is approved as presented in the meeting materials.

The motion was seconded by Trustee Wharton and carried unanimously.

VI. UT KNOXVILLE STRATEGIC PLAN REFRESH, VOL VISION 2020

An update of the UT Knoxville Vol Vision 2020, which had been requested at the April 1 Board of Trustees meeting, was presented by Chancellor Cheek (Exhibit 3). The update included a brief history of the “Journey to the Top 25,” as well as an overview of key accomplishments from 2010 through 2015, challenges, lessons learned, plans moving forward, and implementation. Trustee Wharton expressed continued concern about the level of Trustee involvement in the strategic plan, and spoke of the need for having a staff person solely dedicated to implementation of the plan. There was a lengthy discussion about the merits of both the plan as well as the *U.S. News and World Report* rankings. Trustee Pryse indicated that she would like to see a presentation on the *USNWR* rankings, and expressed some concern that this is the primary metric being used in the strategic plan.

After further discussion, Chair Gregg called for a motion. Vice Chair Jubran moved that the committee recommend the following Resolution for adoption by the Board of Trustees:

[Resolution content not included in the image]
RESOLVED: The University of Tennessee, Knoxville Strategic Plan known as Vol Vision 2020 is approved as presented.

Trustee Lampley seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

VII. TENURE RECOMMENDATIONS

Dr. High presented the list of faculty members recommended for tenure (Exhibit 4) and offered remarks on the purpose, scope, and processes related to tenure of University of Tennessee faculty.

Trustee Foy moved that the committee recommend the following Resolution for adoption by the Board of Trustees:

RESOLVED: Tenure is granted to the faculty members recommended by the President in the particular unit, department, school, or college of a campus as indicated in the meeting materials.

The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

VIII. DIVERSITY ADVISORY COUNCIL UPDATE

Dr. Noma Anderson presented on the membership and work of the Diversity Advisory Council (DAC), and spoke to the following: the outcomes of the DAC for AY 2015-16, membership representation, women and minority vendors, and data trends from 2011 through 2015 (Exhibit 5).

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business to come before the committee.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Gregg adjourned the meeting at 10:00 am EST.

Respectfully Submitted,

Katherine N. High
Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Success
The Board Policy on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure provides for expedited consideration and grant of tenure in exceptional circumstances. The policy calls for completion of all the steps in the normal review process—review by tenured professors in the base department followed by formal recommendations by the department head, dean, chief academic officer, Chancellor, and President—but allows those steps to be accomplished on an accelerated schedule.

By supporting materials summarized in the following memorandum, Chancellor Steve Schwab has recommended to President DiPietro that Dr. Lori Gonzalez, UTHSC Vice Chancellor for Academic, Faculty and Student Affairs and Interim Dean of the College of Health Professions, be granted tenure under the expedited procedures in her faculty appointment in the UTHSC Department of Audiology and Speech Pathology.

All the steps in the tenure review process outlined in Board policy have been completed for Dr. Gonzalez, and she has received strong support at each level of review. President DiPietro fully concurs in the Chancellor’s recommendation and requests that tenure be granted to Dr. Gonzalez.

RESOLVED: Tenure is granted to Dr. Lori Gonzales in her faculty appointment in the Department of Audiology and Speech Pathology at The University of Tennessee Health Science Center.
AUGUST 17, 2016

MEMORANDUM

TO: Joseph A. DiPietro
FROM: Katie High
SUBJECT: Expedited Tenure Recommendations

The Board policy on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure (Appendix D) provides for expedited consideration and grant of tenure in exceptional circumstances. The policy calls for completion of all the steps in the normal review process but allows those steps to be accomplished on an accelerated schedule. I have reviewed the following expedited tenure request and recommend its consideration by the Board of Trustees at their meeting on October 14, 2016.

Chancellor Steve Schwab is presenting Dr. Lori Gonzalez, Vice Chancellor for Academic, Faculty and Student Affairs at UTHSC, for expedited tenure consideration.

Dr. Gonzalez joined UTHSC in 2015 as the Vice Chancellor for Academic, Faculty and Student Affairs. Previously, she served as Senior Advisor to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of North Carolina. Immediately prior to that, she was Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor at Appalachian State University and also Professor with Tenure in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders in the College of Health Science. She served as Dean of the College of Health Sciences at the University of Kentucky from 2005 through 2011 and held tenure as Professor. Dr. Gonzalez is a Fellow of the American Council on Education, the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association and the Association of Schools of Allied Health Professions.

As Dr. Noma Anderson, former Dean of the College of Health Professions at UTHSC, has assumed other responsibilities, Dr. Gonzalez was Chancellor Schwab’s choice as interim Dean of the College of Health Professions.

The faculty vote to award tenure to Dr. Gonzalez tenure was unanimous. The College vote was 6 in favor, with two abstentions, but the abstentions were due to the fact the individuals had previously voted in favor at the department level.
Supporting documents and a summary letter of support from Chancellor Schwab are provided for your information.

If you agree with Chancellor Schwab’s recommendation, please sign and return to me and I will prepare these materials for the October 13-14, 2016 meeting of the Board of Trustees.

Joseph A. DiPietro
President

Date  8/19/16

Attachments
August 15, 2016

Dr. Joe DiPietro, President
800 Andy Holt Tower
Knoxville, TN 37996

Dear Joe:

As you are aware, Dr. Noma Anderson, formerly Dean of the College of Health Professions (COHP) at the University of Tennessee Health Science Center (UTHSC), has assumed other responsibilities for the University of Tennessee system as well as for the COHP. When she took on those other responsibilities and stepped aside from her role as Dean, I looked within our campus for the most highly qualified individual to assume the role of Interim Dean of the COHP. It was immediately clear that our recently hired Vice Chancellor for Academic, Faculty & Student Affairs (AFSA), Lori S. Gonzalez, PhD, was the perfect choice. Given her role as Interim Dean of the COHP, we are seeking your approval for an expedited review for tenure.

Dr. Gonzalez joined us from her role as Senior Advisor to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of North Carolina. Immediately prior to that, she was Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor at Appalachian State University and also Professor with Tenure in the Department of Communication Sciences & Disorders, College of Health Sciences (2011-2015). She served as Dean of the College of Health Sciences at the University of Kentucky (UK) (2005-2011) and her history at UK showed a progression through the faculty ranks in the Division of Communication Sciences from Assistant Professor (1991) to Associate Professor with tenure (1997) and Professor with tenure (2004). She is a Fellow of the American Council on Education (since 2003), the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (since 2007) and the Association of Schools of Allied Health Professions (since 2008). The University of Kentucky presented her their Distinguished Hall of Fame Alumni Award for the College of Health Sciences and the University of Florida awarded her the Outstanding Alumni Award in the Department of Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences.

As you can see from her attached CV, Dr. Gonzalez has extensive and ongoing scholarship in her discipline and in the areas academic and student support, which are precisely where her scholarly contributions as an educator-scholar would be expected. She has published and presented widely (13 journal articles, 4 chapters, more than 30 peer-reviewed abstracts, over 70 refereed works at state and national venues, as well as 29 invited presentations in her area of expertise and leadership) and has served as Editorial Board Member, Editorial Consultant, and Reviewer for professional journals. As Principal Investigator or co-investigator, she has received substantial ongoing internal and external funding for academic and student support initiatives, as well as for scholarly research in her discipline, totaling almost $2,000,000 over 25 years from state and
national entities such as the Bureau of Health and Human Resources and the Health Resources and Services Administration. Since 1991, she has held continuous certification via a Certificate of Clinical Competence from the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. She has received numerous awards recognizing her sustained, significant, and high impact contributions in the areas of education and leadership.

We have had the benefit of a year of Dr. Gonzalez’ leadership in her role as Vice Chancellor of AFSA and know her to be an effective and dynamic leader of our Academic, Faculty and Student Affairs areas. Since her start just prior to the 2015-16 academic year, she has assumed active leadership and membership roles on vital UT System (climate survey committee, cumulative performance review task force) and UTHSC (accessibility task force co-lead, strategic planning committee campus lead and search committees, to name but a few) initiatives. She mobilized and led several colleges and units on campus to submit a grant proposal to the Robert Woods Johnson Foundation’s area of Transforming Healthcare: Impacting Diversity in Health Professions (we were selected for an on-campus visit and the award decision is pending).

Dr. Gonzalez holds the terminal degree (PhD, Department of Speech, University of Florida, 1989) and her academic appointment at UTHSC is in the Department of Audiology and Speech Pathology in the College of Health Professions. Her colleagues within the department enthusiastically endorsed her receipt of tenure in audiology and speech pathology (of 5 eligible to vote, their unanimous vote was 5 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain). The College of Health Professions Collegiate Promotion and Tenure Committee also voted positively in support of tenure (6 for, 0 against, and 2 abstaining, as they had previously voted at the departmental level), as did Dr. Ashley Harkrider, the chair of Audiology and Speech Pathology.

Clearly, I am also supportive of tenure. Thus we hope that you will vote favorably on the request to award tenure to Dr. Lori Gonzalez in the Department of Audiology and Speech Pathology, College of Health Professions, at UTHSC. If there are any questions or concerns, I stand ready to address them.

Sincerely,

Steve Schwab, MD
Chancellor
University of Tennessee Health Science Center

cc: Ashley Harkrider, PhD
### University of Tennessee 2016 Tenure Recommendations

#### 2016 POSITIVE Recommendations for Tenure at all Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>HIR Appointment Date</th>
<th>Position Rank</th>
<th>Initial Appointment Date at Position Rank</th>
<th>Years in Present Rank</th>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Tenure Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lori Stewart Gonzales</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Audiology &amp; Speech Pathology</td>
<td>5/23/2015</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please highlight this entry if recommendation is early, sooner than one year before the end of the probationary period.

*Professor rank is held as individual progresses through recommendations process (prior to final approval). Change the rank entry in such case as needed.
The Board Policy on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure provides for expedited consideration and grant of tenure in exceptional circumstances, such as when an individual with outstanding credentials is recruited from another institution where he or she holds tenure or its equivalent. The policy calls for completion of all the steps in the normal review process—review by tenured professors in the base department followed by formal recommendations by the department head, dean, chief academic officer, Chancellor, and President—but allows those steps to be accomplished on an accelerated schedule.

By supporting materials summarized in the following memorandum, then-Chancellor Larry Arrington recommended to President DiPietro that two members of the UT Institute of Agriculture faculty who meet the above criteria be granted tenure under the expedited procedures. The faculty members being recommended for tenure are:

- **Dr. DeWayne Shoemaker**, Professor and Department Head of Entomology and Plant Pathology
- **Dr. David White**, Associate Dean of AgResearch (with a faculty appointment in the Department of Food Science and Technology)

All the steps in the tenure review process outlined in Board policy have been completed for these faculty members, and they have received strong support at each level of review. President DiPietro fully concurs in the Chancellor’s recommendations and requests that tenure be granted to these outstanding faculty members who have been recruited to key positions at the University. Tenure will apply only to their faculty appointments, not in their administrative appointments.

RESOLVED: Tenure is granted to Dr. DeWayne Shoemaker in his faculty appointment in the Department of Entomology and Plant Pathology at the UT Institute of Agriculture; and

RESOLVED: Tenure is granted to Dr. David White in his faculty appointment in the Department of Food Science and Technology.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 13, 2016

TO: President Joe DiPietro

FROM: Katherine N. High

SUBJECT: Expedited Tenure Recommendation for UTK and UTIA

The Board of Trustees policy on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure (Appendix D) provides for expedited consideration and grant of tenure in exceptional circumstances. The policy calls for completion of all the steps in the normal review process but allows those steps to be accomplished on an accelerated schedule.

The University of Tennessee’s Knoxville campus and Institute of Agriculture have presented five exceptional candidates for tenure at this time:

- **Dr. Easo George, Professor of Materials Science & Engineering, UTK**: Dr. George was appointed Governor’s Chair Professor. Dr. George has worked at Oak Ridge National Lab (ORNL) for nearly thirty years and has demonstrated a high level of success in his field, having published over 200 technical papers.

- **Dr. Chih-Long Hu, Professor of Music, UTK**: Dr. Hu is an internationally renowned pianist and is an award-winning instructor, composer, and performer. Dr. Hu was recruited from East Tennessee State University, where he served as an Associate Professor of Piano, Director of Keyboard Activities, and Director of the Precollege Program.

- **Dr. Michael Mason, Professor of Social Work, UTK**: Dr. Mason has accepted the Betsey R. Bush Endowed Professorship in Children and Families at Risk. Dr. Mason was recruited from Virginia Commonwealth University, where he served as Associate Professor for six years.

- **Dr. Clayton Webster, Professor of Mathematics, UTK**: Dr. Webster is an applied mathematician joining the faculty in accordance with the UT-ORNL Joint Faculty Agreement. Dr. Webster has worked at ORNL since 2011, and is the author of a book as well as multiple book chapters and journal articles.
Dr. DeWayne Shoemaker, Professor and Department Head of Entomology and Plant Pathology, UTIA: Dr. Shoemaker was recruited from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Agricultural Research Service (ARS) Center for Medical, Agricultural, and Veterinary Entomology. Prior to tenure with USDA-ARS, Dr. Shoemaker served as a faculty member at Western Michigan University and at the University of Wisconsin.

Dr. David White, Associate Dean of AgResearch, UTIA: Dr. White has been recruited to the position of Associate Dean in AgResearch with an academic appointment in the Department of Food Science and Technology. Dr White joins UT from the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), has a strong publication record and has served as a faculty member at North Dakota State University and the University of Maryland.

Chancellor Cheek and then-Chancellor Arrington provided additional information and I have carefully reviewed this documentation. All appropriate levels of review have occurred and the documentation includes communications confirming the college’s tenured faculty votes for each individual as well as the Department Chair’s, Dean’s, and Chancellor’s recommendations for tenure.

If you concur with the recommendations of Drs. Cheek and Arrington, please sign below and I will transmit this documentation to Catherine Mizell for inclusion on the agenda of the next available meeting for Board action.

I recommend Drs. George, Hu, Mason, Webster, Shoemaker, and White for tenure at The University of Tennessee.

Joseph A. DiPietro
President

8/19/16

Attachments:

Letters of support from Drs. Cheek and Arrington, CV for each faculty member, and Recorded Tenure Votes by department for UTK and UTIA.
August 26, 2016

TO: Joseph A. DiPietro, President
FROM: Larry R. Arrington, Chancellor
RE: Tenure Review for the October Board of Trustees Meeting

The University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture is requesting expedited tenure review for a new faculty member according to Appendix D of the University of Tennessee, Board of Trustees Policies on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure. Dr. David DeWayne Shoemaker has been recruited to Entomology and Plant Pathology as Department Head.

Dr. Shoemaker is coming to the University of Tennessee from the USDA-ARS Center for Medical, Agricultural and Veterinary Entomology. Dr. Shoemaker completed his PhD in Entomology at the University of Georgia in 1995. Prior to tenure with USDA-ARS, Dr. Shoemaker was on the faculty at Western Michigan University and the University of Wisconsin. Dr. Shoemaker brings an excellent academic record to the University of Tennessee.

Dr. Shoemaker received unanimous support from the faculty in the Department of Entomology and Plant Pathology for his appointment as full professor with tenure. He also has the full support of the UTIA Deans.

With your approval, I request Board of Trustees review at their next meeting. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

cc: Katie High
    Catherine Mizell
    Tim Cross, Bill Brown, Carla Beyl
August 19, 2016

TO: Joseph A. DiPietro, President
FROM: Larry R. Arrington, Chancellor
RE: Tenure Review for the October Board of Trustees Meeting

The University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture is requesting expedited tenure review for a new faculty member according to Appendix D of the University of Tennessee, Board of Trustees Policies on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure. Dr. David White has been recruited to the position of Associate Dean in AgResearch with an academic appointment of Professor in the Department of Food Science and Technology.

Dr. White is coming to the University of Tennessee from FDA and has experience in academia at North Dakota State University and the University of Maryland. Dr. White received his PhD in 1992 from Penn State University. His experience at FDA has been at the interface between food safety, antimicrobial resistance and animal health. Dr. White has a strong publication record and has been active in service to his profession.

Dr. White received unanimous support from the faculty (4 for, 0 against) as full professor with tenure. The Department head and Dean fully support his being awarded tenure.

With your approval, I request Board of Trustees Review at their next meeting. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

cc: Katie High
Catherine Mizell
Tim Cross, Bill Brown, Caula Beyl
Mark Morgan
### 2016 Positive Recommendations for Tenure at all Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>IMS Appointment Date</th>
<th>Present Academic Rank</th>
<th>Initial Appointment Date at Present Rank</th>
<th>Years in Present Rank</th>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Tenure Decision</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Dept Head</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Chancellor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White, David</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Food Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>8/1/2015</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shumaker, D.</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td>8/1/2016</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2016 Probationary Faculty NOT Recommended for Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>IMS Appointment Date</th>
<th>Present Academic Rank</th>
<th>Initial Appointment Date at Present Rank</th>
<th>Years in Present Rank</th>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Tenure Decision</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Dept Head</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Chancellor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Present rank = rank held as individual proceeds through recommendation process (prior to final approval).

*Please note: If recommendation is vary: sooner than two years before the end of the probationary period.
The Board Policy on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure provides for expedited consideration and grant of tenure in exceptional circumstances, such as when an individual with outstanding credentials is recruited from another institution where he or she holds tenure or its equivalent. The policy calls for completion of all the steps in the normal review process—review by tenured professors in the base department followed by formal recommendations by the department head, dean, chief academic officer, Chancellor, and President—but allows those steps to be accomplished on an accelerated schedule.

By supporting materials summarized in the following memorandum, Chancellor Jimmy Cheek has recommended to President DiPietro that four members of the UT Knoxville faculty who meet the above criteria be granted tenure under the expedited procedures. The faculty members being recommended for tenure are:

- Dr. Easo George, Professor of Materials Science & Engineering
- Dr. Chih-Long Hu, Professor of Music
- Dr. Michael Mason, Professor of Social Work
- Dr. Clayton Webster, Professor of Mathematics

All the steps in the tenure review process outlined in Board policy have been completed for these faculty members, and they have received strong support at each level of review. President DiPietro fully concurs in the Chancellor’s recommendations and requests that tenure be granted to these outstanding faculty members who have been recruited to key positions at the University.

RESOLVED: Tenure is granted to Dr. Easo George in the Department of Materials Science & Engineering at UT Knoxville;
RESOLVED: Tenure is granted Dr. Chih-Long Hu in the School of Music at UT Knoxville;
RESOLVED: Tenure is granted to Dr. Michael Mason in the College of Social Work at UT Knoxville; and
RESOLVED: Tenure is granted to Dr. Clayton Webster in the Department of Mathematics at UT Knoxville.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 13, 2016

TO: President Joe DiPietro

FROM: Katherine N. High

SUBJECT: Expedited Tenure Recommendation for UTK and UTIA

The Board of Trustees policy on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure (Appendix D) provides for expedited consideration and grant of tenure in exceptional circumstances. The policy calls for completion of all the steps in the normal review process but allows those steps to be accomplished on an accelerated schedule.

The University of Tennessee’s Knoxville campus and Institute of Agriculture have presented five exceptional candidates for tenure at this time:

- **Dr. Easo George, Professor of Materials Science & Engineering, UTK**: Dr. George was appointed Governor’s Chair Professor. Dr. George has worked at Oak Ridge National Lab (ORNL) for nearly thirty years and has demonstrated a high level of success in his field, having published over 200 technical papers.

- **Dr. Chih-Long Hu, Professor of Music, UTK**: Dr. Hu is an internationally renowned pianist and is an award-winning instructor, composer, and performer. Dr. Hu was recruited from East Tennessee State University, where he served as an Associate Professor of Piano, Director of Keyboard Activities, and Director of the Precollege Program.

- **Dr. Michael Mason, Professor of Social Work, UTK**: Dr. Mason has accepted the Betsey R. Bush Endowed Professorship in Children and Families at Risk. Dr. Mason was recruited from Virginia Commonwealth University, where he served as Associate Professor for six years.

- **Dr. Clayton Webster, Professor of Mathematics, UTK**: Dr. Webster is an applied mathematician joining the faculty in accordance with the UT-ORNL Joint Faculty Agreement. Dr. Webster has worked at ORNL since 2011, and is the author of a book as well as multiple book chapters and journal articles.
- **Dr. DeWayne Shoemaker, Professor and Department Head of Entomology and Plant Pathology, UTIA:** Dr. Shoemaker was recruited from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Agricultural Research Service (ARS) Center for Medical, Agricultural, and Veterinary Entomology. Prior to tenure with USDA-ARS, Dr. Shoemaker served as a faculty member at Western Michigan University and at the University of Wisconsin.

- **Dr. David White, Associate Dean of AgResearch, UTIA:** Dr. White has been recruited to the position of Associate Dean in AgResearch with an academic appointment in the Department of Food Science and Technology. Dr. White joins UT from the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), has a strong publication record and has served as a faculty member at North Dakota State University and the University of Maryland.

Chancellor Cheek and then-Chancellor Arrington provided additional information and I have carefully reviewed this documentation. All appropriate levels of review have occurred and the documentation includes communications confirming the college’s tenured faculty votes for each individual as well as the Department Chair’s, Dean’s, and Chancellor’s recommendations for tenure.

If you concur with the recommendations of Drs. Cheek and Arrington, please sign below and I will transmit this documentation to Catherine Mizell for inclusion on the agenda of the next available meeting for Board action.

I recommend Drs. George, Hu, Mason, Webster, Shoemaker, and White for tenure at The University of Tennessee.

---

**Attachments:**

Letters of support from Drs. Cheek and Arrington, CV for each faculty member, and Recorded Tenure Votes by department for UTK and UTIA.
September 13, 2016

TO: Joseph A. DiPietro, President

FROM: Jimmy G. Cheek, Chancellor

RE: Expedited Tenure Review for the Board of Trustees Meeting on October 13 - 14, 2016

The University of Tennessee at Knoxville is requesting expedited tenure review for four new faculty members according to Appendix D of the University of Tennessee, Board of Trustees Policies on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure. Dr. Easo George, Professor in the Department of Materials Science & Engineering, in the College of Engineering; Dr. Chih-Long Hu, Professor in the School of Music, in the College of Arts and Sciences; Dr. Michael Mason, Professor in the College of Social Work; and Dr. Clayton Webster, Professor in the Department of Mathematics, in the College of Arts and Sciences.

**Dr. Easo George** has been appointed Governor’s Chair Professor in the Department of Materials Science & Engineering. He will begin on January 1, 2017 and will be split with 33% effort belonging to UTK and 67% effort belonging to Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL). Dr. George completed his PhD in Materials Science & Engineering at the University of Pennsylvania in 1985. Prior to his appointment as a Governor’s Chair, he worked for 13 years as Distinguished Research Staff Member at ORNL, and as a Senior Research Staff Member for 14 years prior to that. He has held a UT-ORNL Joint Faculty appointment with the Department of Materials Science & Engineering since 2002. He has also been Professor and Chair of the Institute for Materials at Ruhr University in Bochum, Germany since 2014.

Dr. George is highly recognized in the field of nanomechanical behavior of materials, mainly metals. He is highly productive as an author and has published 200 technical papers over the past three decades. He has published 160 peer-reviewed papers, 42 technical papers in conference proceedings, and three encyclopedia papers and has given numerous invited talks and lectures at various domestic and international conferences and workshops. He has been granted three US patents on new materials and technologies and has won the prestigious “Humboldt-Forschungspreis” which is the highest award that Germany bestows on foreign scientists. In addition, he has won many best papers and technical achievement awards given by domestic and international material societies.

The positive vote of the tenured Materials Science & Engineering faculty (11-9-1), along
Board of Trustees, Tenure Review
September 7, 2016

with the support of the Department Head and Dean warrants his being awarded tenure at the University of Tennessee.

Dr. Chih-Long Hu has accepted the Susan G. Powell Endowed Professorship in Piano at the School of Music. He was recruited from East Tennessee State University, where he worked as an Associate Professor of Piano since 2006. He was also the Director of Keyboard Activities and Director of the Precollege Program at East Tennessee State University. He completed his Doctor of Musical Arts in Piano Performance at the University of Michigan in 2006.

Dr. Hu is an internationally-renowned and award-winning piano instructor, composer and performer. Several of his students have won prestigious competitions, and Hu’s interpretations of Rachmaninov and others have been produced by Blue Griffin Recordings (4 CDs since 2007). He has been an invited solo performer in China, Korea, Canada, and throughout the United States. The Appalachian Music Teachers Association named him Composer of the Year (twice, in 2009 and 2010) and Teacher of the Year in 2012. The Tennessee Music Teachers Association named him Teacher of the Year in 2013. He is an accomplished instructor having taught a diversity of piano performance, theory, composition, and literature courses. His instruction is highly-regarded by the international music community. This is reflected by his 2015 invitations to present Master Classes/Teaching Demonstrations at the New York International Piano Festival, the St. Andrews Piano Academy & Festival International (Canada), and the University of Taipei (Taiwan).

The positive vote of the tenured Music faculty (18-0-1), and the Arts and Sciences College Committee (7-0-0), along with the support of the Department Head and Dean warrant his being awarded tenure at the University of Tennessee.

Dr. Michael Mason has accepted the Betsey R. Bush Endowed Professorship in Children and Families at Risk in the College of Social Work. He was recruited from the Virginia Commonwealth University, where he worked as an Associate Professor in the Department of Psychiatry and as Director of the Commonwealth Institute on Child & Family Studies since 2011. He was an Assistant Professor in the Department of Education & Human Services at Villanova University between 2005 and 2011. Prior to that he worked as an Assistant Professor in Psychiatry at Georgetown University Medical Center from 2001 to 2005. He was the Senior Study Director of the Substance Abuse Research Group at Westat, in Maryland, from 1999-2011. Dr. Mason was an Assistant Professor of Counseling & Human Development and Pediatrics at the University of Rochester (1997-1999) and Research Program Coordinator for Pediatrics at Johns Hopkins University (1996-1997). He began his career as an Assistant Professor in Educational Psychology at the University of Texas-El Paso (1992-1995) and completed his Ph.D. in Clinical Mental Health Counseling at Oregon State University in 1992.

Dr. Mason is considered one of the best clinical researchers in the country. He has over 70 peer reviewed manuscripts in a wide range of top tier journals and has given a large number of peer-reviewed presentations. Aside from his outstanding scholarship, he has an impressive record of external funding in intervention and prevention research with
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youth. His research and funding are an excellent fit with the College of Social Work’s Center for Behavioral Health Research. Dr. Mason also has a solid record of teaching and service.

The positive vote of the tenured Social Work faculty (13-0-2), along with the support of the Dean, warrant his being awarded tenure at the University of Tennessee.

Dr. Clayton Webster has been appointed a Professor of Mathematics (25%) and a UTK-ORNL Distinguished Scientist (75%), beginning August 1, 2016. He was hired by Oak Ridge National Laboratory in 2011 as a Senior Scientist in the Computer Science & Mathematics Division. In 2013, he was promoted to Department Head of Computational & Applied Mathematics. Also in 2013, he was appointed as a Joint Faculty Assistant Professor in the Department of Mathematics in accordance with the UT-ORNL Joint Faculty Agreement. Prior to his work at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, he was the Director of Quantitative Analysis & Trading at NextEra Energy Power Trading LLC, and the John von Neumann Fellow of Optimization and Uncertainty Quantification in the Computer Science Research Institute of Sandia National Laboratories. He completed his Ph.D. in Mathematics at Florida State University in 1996.

Dr. Webster is an applied mathematician who has earned an international reputation as an expert in the emerging field of computationally-intensive “uncertainty quantification.” He is an author of one book, five book chapters, three refereed conference papers, and 26 articles in leading mathematical journals. His excellence in research has been recognized by being named a Frontiers of Science Fellow by the National Academy of Sciences (2014) and by his receipt of an Early Career Award from the Office of Science of the Department of Energy (active from 2016-2021). As a Principal Investigator, he is currently managing a combined grants-portfolio of $14,715,000. Although Dr. Webster does not have any formal teaching experience, the department is confident he will be able to successfully instruct one graduate course per year (as appropriate for his 25% effort appointment in the Department of Mathematics). The confidence is due in part to the fact that he has given talks at seminars that have been well-received and is considered a strong mentor for graduate students and postdocs. Many call him an engaging and gifted speaker with an exceptional ability to explain complex material from a variety of perspectives.

The positive vote of the tenured Mathematics faculty (17-1-1), and the Arts and Sciences College Committee (9-1-0), along with the support of the Department Head and Dean, warrant his being awarded tenure and at the University of Tennessee.

Each individual was carefully selected for his or her respective position. In each case, however, the search process and subsequent negotiations with the candidates of choice did not conclude in time to present them to the Board of Trustees at its last meeting. Therefore, I request their review at the next meeting of the University Of Tennessee Board Of Trustees. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

cc: Katie High
John Zomchick
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Initial Appointment Date</th>
<th>Present Academic Rank</th>
<th>Years in Present Rank</th>
<th>Highest Degree Awarded</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Tenure Decision</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Chief Academic Officer</th>
<th>Chancellor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George, Eiko</td>
<td>Materials Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>1/1/2017</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1/1/2017</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu, Chih-Lang</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>8/1/2016</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>8/1/2016</td>
<td>DMA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakom, Michael</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>1/1/2017</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1/1/2017</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster, Clayton G.</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>8/1/2016</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>8/1/2016</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Recommendations for Tenure at all Ranks
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<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Initial Appointment Date</th>
<th>Present Academic Rank</th>
<th>Years in Present Rank</th>
<th>Highest Degree Awarded</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Tenure Decision</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Chief Academic Officer</th>
<th>Chancellor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Probationary Faculty NOT Recommended for Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Initial Appointment Date</th>
<th>Present Academic Rank</th>
<th>Years in Present Rank</th>
<th>Highest Degree Awarded</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Tenure Decision</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Chief Academic Officer</th>
<th>Chancellor</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University of Tennessee 2016 Expedited Tenure Recommendations - October
Name of UT Unit: Knoxville Campus
Honorary Doctoral Degrees

The Board of Trustees Policy on Awarding Honorary Degrees allows each campus to award up to three honorary degrees each year. In accordance with Board policy, each campus developed specific procedures for nominating and considering honorary degrees. The nominating committee includes a representative faculty group, the campus Chancellor, and the Chair of the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee of the Board. The awarding of honorary degrees must be approved by the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the President. UT Knoxville proposes to award honorary doctorates to the following individuals at the December 2016 commencement ceremony:

- **Harrison H. “Jack” Schmitt.** Mr. Schmitt has served his country as an Apollo astronaut, a U.S. Senator from New Mexico, and as chairman of the NASA Advisory Council. His many accomplishments include being inducted into both the International Space Hall of Fame and Astronaut Hall of Fame, having a U.S. Department of State Leadership Award named in his honor, and receiving the inaugural Columbia Medal from the Aerospace Division of the American Society of Civil Engineers.

- **Kenneth W. Lowe.** Mr. Lowe has served as one of the leading communication and information industry executives in the world for nearly five decades. Some of Mr. Lowe’s most notable successes include founding and launching HGTV and overseeing the acquisition and transformation of both the Food Network and Travel Channel; he is also responsible for relocating the Scripps Network
Interactive corporate headquarters from Cincinnati to Knoxville, which has had a significant and positive impact on UT Knoxville, the city, and State of Tennessee.

- **Philip Bredesen.** As the former Governor of Tennessee, Mr. Bredesen has made numerous positive impacts on the State of Tennessee as well as the University. Governor Bredesen’s administration supported the Tennessee Lottery program and the scholarships it funds, and he was instrumental in the creation of the Energy Science and Engineering Ph.D. program at UT Knoxville. Governor Bredesen’s interest in the UT-ORNL partnership led to the initiation of the Governor’s Chair program, which has attracted 14 renowned scholars and researchers to fill joint appointments with UT and ORNL.

UT Knoxville’s Honorary Degree Nominating committee unanimously approved these nominations, and they have the full support of both Chancellor Cheek and President DiPietro.

- **James Herbert.** Mr. Herbert, a distinguished alumnus and generous supporter of the University of Tennessee, earned his Bachelor of Science degree from UT Knoxville in 1962. Some of his key achievements since that time include serving as a co-founder of the Neogen Corporation, being named Michigan Entrepreneur of the Year by USA Today and NASDAQ, and chairing the Board of Directors for the Michigan Strategic Fund.

UT Knoxville’s Honorary Degree Nominating committee unanimously approved Mr. Herbert’s nomination on behalf of UTIA, and the nomination has the full support of Chancellor Cheek, then-Chancellor Arrington, and President DiPietro.

Supporting documentation for awarding an honorary degree to these outstanding individuals is provided in the following materials.

RESOLVED: Honorary doctoral degrees, as recommended by the President, are awarded to Harrison H. “Jack” Schmitt, Kenneth W. Lowe, Philip Bredesen, and James Herbert.
September 15, 2016

President Joseph A. DiPietro
University of Tennessee System
800 Andy Holt Tower
Knoxville, TN 37996-0180

Dear President DiPietro:

I am pleased to nominate Mr. Harrison H. “Jack” Schmitt to receive an honorary doctorate degree from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Mr. Schmitt’s accompanying biography illustrates his outstanding careers as an Apollo astronaut, US Senator, and as a consultant to the Fusion Technology Institute at the University of Wisconsin in Madison. Currently, Mr. Schmitt is an adjunct professor at the University of Wisconsin in Madison, co-teaching planetary science/engineering courses. He received his Bachelor of Science degree from Caltech, studied as a Fulbright Scholar in Oslo, Norway, and attended graduate school at Harvard. The basis of his Harvard PhD was formed in geological field studies in Norway in 1964. As a civilian, Mr. Schmitt received Air Force jet-pilot wings in 1965 and Navy helicopter wings in 1967.

In 1965, Mr. Schmitt was selected for the Scientist-Astronaut program. He served as the mission scientist in support of the Apollo 11 mission. After his training as a back-up lunar module pilot for Apollo 15, Mr. Schmitt served as lunar module pilot for Apollo 17, the last Apollo mission to the moon. On December 11, 1972, he landed in the Valley of Taurus-Littrow and is the last of 12 men to have ever stepped onto the moon. In 1975, he took on a new exploration by entering politics. He was elected in 1976 and served a six-year term in the US Senate as a Republican colleague of Senator Howard Baker.

Mr. Schmitt has received many honors and distinctive awards throughout his career. In 1973, he received the Arthur S. Fleming Award, the Manned Spacecraft Center Superior Achievement Award, the NASA Distinguished Service Award, and the First Extraterrestrial Field Geologist Award of the Geological Society of America. In addition, he was named a Distinguished Graduate of Caltech and a Caltech Sherman Fairchild Scholar. In 1977, Mr. Schmitt became a Fellow of the AIAA, and he was an Honorary Member of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, the Norwegian Geographical Society, the New Mexico Geological Society, and the Geological Association of Canada. Throughout the 1980s, he was the recipient of the Engineer of the Year Award from the National Society of Professional Engineers, the National Security Award, the Public Service Award of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, the Lovelace Award, and the O.K. Gilbert Award. Later in his career, he was honored with the Aviation Week Legend Award and the
American Association of State Geologists Pick and Gavel Award. He was an Honorary Fellow of the Geological Society of America, the American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical and Petroleum Engineers, and the Geological Society of London.

Additionally, Mr. Schmitt has been inducted into the Astronaut Hall of Fame, the International Space Hall of Fame, and he has received honorary degrees from nine universities. Recognizing his career of service, the US Department of State established the Harrison H. Schmitt Leadership Award for US Fulbright Fellowship awardees. In 2007, Mr. Schmitt was awarded the first Eugene M. Shoemaker Memorial Award by Arizona State University and is the first recipient of the National Space Society's Gerard K. O'Neill Memorial Space Settlement Award. Mr. Schmitt became chairman of the NASA Advisory Council in November 2005 and served until October 2008. He led the council's deliberations on issues related to aeronautics, audit and finance, biomedicine, exploration, human capital, science, and space operations. In 2009, he traveled in Europe as a speaker and specialist for the State Department. He was awarded the 2010 inaugural Columbia Medal by the Aerospace Division of the American Society of Civil Engineers. Most recently, the American Geological Institute and related societies have awarded him with the 2011 AGI Medal in memory of Ian Campbell for Superlative Service to the Geosciences.

Mr. Schmitt has served his country as an Apollo astronaut, a US Senator from New Mexico, an educator, and a space outreach spokesman. Additionally, he has made a great impact on young scientists and engineers at our university. It is evident that Mr. Harrison H. “Jack” Schmitt is most deserving of an honorary doctorate degree from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

The university’s Honorary Degree Nominating Committee approved the nomination of Mr. Harrison H. “Jack” Schmitt, which was submitted by Dr. Lawrence A. Taylor, director of the Planetary Geosciences Institute and Distinguished Professor of Earth and Planetary Sciences. The nominating committee consisted of Trustee Vicky Gregg, chair of the Board of Trustees’ Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee, myself, and five members selected by the Faculty Senate: Drs. Theresa Lee, Dean Kopsell, Ralph Lydic, Terry Hazen, and Carol Tenopir, who served as chair of the nominating committee.

Furthermore, a special committee received the recommendation from the Honorary Degree Nominating Committee. The special committee consisted of Interim Provost John Zoncheck and three tenured faculty members appointed by the chair of the Graduate Council who are not members of the nominating committee. The faculty members included Drs. Robert Fuller, Stephen Kania, Jens Gregor, and Larry McKay, head of the Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences. The special committee, chaired by Dr. Stephen Kania, also approved the recommendation of Mr. Harrison H. “Jack” Schmitt for an honorary doctorate degree.
The entire nomination process is set out on our website (chancellor.utk.edu/honorary-degrees/nomination-selection/) and is modeled on, and consistent with, the University of Tennessee System Board of Trustees' policy for granting honorary degrees.

I request approval to honor Mr. Harrison H. “Jack” Schmitt with this distinction.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Chancellor

Enclosures (3)

Cc: Members of the Honorary Degree Nominating Committee
    Members of the Special Committee
    Dr. Lawrence A. Taylor, Director of Planetary Geosciences Institute and Distinguished Professor of Earth & Planetary Sciences

Approved:

[Signature]

Joseph A. DiPietro
President, University of Tennessee System
September 15, 2016

President Joseph A. DiPietro
University of Tennessee System
800 Andy Holt Tower
Knoxville, TN 37996-0180

Dear President DiPietro:

I am pleased to nominate Mr. Kenneth W. Lowe to receive an honorary doctorate degree from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Mr. Lowe is among the most distinguished communication and information executives and has a remarkable record of professional accomplishments. He has also been diligent in giving back to the community. Mr. Lowe has been a great supporter of the College of Communication and Information, the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and the state of Tennessee.

During Mr. Lowe’s nearly 50 years as one of the top communication and information industry executives in the world, he has served as chairman of the board and president and CEO of Knoxville-based (since 2011) Scripps Networks Interactive (2008–present); president and CEO of the E.W. Scripps Company (2000–2008); and chairman and CEO of Knoxville-based Scripps Networks (1994–2000).

Mr. Lowe’s skill, talents, and entrepreneurial expertise have had a transformative impact on global lifestyle information dissemination and consumption. He founded and built the world’s fastest-growing and most successful company engaged in the creation of unique lifestyle brands for cable television and Internet. In addition to founding and launching HGTV in 1994, Mr. Lowe oversaw the acquisition and transformation of the Food Network and presided over the launches of the DIY Network and the Cooking Channel as well as the acquisitions of the Travel Channel in 2009 and Great American Country television network in 2004. Since 2009, Mr. Lowe has directed the company’s rapid expansion as a global media company, including the 2015 acquisition of Poland’s Premier multiplatform and multichannel media company, TVN. The company’s portfolio of interactive content services in the food and home lifestyle categories grew under Mr. Lowe’s guidance. Now, the company’s media businesses collectively engage more than 190 million consumers worldwide each month. Mr. Lowe has served as a member of the most prestigious industry Boards of Directors including the National Cable & Telecommunications Association (2009–present), the Paley Center for Media (2006–present), The Cable Center (2012–present), the Associated Press (2006–2008), and the Newspaper Association of America (2004–2006).
He is an outstanding community servant as indicated by his service on the boards of directors of the Cincinnati Business Committee (2005–2012); the Cincinnati Center City Development Corporation (2014–2012); The University of Cincinnati College of Medicine (2008–2011); the Cincinnati Museum Center (2002–2008); the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce (2004–2006); the Cincinnati Fine Arts Fund (2003–2006), including serving as the 2005 campaign chair; the board chair of the Cincinnati USA Partnership (2004–2005); and the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill Board of Visitors (2000–2004).

Similarly, Mr. Lowe has had a profound impact on the College of Communication and Information (CCI), the University of Tennessee, and the city of Knoxville. In particular, he played the key role in the Scripps Howard Foundation’s decision to make a $500,000 cash gift to CCI—the largest cash gift ever received by the college as of 2007—to create the Scripps Convergence Lab. The gift served as a powerful endorsement of CCI and its programs from one of the industry’s leading companies and foundations. Lowe was also instrumental in the establishment of the UT/Scripps Networks Executive In Residence Program (SNI/EIR) that brings top-level SNI executives to campus to share their expertise with CCI and Haslam College of Business students. Finally, Lowe’s decision to make the investment required to move the corporate headquarters of Scripps Networks Interactive from Cincinnati to Knoxville in 2012 has had a far-reaching psychological, financial, and employment-focused impact on Knoxville, the state of Tennessee and the University of Tennessee. The company’s past and future success are integrally tied to Knoxville and Tennessee, thanks to the leadership of Mr. Lowe.

Thanks to Mr. Lowe’s leadership, Scripps Networks Interactive has been one of the leading champions of diversity and inclusion in the communication and information industry. Examples include high-level SNI support and involvement in Women in Cable Telecommunications (WICT), the National Association of Multi-Ethnicity in Cable (NAMIC), the National Urban League/Knoxville Area Urban League (NULKAUL), and the Walter Kaitz Foundation. Scripps Networks Interactive has been recognized by Women in Cable Telecommunications (WICT) as one of the top places to work in cable. Scripps Networks employees have been recognized as some of cable’s “Women to Watch” and “Most Powerful Women in Cable,” with multiple Red Letter Awards and as one of WICT’s Best Programmers for Women in Cable. SNI has also received numerous recognitions from NAMIC, including Next Generation Leaders, Members Choice Award, NAMIC Luminaries, and the NAMIC Vision Award. SNI has also sponsored a series of Young Professionals receptions in New York, Chicago, Atlanta, Dallas, and Knoxville for the National Urban League. Additionally, each year, SNI attends the National Urban League Annual Conference as a participant and as a sponsor. SNI also works closely with the Walter Kaitz Foundation to support the Howard University School of Business. As a corporate sponsor, Scripps Networks mentors students, delivers presentations at retreats and workshops, puts students to work solving real industry problems, and hosts networking activities. The Kaitz Foundation helps fund the Link Mentoring Program, summer conference, and the Emma Bowen Foundation Career Guide. SNI supports the Emma Bowen Foundation’s effort for minority involvement in the media by offering internships to foundation students. Mr. Lowe’s willingness to walk the talk has brought a number of diverse executives to Knoxville, and SNI has been a very positive force for
diversity and inclusion in the Knoxville area by co-sponsoring and hosting (with the Knoxville Area Urban League and the Knoxville Chamber of Commerce) the Knoxville region's first diversity summit in 2011, which brought together a distinguished group of community, business, and political leaders to discuss the value of a diverse community and workforce as well as to explore strategies to enhance marketplace diversity in Tennessee’s Innovation Valley; by serving as a lead sponsor of the Knoxville Area Urban League’s annual gala; and by serving as a lead sponsor of CCI’s annual Experience Diversity Banquet.

Additionally, Mr. Lowe has received numerous national awards and honors. In 2011, he was honored by the Museum of Moving Image, which each year recognizes two leaders in the industry. In 2009, he received three honors including the National Association of Home Builders’ Special Achievement Award, the Hearthstone BUILDER Humanitarian Award, and he was honored at the Paley Center for Media Gala Evening. In 2008, Mr. Lowe received the National Cable and Telecommunications Association’s prestigious Vanguard Award for Programmers, the Broadcast and Cable Financial Managers Association’s most prestigious Avatar Award, and he was recognized with the T. Howard Foundation’s Executive Leadership Award. He received The Media Institute’s American Horizon Award and the Broadcasters Foundation of America Golden Mike Award in 2007. Mr. Lowe was honored as a leading pioneer, innovator, and star of the electronic arts by being inducted into the Broadcasting & Cable Hall of Fame in October of 2005, and he was among the first Brandon Tartikoff Legacy Award winners presented by the National Association of Television Programming Executives. These outstanding distinctions are further testaments to Mr. Lowe’s worthiness to receive an honorary doctorate degree from the University of Tennessee. He is an outstanding individual who is very deserving of this honor.

The university’s Honorary Degree Nominating Committee approved the nomination of Mr. Kenneth W. Lowe which was submitted by Dr. Mike Wirth, dean and professor of the UT Knoxville College of Communication and Information. The nominating committee consisted of Trustee Vicky Gregg, chair of the Board of Trustees’ Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee, myself, and five members selected by the Faculty Senate: Drs. Theresa Lee, Dean Kopsell, Ralph Lydic, Terry Hazen, and Carol Tenopir, who served as chair of the nominating committee.

Furthermore, a special committee received the recommendation from the Honorary Degree Nominating Committee. The special committee consisted of Interim Provost John Zomchick and three tenured faculty members appointed by the chair of the Graduate Council who are not members of the Nominating Committee. The faculty members included Drs. Robert Fuller, Jens Gregor, Stephen Kania, and Mike Wirth, dean of the College of Communication and Information. The special committee, chaired by Dr. Stephen Kania, also approved the recommendation of Mr. Kenneth W. Lowe for an honorary doctorate degree.
The entire nomination process is set out on our website (chancellor.utk.edu/honorary-degrees/nomination-selection/) and is modeled on, and consistent with, The University of Tennessee System Board of Trustees’ policy for granting honorary degrees.

I request approval to honor Mr. Kenneth W. Lowe with this distinction.

Sincerely,

Jimmy G. Cheek
Chancellor

Enclosures (3)

Cc: Members of the Honorary Degree Nominating Committee
    Members of the Special Committee
    Dr. Mike Wirth, Dean and Professor of the College of Communication and Information

Approved:

Joseph A. DiPietro
President, University of Tennessee System
September 15, 2016

President Joseph A. DiPietro
University of Tennessee System
800 Andy Holt Tower
Knoxville, TN 37996-0180

Dear President DiPietro:

It is especially important for the University of Tennessee, Knoxville to recognize the achievements of select individuals who make important contributions to the university and our world. As such, I am pleased to nominate former governor Philip Bredesen to receive an honorary doctorate degree from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. From 2003 until 2011, he served as governor of Tennessee. Prior to his time as governor, he served as mayor of Nashville from 1991 to 1999. Additionally, Governor Bredesen has made a significant impact on the University of Tennessee by helping establish the UT-ORNL partnership and the Energy Science and Engineering PhD program.

Governor Bredesen spent his youth in rural New York and attended Harvard University, where he earned a bachelor’s degree in physics in 1967. The former governor has never worked in physics or science in his career, but his interest in and knowledge of science has remained an integral part of his personality and work. After college, he was employed by a pharmaceutical company and worked in the Boston area and in the United Kingdom. After his move to Nashville in 1975 with his wife, Andrea, he founded HealthAmerica Corp. This insurance company grew to have more than 6,000 employees and was publicly traded on the New York Stock Exchange. Governor Bredesen recently authored Fresh Medicine: How to Fix Reform and Build a Sustainable Health Care System, and he frequently speaks to national audiences on a variety of topics including health care and political leadership. In addition to science and health care, it was evident throughout his administration that the governor had a special interest in education.

Under Governor Bredesen’s leadership, a number of measures were aimed at improving education. One initiative was the establishment of the Tennessee Lottery in order to fund college scholarships for the state’s top high school graduates. This measure allowed more of the top high school graduates to stay in Tennessee for college with many of them attending the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. His leadership helped to achieve funding for the UT Biofuels Initiative and two new joint institutes between UT and Oak Ridge National Laboratory, in biological sciences and neutron sciences. Governor Bredesen’s interest in the UT-ORNL partnership led to the initiation of the Governor’s Chairs program. UT is grateful and proud to say that this program has brought 14 nationally known scholars and
researchers into high-level joint appointments between the national lab and the university. Perhaps as a result of his interest in science and energy, the Volunteer State Solar Initiative was funded, and a solar panel array in West Tennessee is now producing electricity on the TVA grid. Throughout his administration, Governor Bredesen accomplished a great deal for the state of Tennessee. He was a strong fiscal leader and helped to achieve many advances in education, healthcare, and economic development opportunities.

At the close of his administration, he leveraged the assets of UT and ORNL to initiate a new doctoral program related to energy issues. ORNL Director Thom Mason and I established a task force in February 2010 to design the new interdisciplinary doctoral program and an academic center in which the new PhD program would operate. The Energy Science and Engineering (ESE) doctoral program was the result, and it received approval by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission late in 2010. As you know, the Bredesen Center is the academic unit in which the ESE doctoral program is now housed, and it is the only example in Tennessee of something to which he has allowed his name to be attached.

The ESE doctoral program has been so successful that it has led us to propose the initiation of a Data Science and Engineering doctoral program. This program is to focus on the big data issues impacting numerous fields of science and technology. Governor Bredesen has guided and advised our evolution and how to kick-start this second doctoral program within the Bredesen Center.

Even after his retirement from elected office, Governor Bredesen remains engaged in the ESE doctoral program helping first-year graduate students learn about policies related to energy. Additionally, Governor Bredesen continues to be an active entrepreneur. In recent years, he and two colleagues founded Silicon Ranch, a solar-energy developer and installer. This facility is one of the top 15 solar-power generators in the nation and enables the Department of the Navy to meet energy and security goals. Furthermore, these generators advance Silicon Ranch’s and TVA’s commitment to renewable energy in the state. Governor Bredesen is a role model of what a person can accomplish with a dedication to science and innovation, a strong devotion to public service, and a passion for entrepreneurship.

The university’s Honorary Degree Nominating Committee unanimously approved the nomination of former Governor Philip Bredesen, which was submitted by Lee Riedinger, professor of physics and director of the Bredesen Center for Interdisciplinary Research and Graduate Education. The nominating committee consisted of Trustee Vicky Gregg, chair of the Board of Trustees’ Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee, myself, and five members selected by the Faculty Senate: Drs. Theresa Lee, Dean Kopsell, Ralph Lydie, Carol Tenopir, and Terry Hazen, who served as chair of the nominating committee.

Furthermore, a special committee received the recommendation from the Honorary Degree Nominating Committee. The special committee consisted of Interim Provost John Zomchick and three tenured faculty members appointed by the chair of the Graduate Council who are not members of the nominating committee. The faculty members included Drs. Robert
Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee - Consent Agenda

Fuller, Stephen Kania, Jens Gregor, and Leo Riedinger, director of the Bredesen Center for Interdisciplinary Research and Graduate Education. The special committee, chaired by Dr. Stephen Kania, also approved the recommendation of Governor Philip Bredesen for an honorary doctorate degree.

The entire nomination process is set out on our website ( chancellor.utk.edu/honorary-degrees/nomination-selection/) and is modeled on, and consistent with, the University of Tennessee System Board of Trustees’ policy for granting honorary degrees.

I request approval to honor former Governor Philip Bredesen with this distinction.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jimmy G. Cheek
Chancellor

Enclosures (3)

Cc: Members of the Honorary Degree Nominating Committee
    Members of the Special Committee
    Dr. Lee Riedinger, Professor & Director of the Bredesen Center for Interdisciplinary Research and Graduate Education

Approved:

[Signature]

Joseph A. DiPietro
President, University of Tennessee System
September 15, 2016

President Joseph A. DiPietro
University of Tennessee System
800 Andy Holt Tower
Knoxville, TN 37996-0180

Dear President DiPietro:

I am pleased to nominate Mr. James Herbert to receive an honorary doctorate degree from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Mr. Herbert’s accompanying biography illustrates his outstanding career and service. Mr. Herbert is a native Tennessean, originally from Memphis. Having earned his Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in 1962, he is a distinguished alumnus of the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources (CASNRR). Mr. Herbert has served as a member of the Institute of Agriculture Advancement Board and is currently serving on the University of Tennessee Foundation Board of Directors.

Since his 1962 graduation, Mr. Herbert has attained many great achievements and is most known for being one of the founders of Neogen Corporation. Neogen was founded in 1962, and it is now a publicly held company that focuses on the development, manufacturing, and marketing of products for food and animal safety. Through this role, Mr. Herbert has achieved well-deserved international recognition. Fortune magazine named Neogen one of the 100 fastest-growing small public companies in America five times. His expertise was honored by USA Today and NASDAQ when he was named Michigan Entrepreneur of the Year and by the governor of Michigan when he was appointed to two different initiatives, serving as the chairman of the Board of Directors for the Michigan Strategic Fund and a member of the Michigan Food Policy Council. Neogen revenues for 2015 were approximately $283 million. The compound annual growth rate of the company has been 20 percent annually for the past five years. Neogen Corporation is headquartered in Lansing, Michigan, but it is an international leader in food safety innovation.

Mr. Herbert has been the recipient of honorary doctoral degrees from both Michigan State University and Queen's University in Belfast, Ireland. He was named a Global Scot in 2005 in recognition of his extraordinary development activities in Scotland, where Neogen has operations along with locations in Brazil, Mexico, China, and India.

Mr. Herbert has been CEO of Neogen since 1982, and he has been generous in his financial support of the University of Tennessee. Mr. Herbert and his wife, Judi, have provided endowments for the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources and the College
of Arts and Sciences. Additionally, Mr. Herbert and Judi have been dedicated volunteers 
and community servants. I am pleased to have such a deserving alumnus, humanitarian, 
and friend of the university to offer for nomination.

The university's Honorary Degree Nominating Committee unanimously approved the 
nomination of Mr. James Herbert, which was submitted by Dr. Caula A. Beyl, dean of 
CASNR. The nominating committee consisted of Trustee Vicky Gregg, chair of the Board of 
Trustees' Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee, myself, and five members 
selected by the Faculty Senate: Drs. Theresa Lee, Dean Kopsell, Ralph Lydic, Carol 
Tenopir, and Terry Hazen, who served as chair of the nominating committee.

Furthermore, a special committee received the recommendation from the Honorary Degree 
Nominating Committee. The special committee consisted of Interim Provost John Zomchick 
and three tenured faculty members appointed by the chair of the Graduate Council who are 
not members of the nominating committee. The faculty members included Drs. Robert 
Fuller, Jens Gregor, Stephen Kania, and Neal Schrick, head of the Department of Animal 
Science. The special committee, chaired by Dr. Stephen Kania, also approved the 
recommendation of Mr. James Herbert for an honorary doctorate degree.

The entire nomination process is set out on our website (chancellor.utk.edu/honorary-
degrees/nomination-selection/) and is modeled on, and consistent with, The University of 
Tennessee System Board of Trustees' policy for granting honorary degrees.

I request approval to honor Mr. James Herbert with this distinction.

Sincerely,

Jim Shotch
Chancellor

Enclosures (3)

Cc: Members of the Honorary Degree Nominating Committee
 Members of the Special Committee
  Dr. Caula A. Beyl, Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural 
Resources

Approved:

Joseph A. DiPietro
President, University of Tennessee System
In the spring of 2015, in response to a Budget Advisory Group (BAG) recommendation, President DiPietro charged a task force of faculty and administrators and Trustee Vicky Gregg, Chair of the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee, to review the Board of Trustees Policy on Academic Freedom, Responsibilities and Tenure. Specifically, the group was charged with reviewing and recommending changes to the Cumulative Performance Review (CPR) provisions of the policy.

The CPR provisions were approved by the Board in 1998. CPR was developed to provide an enhanced review of the performance of tenured faculty whose performance did not meet the expectations of their discipline and rank. Since 1998, CPR has been invoked rarely, but the administration reported several challenges in carrying out the policy effectively, including ambiguous language, unclear timelines, and varying interpretation of the CPR procedures.

Based on the work of the system-wide, 11-member task force, revised policy provisions, known as Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR), were developed. The new provisions will provide needed clarification of procedures and timelines and are intended to be a more efficient and appropriate way of handling the review of the University’s tenured faculty.

MOTION: I move that the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee recommend adoption of the following Resolution by the Board of Trustees.

RESOLVED: Revision of the post-tenure performance review provisions of the Board Tenure Policy (known as Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review) is approved.
Proposed Policy on the Review of Tenured Faculty

Enhanced Post-tenure Performance Review

Office of Academic Affairs & Student Success
Cumulative Performance Review (CPR) Policy 1998 - Present

- 25 cases of CPR review since implementation
- Outcomes included termination for cause, resignation or retirement, and those who are now in good standing
- Challenges to implementing CPR: vague language, procedures, and timelines
- Negative association with the process
- Outdated policy in need of review
Committee to Review CPR Policy
What was the process like?

• All campuses represented by faculty and administrators
• A year-long investment
• 11-member committee
• Trustee inclusion
• Substantial faculty input and support
• Iterative process
CPR-Review Committee Members

• Toby Boulet, Associate Professor of Mechanical, Aerospace, and Biomedical Engineering, UT Knoxville, Chair
• Vicky Gregg, Member, UT Board of Trustees
• Susan Martin, Provost, UT Knoxville
• Susan Davidson, Professor of Nursing, UT Chattanooga
• Valerie Rutledge, Dean of the College of Health, Education, and Professional Studies, UT Chattanooga
• John Stier, Assistant Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resource, UT Institute of Agriculture
• Tom Samples, Professor of Plant Sciences, UT Institute of Agriculture
• Lori Gonzalez, Vice Chancellor for Academic, Faculty, and Student Affairs, UT Health Science Center
• Phyllis Richey, Associate Professor of Preventive Medicine, UT Health Science Center
• Jeff Rogers, Professor of Geography, UT Martin
• Daniel Pigg, Professor of English, UT Martin
Enhanced Post-tenure Performance Review

What are the objectives of EPPR?

1. Identify situations when expectations for discipline and rank are not met
2. Provide in-depth evaluation by peers over a 5-year period
3. Facilitate greater cooperation between faculty and administration
Enhanced Post-tenure Performance Review

How is the new policy different?

• Offers more clarity and precision than the previous policy
• Permits faculty to request review via EPPR, if desired
• Establishes time limits on actions and the duration of the review process
• Prescribes specific guidelines and provides campus default procedures
• Shifts oversight from the Dean to the Chief Academic Officer
• Operates independently of all other grievances
Enhanced Post-tenure Performance Review
What are some of the specifics?

• The evaluation review window was shortened from 5 years to 4
• 1 “Unsatisfactory” evaluation now initiates immediate action by the CAO
• The review committee is made up of 5 peers who meet specific criteria
• Detailed voting processes and written documentation of actions are now required
• Specific procedures were established for interviews and document review
• Timelines for each part of the process have been developed; the Improvement Plan period is capped at 8 months
Enhanced Post-tenure Performance Review
What are the key takeaways?

• The new policy…
  • has the support of both faculty and administrators
  • provides a needed update to an 18-year old policy
  • offers greater clarity, efficiency, and fairness
  • improves consistency of the process throughout the system
  • allows for campuses to establish certain procedures where appropriate
  • represents a thorough and collaborative process of improvement
Questions?
Board of Trustees Policies
Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure

I. Academic Freedom and Responsibility of the Faculty Member
II. Academic Freedom and Responsibility of the University Administration
III. Tenure
   A. Definition of Tenure
   B. Eligibility for Tenure Consideration
   C. Probationary Period
   D. Criteria for Tenure
   E. Procedures for Consideration and Grant of tenure
   F. Locus of Tenure

G. Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Members

The University is committed to the evaluation of all faculty members as a means of strengthening the principle of tenure. To that end, the University applies two mechanisms for evaluating and supporting the work of tenured faculty: the Annual Performance-and-Planning Review (detailed primarily in campus faculty handbooks) and the Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (detailed in G.2. below and Appendix F). Both review processes focus on the faculty member’s contributions to the University’s missions through teaching, research (including scholarly and artistic work), service, and clinical care.

Competent teaching is a crucial responsibility for faculty members, and the effective use of appropriate instructional evaluation (including departmental files of class syllabi and related materials, student, and peer evaluation, etc.) is important to all objective review processes. Faculty members with research/creative arts responsibilities should have the quantity and quality of their work fairly assessed. Each faculty member's service contributions should be evaluated impartially.

1. Annual Performance-and-Planning Review

Each faculty member and his or her department head will engage in a formal annual Performance-and-Planning Review, examining the current fiscal/academic year's activities and planning what should occur during the coming fiscal/academic year. The planning aspects of these annual academic year reviews also should take place in the context of longer-term goals for the campus, college, and department. Each campus shall strive to reward faculty members who more than meet expectations for rank, and administrators shall develop and publish guidelines for each campus to allocate funds for this purpose whenever feasible. Each faculty member's annual review should proceed from guidelines and criteria which are appropriate to the department, college, and campus, and this annual review should be a key element in merit pay or performance-based salary adjustments. A document summarizing the review—including an objective rating of the faculty member's
performance, as listed below—must be signed by the faculty member (to acknowledge receipt of the review document) and the Department Head. The Head must send a copy to the Dean. The Dean must send copies of the documents or a list of names by category to the Chief Academic Officer for review and approval/disapproval.

The performance ratings scale for annual reviews shall be approved by the Board of Trustees, and may include (in whole or in part) the ratings defined below. Unless or until the Board of Trustees approves a campus-specific rating scale, campuses shall employ the rating scale defined below. To ensure seamless application of other faculty policies and procedures related to performance ratings (whether part of this document or some other policy or procedure), any campus-specific rating scale must explain how it articulates with the rating scale defined below. Campus faculty handbooks, college bylaws, and/or department bylaws must specify the substantive performance criteria to be used when conducting performance reviews within the particular unit.

The following performance rating scale is to be applied in evaluating tenured faculty members when no campus-specific scale is in place:

a. Exceeds Expectations for Rank—eligible for significant merit pay or performance-based salary adjustment that is consistent with campus, college, and department fiscal situations;

b. Meets Expectations for Rank—eligible for minimum merit pay or performance-based salary adjustment that is consistent with campus, college, and department fiscal situations;

c. Needs improvement for Rank—not eligible for merit pay or performance-based salary adjustment and required to implement an Annual Review Improvement Plan (see below); and

d. Unsatisfactory for Rank—not eligible for any salary adjustment and required an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (III.G.2. below) to implement an Annual Review Improvement Plan (see below).

Annual Review Improvement Plans: Within 30 days of the annual review, any faculty member with an overall performance rating of rated Needs Improvement for Rank or Unsatisfactory for Rank must collaborate with the Head on an Annual Review Improvement Plan to be reviewed by the Dean and recommended by him/her to the Dean for review and approval/denial. The next year’s annual review must include a progress report that clearly describes improvements in any area(s) for which improvement was required noted as Needs Improvement for Rank or Unsatisfactory for Rank.
Appeal Process: Each campus shall have a campus-wide process by which a faculty member may appeal his/her annual review rating. Developing the process should involve the Faculty Senate or an appropriate committee thereof.

2. Cumulative Performance Review (CPR)

A comprehensive, formal, cumulative, performance review is triggered for the following tenured faculty members:

a. a faculty member whose annual review is Unsatisfactory in any two of five consecutive years;

b. a faculty member whose annual review is any combination of Unsatisfactory or Needs Improvement in any three of five consecutive years.

Each campus shall establish policies and procedures for peer evaluation of the faculty member’s cumulative performance. Within thirty days of being triggered, a CPR Committee shall be convened by the Dean, who shall determine its chair. This committee shall be composed of appropriate, same or higher rank, tenured departmental faculty members (excluding the Head), and appropriate faculty (same or higher rank) from outside the department. The faculty member being reviewed and the Head may each name a campus tenured professor (same or higher rank) to the committee, which normally should have at least five (5) members including the CPR Committee chair, and at least two additional faculty members nominated by the Faculty Senate (one departmental faculty member [same or higher rank] and one non-departmental faculty member [same or higher rank]). The Committee chair shall forward the committee consensus recommendation to the Head, Dean and Chief Academic Officer. Performance ratings for cumulative reviews shall be as follows:

- Satisfies Expectations for Rank
- Fails to Satisfy Expectations for Rank

If the CPR Committee consensus rates the faculty member’s performance as Fails to Satisfy Expectations for Rank, it may develop with the affected faculty member and Head a written CPR Improvement Plan (which may include, but shall not be limited to, skill-development leave of absence, intensive mentoring, curtailment of outside services, change in load/responsibilities), normally of up to one calendar year, and a means to assess its efficacy, with the plan to be reviewed by the Dean and approved by the Chief Academic Officer; or the committee may recommend to the Dean and Chief Academic Officer that the Chancellor initiate proceedings, as specified in the Faculty Handbook, to terminate the faculty member for adequate cause after the Chancellor has consulted with the Faculty Senate President and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (which may delegate its responsibility to the appropriate Faculty Senate committee).

If the CPR Committee consensus rates the faculty member’s performance as Satisfies Expectations for Rank, the Committee must forward its justification/rationale to the Dean.
The Dean must recommend one of the following three actions by the Chief Academic Officer:

a. concur that the faculty member’s performance has been Satisfies Expectations for Rank, that his/her personnel file should show that both the Committee and the Dean concur in a Satisfactory CPR rating, and that a new five-year period annual review cycle will begin; or

b. find that the faculty member’s performance has been Fails to Satisfy Expectations for Rank (including a rationale for that ranking), and recommend that the Chief Academic Officer should require that the CPR Committee develop with the affected faculty member a written CPR Improvement Plan (which may include, but shall not be limited to, skill development leave of absence, intensive mentoring, curtailment of outside services, change in load/responsibilities), normally of up to one calendar year, and a means to assess its efficacy; or

c. find that the faculty member’s performance has been Fails to Satisfy Expectations for Rank (including a rationale for that ranking), and recommend to the Chancellor that he/she initiate proceedings, as specified in the Faculty Handbook, to terminate the faculty member for adequate cause after the Chancellor has consulted with the Faculty Senate President and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (which may delegate its responsibility to the appropriate Faculty Senate committee).

At the end of the time allotted for a CPR Improvement Plan, the Head, CPR Committee, Dean, and Chief Academic Officer shall send a written consensus report to the campus Chancellor, recommending:

(i) that the faculty member’s performance is Satisfies Expectations for Rank and no other action need be taken at this time; or

(ii) that the faculty member’s performance has improved sufficiently to allow for up to one additional year of monitoring of improvement, after which the Head, CPR Committee, Dean, and Chief Academic Officer must by consensus determine if the faculty member’s performance is Satisfies Expectations for Rank or recommend that the Chancellor initiate Proceedings, as specified in the Faculty Handbook, to terminate the faculty member for adequate cause after the Chancellor has consulted with the Faculty Senate President and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (which may delegate its responsibility to the appropriate Faculty Senate committee); or
(iii) that the Chancellor initiate proceedings, as specified in the Faculty Handbook, to terminate the faculty member for adequate cause after the Chancellor has consulted with the Faculty Senate President and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (which may delegate its responsibility to the appropriate Faculty Senate committee).

2. Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR)

Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR) is an expanded and in-depth performance evaluation conducted by a committee of tenured peers and administered by the chief academic officer. Procedures for conducting an EPPR are detailed in Appendix F.

This policy recognizes that the work of a faculty member is not neatly separated into academic or calendar years. To ensure that performance is evaluated in the context of ongoing work, the period of performance subject to enhanced review is the five most recent annual performance review cycles. Each campus administration must collect and maintain sufficient data regarding annual performance reviews to implement this policy effectively.

An Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review must be initiated when the chief academic officer determines that a faculty member has:

- requested an EPPR, after at least four annual performance review cycles since the last enhanced review (such as a previous EPPR or a review in connection with tenure or promotion);
- received one overall annual performance rating of “Unsatisfactory” (or the campus equivalent for the lowest performance rating); or
- received two overall annual performance ratings of “Needs Improvement” (or the campus equivalent for the next-to-lowest performance rating) during any four consecutive annual performance review cycles.

a. Administration of the EPPR by the Chief Academic Officer

The EPPR process will be administered under the direction and oversight of the campus chief academic officer. As with any performance evaluation, the chief academic officer may overrule a performance rating assigned by a department head or dean during the annual review process. This practice ensures that when an EPPR process is activated by one or more negative performance ratings (III.G.2. above), the chief academic officer is aware of existing concerns.

---

1 Where indicated in Appendix F, the chief academic officer may delegate tasks associated with the EPPR to a vice provost, associate or assistant vice chancellor for academic affairs, or other appropriate campus academic administrator.
The task of administering the EPPR requires implementation of this policy and the procedures detailed in Appendix F, as well as any additional steps the chief academic officer finds necessary to comply with the policy objectives. For example, the chief academic officer may be required to adapt the implementation of this policy to satisfy legal requirements (such as limitations on disclosure of student information) or respond to unexpected events (such as replacement of a committee member who becomes unable to serve).

b. Peer Review Committee’s Charge

The peer review committee is charged to review the information relevant to the faculty member’s performance during the review period and to conclude whether or not that performance has satisfied the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank.

As detailed in Appendix F, the expectations for faculty performance may differ by campus, college, department, and even among sub-disciplines within a department or program. Those expectations may be commonly-held standards in the discipline or may be stated explicitly in the faculty member’s own past annual performance reviews, work assignments, goals or other planning tools (however identified), as well as department or college bylaws, the campus faculty handbook, this policy, and in other generally-applicable policies and procedures (for example, fiscal, human resources, safety, research, or information technology policies and procedures).

The peer review committee must reach a conclusion as to whether or not the performance has satisfied the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank. If the peer review committee concludes that the faculty member’s performance has not met the expectations for the discipline and academic rank, the committee must also recommend either that an EPPR improvement plan be developed as detailed in Appendix F, or that the Chancellor initiate proceedings to consider termination of tenure for Adequate Cause under III.H. below and Appendix B.

The committee must report its conclusions and recommendations in writing, including an explanation for each conclusion or recommendation, and enumerating the vote for any conclusion or recommendation that is not adopted unanimously. The faculty member must have an opportunity to review and respond to the committee’s draft report.

All written conclusions and recommendations of the peer review committee must be reviewed and considered by the chief academic officer and the Chancellor.

c. Review and Action by the Chancellor

The Chancellor may accept the peer review committee’s conclusions and recommendations or make different conclusions in a written explanation provided to the faculty member with copies to the chief academic officer, dean, department head, and members of the peer review
committee. Based on those conclusions, the Chancellor may take further action as deemed appropriate, including (without limitation) actions described in this policy, in the applicable faculty handbook, or in any other policy and procedures generally applicable to faculty.

If the Chancellor concludes (based on the recommendation of a peer review committee or based on independent review of the EPPR materials) that an EPPR improvement plan is warranted, the Chancellor will promptly direct the chief academic officer to oversee development of the plan (Appendix F).

d. Final Review and Action Following Any EPPR Improvement Plan

If an EPPR improvement plan is implemented, the peer review committee must reconvene to review performance under the plan and to decide whether or not performance under the plan satisfies the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank. The committee must report its conclusions and recommendations in writing, as described in Appendix F. The chief academic officer and the Chancellor must review all conclusions and recommendations of the peer review committee. The Chancellor may accept the committee’s conclusions and recommendations, provide a written explanation of different conclusions, or take further action deemed appropriate, including (without limitation) actions described in this policy, in the applicable faculty handbook, or any other policy and procedures generally applicable to faculty.

3. Campus Coordination of the APPR and EPPR Review Processes

Because each campus conducts the Annual Performance-and-Planning Review (APPR) on its own timetable, procedures for coordinating the APPR (III.G.1.) and the EPPR (III.G.2.) must also vary by campus. This policy therefore requires that each campus establish (by July 1, 2017) a system for evaluating the ongoing performance of a faculty member whose past performance is being reviewed under the EPPR process.

Such a campus system for coordinating the APPR and the EPPR must be reviewed and approved by the President (or a designee) and Chancellor before implementation. A properly-approved system of coordinated reviews may include an alternate form of annual review (in lieu of the normal APPR) when an EPPR is underway. In such a case, any campus performance evaluation substituted for the APPR must result in an overall performance rating considered for annual salary adjustments (including across-the-board and other raises).
Appendix F: Procedures for Conducting the Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR)

1. Objectives of the Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR)

The EPPR policy and procedures provide a thorough, fair, and transparent process for:

- coordinating peer evaluation of a tenured faculty member’s performance across a five-year period;
- facilitating cooperation between a tenured faculty member and administrators in identifying effective strategies to assist the faculty member in meeting the expectations for the relevant discipline and academic rank; and
- distinguishing those unusual situations in which (despite efforts to facilitate improvement) the faculty member’s performance fails to satisfy expectations for the discipline and academic rank, and which may lead to disciplinary action, up to and including proceedings to consider termination of tenure.

2. Review by the Chief Academic Officer To Determine Whether EPPR is Warranted

Irrespective of other campus processes or practices through which an annual performance review is finalized, the chief academic officer must review any annual performance evaluation that would result in EPPR.

- If the chief academic officer overrules the performance rating and determines that EPPR is not warranted, the faculty member may choose to proceed with EPPR.
- If the chief academic officer determines that an EPPR is warranted, the chief academic officer should meet promptly with the faculty member to explain the decision and review the EPPR process. The chief academic officer must also provide written notice of this decision (copied to the department head, dean, and faculty senate president) that an EPPR will be conducted.

3. Appointment of the Peer Review Committee

Within 45 days of the written notice that an EPPR will be conducted, the chief academic officer (or designee) must appoint the peer review committee in the manner described below and meet with the committee to review its charge.

Every member of the peer review committee must be tenured; hold the same or higher academic rank as the faculty member undergoing review; and have some familiarity with the relevant performance expectations for faculty in that discipline and academic rank. In the unusual event that an appropriate peer review committee cannot be assembled using
these criteria, the chief academic officer must provide to the faculty member a written explanation for the deviation from the prescribed criteria.

Consistent with the criteria for service stated above, and absent approval by the Board of Trustees to implement some other appointment mechanism, the chief academic officer (or designee) must appoint the peer review committee using the following nomination process:

- the dean nominates one faculty member to serve both as chair and as a voting member of the peer review committee;

- the department head or chair nominates three faculty members who meet the criteria above, from whom one committee member is appointed;

- the faculty member undergoing review nominates three faculty members who meet the criteria above, from whom one committee member is appointed;

- the faculty senate president nominates three faculty members who meet the criteria above, from whom one committee member is appointed; and

- if a college promotion and tenure committee exists, that committee nominates three actively serving members who meet the criteria above, from whom one committee member is appointed. If no college promotion and tenure committee exists, the faculty member under review selects a department other than his/her own from which the chief academic officer selects a final committee member, consistent with the criteria above.

To ensure diverse perspectives among members of the peer review committee, the chief academic officer should solicit nominations from faculty serving in different roles. When feasible, nominations to the peer review committee should include:

- faculty members whose tenure lies in the same department as the faculty member undergoing review or, in a small department, faculty members who hold tenure in the same college as the faculty member undergoing review;

- at least one faculty member whose tenure resides in a different department than the faculty member undergoing review; and

- at least one faculty member who currently serves (or who served during the most recent cycle) on a college promotion and tenure review committee, if such a committee exists.

4. **Collection of Records for Review by the Peer Review Committee**

The chief academic officer (or designee) must collect the following records with respect to the faculty member under review:
• all annual performance reviews for the past five annual performance review cycles, including materials submitted by the faculty member (or an administrator) or developed as part of the evaluation process;

• written performance expectations, which may have been established in the past five annual performance reviews, in department or college bylaws, in the faculty handbook, or in Board of Trustees, fiscal, human resources, research, safety, or information technology policies or procedures; and

• any work assignments, goals, or other plans (however identified) that were described in previous performance evaluations during the review period.

The faculty member undergoing review may submit additional written materials relevant to the review period for the committee’s consideration. Such materials must be submitted to the chief academic officer (or designee) for distribution to the committee. The peer review committee may also request that the chief academic officer (or designee) collect and provide additional written materials. Reasonable requests for relevant records will be honored when permitted by law and University policy.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations by the Peer Review Committee

The peer review committee is charged to review the available performance information and to conclude (based on that information) whether or not performance during the review period has satisfied the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank. This review should be completed (and written report drafted) within 75 days from the chief academic officer’s charge to the peer review committee.

**Interviews** — The peer review committee may conduct a reasonable number of interviews in person or electronically. If the committee chooses to conduct interviews, both the faculty member undergoing review and the administrator who assigned the negative rating(s) must be given the opportunity to be interviewed. All interviews must be conducted separately. Unavailability of the faculty member or administrator for an interview does not constitute grounds for an extension of time to complete the EPPR.

**Voting** — Voting must be conducted by anonymous ballots. No member of the committee may abstain or recuse him/herself from voting. All conclusions and recommendations are adopted upon the vote of a simple majority, except a recommendation that the Chancellor initiate tenure termination proceedings, which requires the support of at least four members of the peer review committee.

a. **Conclusions Regarding Performance and Recommended Action(s)**

All conclusions and recommendations of the peer review committee must be made in writing, with copies to all parties (faculty member, department head, dean, and chief academic officer). Minority reports may be attached. While the committee is not permitted
to share written materials directly with the faculty senate, the faculty member under review remains free to do so.

Based on the judgment of its members, the peer review committee must conclude either:

1. that the performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank; or

2. that the performance does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank. In such a case, the committee must recommend either:

   - that an EPPR improvement plan be developed and implemented; or
   - by a vote of at least four committee members, that the Chancellor should initiate proceedings to consider termination of tenure based on Adequate Cause (Unsatisfactory Performance in Teaching, Research, or Service) as defined in III.H. of this policy and the procedures detailed in Appendix B.

b. Review and Responses to the Peer Review Committee’s Report

The committee’s written conclusions and recommendations must be distributed to the faculty member, department head, and dean for simultaneous review, who must submit any written responses to the chief academic officer within 14 days.

c. Conclusions and Recommendations of the Chief Academic Officer

The chief academic officer will review the committee’s report and all timely written responses and will make an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s performance. Within 28 days of the distribution of the peer review committee’s report (14 days for review and comment by others and 14 days for independent review by the chief academic officer), the chief academic officer must provide to the Chancellor copies of the committee’s report, all timely responses to the report, and any additional conclusions or recommendations based on the chief academic officer’s independent review of the material. The entire report, including any materials added by the faculty member, department head, dean, and chief academic officer, must be copied to the faculty member, peer review committee, department head, and dean.

6. Review and Action by the Chancellor

The Chancellor will make an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s performance and must provide to the faculty member (copied to the department head, dean, chief academic officer, and members of the peer review committee) a written explanation of the rationale for any conclusions, decisions, or further actions to be taken.
If the Chancellor concludes that the performance under review has satisfied the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank, the EPPR process is concluded. In doing so, the Chancellor may overrule previous performance ratings and may adjust the faculty member’s salary to reflect any across-the-board raises.

If the Chancellor concludes that the performance under review does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank, the Chancellor may take further action as deemed appropriate. For example (without limitation):

- The Chancellor may require that an EPPR improvement plan be implemented for a period of up to 18 months, as further described below.

- The Chancellor may propose disciplinary action, up to and including proceedings to consider tenure termination based on Adequate Cause (Unsatisfactory Performance in Teaching, Research, or Service) as defined in III.H. of this policy and the procedures detailed in Appendix B.

7. Development and Implementation of an Improvement Plan (When Applicable)

   a. Written Notice to All Parties

   If the Chancellor concludes that an EPPR improvement plan should be developed, the Chancellor must promptly instruct the chief academic officer to develop and implement an improvement plan using the process detailed below. The chief academic officer must promptly notify in writing the faculty member under review that the Chancellor has determined that an EPPR improvement plan must be implemented (with copies to the department head, dean, and peer review committee). Only one improvement plan may be offered to a faculty member during a given EPPR process; however, the EPPR process may be implemented more than once during a faculty member’s career. An EPPR improvement plan may extend no more than 18 months from the time it is implemented by the chief academic officer.

   b. Development of the EPPR Improvement Plan

   The department head is responsible for drafting the EPPR improvement plan in close collaboration with the peer review committee, dean, and chief academic officer. In drafting the improvement plan, the department head should attempt to address any written concerns raised by the faculty member during the relevant annual review cycles.

   Within 30 days of notice that an improvement plan must be developed, the department head is expected to produce a plan supported by the dean, chief academic officer, and a majority of the peer review committee. Once such an improvement plan is developed, the chief academic officer shall forward the proposed plan to the faculty member.
If the department head fails to produce within 30 days an improvement plan supported by
the chief academic officer, dean, and majority of the peer review committee, then the
committee must assume responsibility for drafting an improvement plan. In such a case, the
committee must complete the plan within 14 additional days. Upon approval by a majority
of the peer review committee, the proposed plan must be provided to the dean and chief
academic officer for review and approval.

In either case, the chief academic officer must ensure that an improvement plan acceptable
to the chief academic officer, dean, and majority of the peer review committee is developed
and must send the proposed plan to the faculty member for review and response. The
faculty member under review must be given one opportunity to review and respond to the
proposed improvement plan (within 14 days). The peer review committee must review and
consider the faculty member’s response, including any modifications requested by the
faculty member (within another 14 days). In its discretion, the peer review committee may
revise the proposed plan after considering the faculty member’s response. The committee
must then forward the proposed improvement plan to the chief academic officer for review
and, if approved, implementation (with copies to the dean, department head, and faculty
member).

d. Committee Review after an EPPR Improvement Plan

At the end of the time allotted for the EPPR improvement plan, the peer review committee
must reconvene to review performance under the plan, and to determine whether or not
such performance (in the context of the EPPR review period) has satisfied expectations for
the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank. The peer review committee must
provide a written report of its conclusions and recommendations to the faculty member,
department head, and dean, who may respond in writing within 14 days.

The chief academic officer must review the committee’s report and any timely written
responses and must independently evaluate performance under the improvement plan. The
chief academic officer must then submit the reconvened committee’s report, all written
responses, and his/her own conclusions and recommendations to the Chancellor, with
copies to the faculty member, peer review committee, department head, and dean.

e. Chancellor’s Review and Action after an EPPR Improvement Plan

The Chancellor will make an independent evaluation of the performance under the EPPR
improvement plan (in the context of the EPPR review period) and must provide to the faculty
member (copied to the department head, dean, chief academic officer, and members of the
peer review committee) a written explanation of the rationale for any conclusions, decisions,
or further actions to be taken.
8. **Timeline for Conducting the EPPR**

All EPPR deadlines are counted in calendar days rather than business days, except when the last day of the time period falls during a holiday or administrative closure lasting five business days or longer (such as the administrative closure between fall and spring semesters or an extended weather-related closure). The following table summarizes the key events and deadlines in the EPPR process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event begins</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Event ends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written notice from the chief academic officer that EPPR is warranted</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Chief academic officer charges the peer review committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief academic officer charges the peer review committee</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Committee report is distributed for review by the faculty member, department head, and dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee report is distributed for review by the faculty member, department head, and dean</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Faculty member, department head, and dean submit written responses to the chief academic officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief academic officer reviews timely responses to the report and makes an independent evaluation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Chief academic officer submits to the Chancellor the committee’s report, all timely responses, and any additional conclusions and recommendations based on the chief academic officer’s independent evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the Chancellor requires implementation of an EPPR improvement plan, the chief academic officer provides written notice to all parties</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Department head submits to the chief academic officer a proposed improvement plan supported by the dean, chief academic officer, and a majority of the peer review committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the department head fails to produce an improvement plan supported by the dean, chief academic officer, and a majority of the committee, then the peer review committee assumes responsibility for drafting a plan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Peer review committee submits the proposed improvement plan to the dean and chief academic officer for review and approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon approval by the chief academic officer, the proposed improvement plan is sent to the faculty member for review</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Faculty member submits to the peer review committee any written response (including any requested modifications to the improvement plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review committee considers faculty member’s response and may revise the proposed improvement plan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Peer review committee submits the proposed improvement plan to the chief academic officer for review and approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief academic officer reviews the proposed plan, responds to the committee as needed, and approves a final improvement plan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Chief academic officer sends the approved plan to the faculty member and others for implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On a case-by-case basis, the chief academic officer (or designee) may approve a written request from the peer review committee for an extension of time to complete the initial review. Only one extension may be granted to the peer review committee during a single EPPR, and the chief academic officer (or designee) will determine the length of the extension.

Concurrent Appeals or Grievances — While appeal of an annual performance rating (or other procedure) may overlap in time with the five-year review period, the EPPR is purposefully different from the annual performance review process. To the extent provided under the applicable faculty handbook or other campus policies or practices, the faculty member may choose to initiate or maintain an appeal of the most recent annual performance rating while EPPR is underway. Any appeal or other process must be conducted without interference or influence from the EPPR, and vice versa. Faculty senate leaders should take care to ensure the integrity of all procedures by confirming that no person serves in multiple proceedings related to the same faculty member. Except as may be required by law (for example, under regulatory requirements or a judicial order) any such appeal, grievance, or other University process must proceed simultaneously with the EPPR and must have no impact on the timing or procedures described in this policy.

9. Phased Implementation of this Policy

If approved by the Board of Trustees on October 14, 2016, this policy becomes effective on July 1, 2017. Any faculty member who is engaged in a Cumulative Performance Review (CPR) on October 14, 2016 must complete the CPR process under the then-applicable CPR policy. Otherwise, the following implementation schedule applies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of annual performance review meeting</th>
<th>Overall rating of Needs Improvement (or campus equivalent)</th>
<th>Overall rating of Unsatisfactory (or campus equivalent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On or before June 30, 2017</td>
<td>CPR policy applies</td>
<td>CPR policy applies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018</td>
<td>Performance ratings are reviewed by the chief academic officer, who decides whether CPR or EPPR should be applied.</td>
<td>EPPR policy applies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2018 or later</td>
<td>EPPR policy applies</td>
<td>EPPR policy applies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Program Review: Why Is it Important?

- UT’s integrity as an institution
- Accreditation
  - SACS
  - Disciplinary
- THEC Quality Assurance Funding
- Utilized since 1974
Academic Program Review: How Does it Work?

- Regular Campus Cycle/THEC Requirement/Accreditation Requirement
- Chief Academic Officer Coordinates Review
- Program Produces Self-study Documents
- Self-study Documents Provided to Internal & External Reviewers
- On-site Visits
- Final Report
- Implementation
- Follow-up
Academic Program Review:
What is the Purpose?

• To Review Programs Against National Standards
• To Judge Efficiency and Effectiveness Against National Standards within Existing Resource Base
• To Make Recommendations:
  • Suggest improvements within existing resource base
  • Allocation of additional resources
  • Reallocation of existing resources
  • Termination of programs
Academic Program Review: How do We Measure Quality?

- Strategic Plan
- Curriculum
- Learning (We assess both for General Education and Major)
- Enrollment
- Retention/Graduation Rates
- Diversity
- Teaching
- Research/Scholarship
- Service/Engagement
- Management
- Resources
- Accreditation
- Productivity Reports
- Pass Rates on Licensure Exams (Law, Medicine, Education, etc.)
- Alumni and Employer Satisfaction
Academic Program Review: What are the Outcomes?

- Strengths
- Weaknesses
- Threats
- Opportunities for Improvement

Restructure
Reallocation
Closure
Academic Program Review:
Reporting to the Board Since 1980

- Program “Inactivation”
- Program “Termination”
- Program “Reorganization”
- Program “Discontinuation”
Academic Program Review:
UTK Actions

- Actions in AYs 2014-15 and 2015-16:
  - Terminated Nursing Graduate Certificate
  - Terminated Public Health Leadership Graduate Certificate
  - Terminated Sustainability Graduate Certificate
  - Terminated Art Education BA/BFA
  - Terminated University Research Administration Graduate Certificate
Academic Program Review: UTM Actions

- Between 2011 and 2016:
  - Eliminated Dept. of Computer Science and Information Systems; combined Computer Science with Engineering and combined Information Systems with Management & Marketing
  - Eliminated Geology, Geography, & Physics; Geol. & Geog. moved to Dept. of Agriculture and Physics moved to Chemistry Department
  - Eliminated Psychology Department and merged with Department of Behavioral Sciences
  - Eliminated Modern Foreign Language Dept. and merged with English
  - Consolidated 12 Education Programs into a Single Major with Concentrations
Academic Program Review: UTC Actions 2015-16

- Merged Philosophy & Religion with Modern and Classical Language and Literature
- Reorganized Bachelor of Integrated Studies—
  - moved to College of Health, Education and Professional Studies (CHEPS)
- Reorganized Economics—moved to College of Business
- Eliminated 2 concentrations in Engineering
- Moved Physics major into Chemistry
- Moved Geology to Biology and Environmental Sciences
- Moved STEM Teacher Training to CHEPS
- Combined Music and Theatre Programs to form Performing Arts Department
Academic Program Review:
UTHSC Actions

• Inactivated Physical Therapy Science
• Terminated Masters in Physical Therapy
• Terminated PhD in Anatomy
• Terminated PhD in Biochemistry
• Terminated PhD in Pathology
• Terminated PhD in Pharmacology
• Terminated 3 concentrations in the DNP
Academic Program Review:
2016-17 Cycle by Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UT Knoxville</th>
<th>UT Chattanooga</th>
<th>UT Martin</th>
<th>UT Health Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth &amp; Planetary Sciences</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Dental Hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Health Informatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>MS in Accounting</td>
<td>Information Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Health Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical, Aerospace, and Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>Athletic Training</td>
<td>Physician’s Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial and Systems Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine and Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Every unit should strive for excellence.

• Excellence is defined differently, according to the discipline.

• Different ranking methods and measures are used for various units.

• We did not tie our Journey to a single ranking.
ILLUSTRATIVE RANKINGS
UT KNOXVILLE RANKING AMONG PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

2017 Best Colleges & Best Graduate Schools

- Best Public Universities: #46
- Undergraduate Business: #30
- Undergraduate Engineering: #32
- Best Colleges for Veterans: #31
- Graduate Fine Arts: #15
- Graduate Social Work: #19
- Graduate Nursing Schools: #25
- Graduate Business Schools: #34
- Graduate Engineering Schools: #36
- Law Schools: #37
- Graduate Education Schools: #46
- Online Master’s—Social Work: #2
ILLUSTRATIVE RANKINGS
UT KNOXVILLE RANKING AMONG PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

Top 25 American Public Research University

#16—Undergraduate Architecture

Best Colleges and Colleges That Pay You Back

America’s Best Value Colleges
### Sample of Programs In or Near the Top 25 of Public Universities or with National Distinction in Their Fields*

*Standard rankings systems do not exist for all programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nuclear Engineering</th>
<th>Clinical Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply Chain and Logistics</td>
<td>Counseling Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Law Training</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking</td>
<td>Ecology and Evolutionary Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosystems Engineering</td>
<td>Animal Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace Engineering</td>
<td>Music (Opera)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>Agriculture Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>Food Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sciences</td>
<td>Microbiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Modern Foreign Language (Spanish and Portuguese)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment of Excellence (Survey) 22.5%
Retention and Graduation 30.0%
Faculty Resources 20.0%
Student Selectivity 12.5%
Financial Resources 10.0%
Alumni Giving 5.0%
Quality of program survey, student selectivity, and career placement are common requirements, but are tracked differently in each ranking.
U.S. NEWS BEST COLLEGES

KEY POINTS

• Rankings Based on Quantified Metrics and Surveys

• Move in Clusters Due to “Ties”
  UT’s Cluster: University of Alabama, University of Oregon

• Graduation and Retention Has Highest Impact

• Some Metrics Averaged Over Two or Four Years

• Lag Time in Reported Data
U.S. NEWS BEST COLLEGES

HOW THE RANKINGS WORK

UT Knoxville
• UTK Office of Institutional Research and Assessment responds to annual data request from U.S. News
• UTK chancellor, provost, and dean of admissions participate in survey
• Material sent to campus presidents/chancellors and provosts
  - Chancellor’s Annual Report
  - Quest research mag
  - Major announcements (e.g. Governor’s Chairs)

Survey
• Rank each school based on a 5-point scale
• Academic Peer Assessment
  - 4,350 campus presidents/chancellors, provosts, and deans of admissions
  - 39% response
• Guidance Counselor Assessment
  - 4,600 guidance counselors
  - 9% response

U.S. News
• Calculates rankings solely based on metrics and survey results
• Rigorous control and data quality checks by U.S. News
U.S. NEWS BEST COLLEGES
2017 RANKINGS HIGHLIGHTS—ONE YEAR CHANGES

- Six-year graduation rate: 69% in 2015, 70% in 2016.
- Freshmen in the top 10% of their high school class: 50% in 2015, 54% in 2016.
- Average Alumni giving rate: 9.9 in 2015, 9.5 in 2016.
U.S. NEWS BEST COLLEGES

RETENTION AND GRADUATION CATEGORY

Metrics

• Six-year Graduation—18%
• Graduation Prediction—7.5%
• First-to-second Year Retention—4.5%

Considerations

• Graduation rate averages four years
• Retention important to continued progress

Five-Year Change In Rank (Public and Private)

2017— #122
2012— #138

U.S. NEWS Retention and Graduation 30% Impact

Five-Year Change In Rank

— #122
— #138
+16
11

Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee - Presentation on U.S. News & World Report Rankings
U.S. NEWS BEST COLLEGES

ASSESSMENT OF EXCELLENCE CATEGORY

Metrics
- Peer Assessment Survey—15%
- Guidance Counselor Survey—7.5%

Considerations
- Limited changes in this category
- Peer Assessment averages two years
- Guidance Counselor averages three years

Academic Peer Assessment
2017—3.1
2012—3.2

Guidance Counselor Assessment
2017—3.7
2012—3.7

Assessment of Excellence
22.5% Impact
U.S. NEWS BEST COLLEGES

FACULTY RESOURCES CATEGORY

Faculty Resources 20% Impact

Metrics
- Class Size—40%
- Faculty Salary—35%
- Student/Faculty Ratio ——5%
- % Full-Time Faculty—15%
- % Faculty Terminal Degree—5%

Five-Year Change In Rank (Public and Private)
2017— #137
2012— #131

Considerations
- Class size methodology changed this year
- Faculty salary ranked by an outside firm; cost of living adjustments made
**U.S. NEWS BEST COLLEGES**

**STUDENT SELECTIVITY SUMMARY**

**Metrics**
- ACT 75th to 25th Percentile—65%
- Freshmen in Top 10%—25%
- Acceptance Rate—10%

**Considerations**
- Increase in ACT 75th percentile and freshmen in top 10%

**Five-Year Change In Rank (Public and Private)**
- 2017—#79
- 2012—#94

+15
Financial Resources
10% Impact

Metric
• Instruction, Research, Student Service, and Educational Expenditures Per Student (excludes spending on athletics, dorms, hospitals)

Five-Year Change In Rank (Public and Private)
2017— #72
2012— #60

Considerations
• Viewed as level of investment in students
U.S. NEWS BEST COLLEGES

ALUMNI GIVING CATEGORY

Metric
• Alumni Giving Rate

Five-Year Change In Rank (Public and Private)
2017 — #115
2012 — #131

Considerations
• Large living alumni base
• Two-year average used
U.S. NEWS BEST COLLEGES MOVING FORWARD

• Improvement in Retention; Continued Graduation Progress

• Competitive Recruitment for High-Ability Students

• Alumni Giving Percentage

• Merit and Market-Based Salary Increases

• Outreach to Campus Presidents/Chancellors, Provosts, Deans of Admissions, and High School Guidance Counselors
How has UT performed since last year?
Bachelors Degrees: Up on all campuses

University of Tennessee Baccalaureate Degrees Conferred

- UTK
- UTC
- UTM
- UTHSC
UT close to meeting the State Master Plan goal in baccalaureate degree production

University of Tennessee Unduplicated Baccalaureate Degrees Compared to State Master Plan
Graduate and Professional Degrees: Up at UTHSC
Down at UTK, UTC, and UTM

University of Tennessee Graduate and Professional Degrees Conferred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UTK</th>
<th>UTC</th>
<th>UTM</th>
<th>UTHSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2,128</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,124</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2,066</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Year Grad Rates: Up at UTM and UTC
UTK slipped

6-Year Graduation Rates for New Full-Time, First-Time Freshmen for UTK, UTM, and UTC
First-year Retention: Up At All Campuses

First-Year Retention Rates for New Full-Time, First-Time Freshmen at UT Knoxville, Martin, and Chattanooga

Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee - Fall Data Report
Undergraduate Enrollment: 
Up at UTK, UTC and UTHSC 
Down at UTM

University of Tennessee Undergraduate Headcount by Campus

UTK

UTC

UTM

UTHSC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UTK</th>
<th>UTC</th>
<th>UTM</th>
<th>UTHSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>20,829</td>
<td>10,159</td>
<td>7,326</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>21,033</td>
<td>10,297</td>
<td>7,025</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>21,451</td>
<td>10,315</td>
<td>6,677</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>21,863</td>
<td>10,083</td>
<td>6,435</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>22,139</td>
<td>10,170</td>
<td>6,279</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate and Professional Enrollment:
Up at UTC and UTM; Down at UTK

University of Tennessee Graduate and Professional Student Headcount by Campus

- UTK
- UTC
- UTM
- UTHSC

Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee - Fall Data Report
Freshman Enrollment: Up at UTK and UTC
Continued decline UTM

University of Tennessee New Freshmen by campus
ACT scores: Up at UTC and UTM
Stayed the same UTK

Average ACT Comprehensive Score for UT New Freshmen

- UTK
- UTC
- UTM
- State Avg.
GPA: Up at UTM and UTC
Stayed the same at UTK

Average Weighted High School GPA for University of Tennessee New Freshmen
Freshman Applicants up on all campuses

Freshmen Applications to the University of Tennessee

- UTK
- UTC
- UTM
New Transfer Enrollment:
Up at UTM and UTHSC
Down at UTK and UTC

University of Tennessee New Transfers by campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UTK</th>
<th>UTC</th>
<th>UTM</th>
<th>UTHSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transfer Applications down on all campuses

Transfer Applications to the University of Tennessee

Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee - Fall Data Report
New Graduate Enrollment: Big Increase at UTC; Slippage at UTK

University of Tennessee New Graduate and Professional Students

- UTK
- UTC
- UTM
- UTHSC

Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee - Fall Data Report
QUESTIONS?
## University of Tennessee
### Fall Student Enrollments
#### Headcount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>1-Yr Change</th>
<th>% 5-Yr Change</th>
<th>5-Yr Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>38,401</td>
<td>38,504</td>
<td>38,656</td>
<td>38,646</td>
<td>38,875</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad / Professional</td>
<td>10,843</td>
<td>10,623</td>
<td>10,442</td>
<td>10,489</td>
<td>10,512</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49,244</td>
<td>49,127</td>
<td>49,098</td>
<td>49,135</td>
<td>49,387</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Knoxville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>20,829</td>
<td>21,033</td>
<td>21,451</td>
<td>21,863</td>
<td>22,139</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad-Academic</td>
<td>5,407</td>
<td>5,349</td>
<td>5,219</td>
<td>5,259</td>
<td>5,244</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad-Professional</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>-14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Graduate/Prof</td>
<td>6,189</td>
<td>6,138</td>
<td>5,959</td>
<td>5,982</td>
<td>5,913</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27,018</td>
<td>27,171</td>
<td>27,410</td>
<td>27,845</td>
<td>28,052</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Chattanooga</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>10,159</td>
<td>10,297</td>
<td>10,315</td>
<td>10,083</td>
<td>10,170</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>1,304</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>-9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,660</td>
<td>11,674</td>
<td>11,670</td>
<td>11,387</td>
<td>11,533</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Martin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>7,326</td>
<td>7,025</td>
<td>6,677</td>
<td>6,435</td>
<td>6,279</td>
<td>(156)</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td>-14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,751</td>
<td>7,423</td>
<td>7,042</td>
<td>6,827</td>
<td>6,705</td>
<td>(122)</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>-13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Health Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>229.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad-Academic</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad-Professional</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Graduate/Prof</td>
<td>2,728</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>2,763</td>
<td>2,811</td>
<td>2,810</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>2,859</td>
<td>2,976</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>3,097</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Includes non-degree seeking and dual enrollment (high school) students
- Excludes students enrolled in audited classes and co-op courses
- UTK includes Space Institute and Veterinary Medicine students
- UTHS excludes Residents in Health Sciences
# University of Tennessee

## Fall Student Enrollments

### Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>1-Yr Change N</th>
<th>1-Yr Change %</th>
<th>% 5-Yr Change</th>
<th>5-Yr Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UT System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>35,381</td>
<td>35,829</td>
<td>35,951</td>
<td>35,940</td>
<td>35,965</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>9,064</td>
<td>8,922</td>
<td>8,312</td>
<td>8,873</td>
<td>8,893</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44,445</td>
<td>44,751</td>
<td>44,263</td>
<td>44,813</td>
<td>44,858</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Knoxville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>19,721</td>
<td>19,998</td>
<td>20,440</td>
<td>20,837</td>
<td>21,092</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>5,004</td>
<td>5,006</td>
<td>4,365</td>
<td>4,890</td>
<td>4,815</td>
<td>(75)</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24,725</td>
<td>25,004</td>
<td>24,805</td>
<td>25,727</td>
<td>25,907</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Chattanooga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>9,045</td>
<td>9,334</td>
<td>9,177</td>
<td>9,029</td>
<td>9,122</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,011</td>
<td>10,227</td>
<td>10,080</td>
<td>9,917</td>
<td>10,055</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Health Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad *</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>259.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad-Academic</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>-5.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad-Professional</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grad</td>
<td>2,879</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>2,867</td>
<td>2,903</td>
<td>2,934</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,962</td>
<td>2,981</td>
<td>3,102</td>
<td>3,175</td>
<td>3,232</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Notes:

- **UTK includes Space Institute and Vet Med**
- **UTHS excludes Residents in Health Sciences**
- **Includes non-degree seeking and dual enrollment (high school) students**
- **beginning in 2011, fte calculations exclude audit only students**

**UTHSC Professional = Medicine: MD, Dentistry: DDS, Pharmacy: PHARM**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>1-Yr Change N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>% 5-Yr Change</th>
<th>5-Yr Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>7,499</td>
<td>7,625</td>
<td>7,688</td>
<td>7,808</td>
<td>8,141</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>-34.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>2,339</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
<td>-8.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,058</td>
<td>11,182</td>
<td>11,152</td>
<td>11,288</td>
<td>11,565</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Knoxville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>4,731</td>
<td>4,621</td>
<td>4,561</td>
<td>4,634</td>
<td>4,675</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>-47.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>1,571</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
<td>-7.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,885</td>
<td>6,793</td>
<td>6,689</td>
<td>6,758</td>
<td>6,741</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Chattanooga</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>2,069</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>-14.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>-9.9%</td>
<td>-22.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>-37.5%</td>
<td>-25.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>2,494</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Martin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>-14.3%</td>
<td>-22.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Health Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>230.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

Degrees Awarded are duplicates (single student getting two degrees counts as two degrees)

Professional = Law, Vet Med, Medicine, Dentistry, Pharmacy
## University of Tennessee

### Six-Year Graduation Rates

#### New First-Time Full-Time Freshmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-Yr Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% 5-Yr Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5-Yr Trend</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entering Cohort</strong></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Knoxville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Indian</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MultiRacial</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Chattanooga</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Indian</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MultiRacial</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Martin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Indian</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Small cohort (less than 10 students)
## Retention Rate (Freshmen to Sophomore)

### University of Tennessee

#### New First-Time Full-Time Freshmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entering Cohort</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>1-Yr Change</th>
<th>% 5-Yr Change</th>
<th>5-Yr Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UT Knoxville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Indian</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Chattanooga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Indian</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>-16.7%</td>
<td>-22.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>-17.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Indian</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-66.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>-24.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Small cohort (less than 10 students)
## University of Tennessee

### Fall New Student Enrollments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>1-Yr Change N</th>
<th>% 5-Yr change</th>
<th>5-Yr Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Freshmen</td>
<td>7,817</td>
<td>7,945</td>
<td>8,060</td>
<td>7,607</td>
<td>7,877</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Transfers</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>2,833</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>2,964</td>
<td>2,837</td>
<td>(127)</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Graduate</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>3,085</td>
<td>3,152</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Knoxville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Freshmen</td>
<td>4,207</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td>4,701</td>
<td>4,719</td>
<td>4,851</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Transfers</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Graduate Acad.</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>(73)</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Professional</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New Graduate</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>(71)</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Chattanooga</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Freshmen</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>-9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Transfers</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>(86)</td>
<td>-9.5%</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Graduate Acad.</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>(73)</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Graduate</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Martin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Freshmen</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>1,327</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td>-7.6%</td>
<td>-28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Transfers*</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Graduate</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Health Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Freshmen</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>283.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Transfers</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Graduate Acad.</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Professional</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 1-Yr Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee - Fall Data Report**

---
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# University of Tennessee

## Fall New Student Enrollments

Applications, Admits, Enrolled

### New Freshmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Tennessee</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>1-Yr Change</th>
<th>% 5-Yr change</th>
<th>5-Yr Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UT Knoxville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>14,398</td>
<td>14,396</td>
<td>15,442</td>
<td>17,101</td>
<td>17,583</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>9,693</td>
<td>10,435</td>
<td>11,555</td>
<td>13,035</td>
<td>13,578</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>4,207</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td>4,701</td>
<td>4,719</td>
<td>4,851</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>-17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-11.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Chattanooga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>7,677</td>
<td>7,628</td>
<td>7,399</td>
<td>6,752</td>
<td>7,628</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>5,826</td>
<td>5,917</td>
<td>5,718</td>
<td>5,349</td>
<td>5,970</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>-9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-11.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>3,733</td>
<td>3,589</td>
<td>3,530</td>
<td>3,485</td>
<td>3,547</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,791</td>
<td>2,587</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td>2,366</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>-16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td>-7.6%</td>
<td>-28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>-11.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
<td>-14.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Transfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Tennessee</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>1-Yr Change</th>
<th>% 5-Yr change</th>
<th>5-Yr Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UT Knoxville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>3,563</td>
<td>3,455</td>
<td>3,226</td>
<td>3,515</td>
<td>3,007</td>
<td>(508)</td>
<td>-14.5%</td>
<td>-15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>2,293</td>
<td>2,092</td>
<td>2,313</td>
<td>2,103</td>
<td>(210)</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Chattanooga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>(117)</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>(93)</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>(86)</td>
<td>-9.5%</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>-13.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
<td>-8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
<td>-6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UT Health Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Tennessee</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>1-Yr Change</th>
<th>% 5-Yr change</th>
<th>5-Yr Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>308.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>249.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>283.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>-22.7%</td>
<td>-14.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>1-Yr Change</th>
<th>% 5-Yr change</th>
<th>5-Yr Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Knoxville Grad Academic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>6,362</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,162</td>
<td>7,080</td>
<td>6,646</td>
<td>(434)</td>
<td>-6.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>2,217</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>2,521</td>
<td>3,367</td>
<td>2,887</td>
<td>(480)</td>
<td>-14.3%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>(73)</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Knoxville Grad-Professional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>1,765</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>-12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Chattanooga</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td>-5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Martin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
<td>-18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Health Science Grad-Academic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-14.0%</td>
<td>-20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-14.0%</td>
<td>-31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Health Science Grad-Professional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>3,446</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>3,947</td>
<td>4,470</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-13.4%</td>
<td>-17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## University of Tennessee

### Indicators of Academic Quality of New Students

#### New Freshmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT Equivalent</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>1-Yr Change N</th>
<th>% 5-Yr Change</th>
<th>5-Yr Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ACT State Avg.

|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|----------------|----------------|------------|

#### ACT National Avg.

|-------------------|------|------|------|------|------|----------------|----------------|------------|

#### Weighted H.S GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighted H.S GPA</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>1-Yr Change N</th>
<th>% 5-Yr Change</th>
<th>5-Yr Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### New Transfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>