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AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: November 2, 2018
Committee: Education, Research, and Service
Item: Education, Research, and Service Committee Charter
Type: Action
Presenter(s): Donald J. Smith, Committee Chair

The Education, Research, and Service Committee is a new standing committee of the Board combining responsibilities of two committees formerly called Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee and Research, Outreach, and Economic Development Committee.

The Bylaws of the Board of Trustees describe the general responsibilities of the new committee as follows:

The Education, Research, and Service Committee shall assist the Board in overseeing the University’s educational mission of teaching, research, and service, including matters related to academic programs, the faculty, student success and student conduct, research, service and outreach and shall have the specific responsibilities deemed necessary or advisable and included in a committee charter approved by the Board.

Committee staff, in consultation with the committee chair, have developed for the committee’s consideration a charter outlining specific responsibilities of the committee. The proposed charter is included in the meeting materials.

In compliance with the Bylaws, the charter is presented to the committee for consideration and, if approved, for recommendation to the Board.

Motion: I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee approve and recommend the committee charter to the Board of Trustees for approval by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

[Resolution to approve follows]
The University of Tennessee
Board of Trustees

Resolution 00_-2018*
Education, Research, and Service Committee Charter

Resolved: The Board of Trustees approves the committee charter for the Education, Research, and Service Committee as presented in the meeting materials, which shall be attached to this Resolution after adoption.

Adopted this 2nd day of November, 2018.

* Number will be inserted after adoption.
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE COMMITTEE
CHARTER

PURPOSE

The Education, Research, and Service Committee shall assist the Board in overseeing the University’s educational mission of teaching, research, and service, including matters related to academic programs, the faculty, student success, student conduct, research, service, and outreach. The committee shall have the specific responsibilities included in this committee charter approved by the Board.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Responsibility for Recommendations to the Board

The Education, Research, and Service Committee shall recommend to the Board of Trustees, or to the Executive Committee when necessary between meetings of the Board, the following and similar matters within the scope of the committee’s purpose:

1. Mission statement for the University of Tennessee System and each campus and institute;

2. Scope of the educational opportunities to be offered by the University, including approval of new academic programs and, if required by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, approval of the modification of existing programs; provided that the planning and development of curricula shall be the function of the faculties;

3. Establishment of a new campus, institute, college, school, or academic department;

1 Under the Bylaws of the Board, the Chair of the Board may designate any of the listed matters for deliberation and action at a meeting of the Board without prior review and recommendation of the committee.
4. Termination of academic programs when termination of tenured or tenure-track faculty members is involved;

5. Annual ratification of administrative action to terminate academic programs when termination of tenured or tenure-track faculty members is not involved;

6. Annual approval of a comprehensive inventory of all academic programs;

7. General admission, retention, and graduation requirements for each campus;

8. Policies and procedures, including campus faculty handbook provisions, governing (1) academic freedom; (2) appointment, retention, promotion, tenure, evaluation, and termination of faculty members; (3) faculty workload; (4) intellectual property rights; and (5) compensated outside services by faculty members;

9. Granting tenure, upon the President’s positive recommendation, to (1) an officer of the University (as defined in the Bylaws of the Board) who simultaneously holds a faculty appointment; (2) a faculty member who is to be granted tenure upon initial appointment without serving a probationary period at a University campus; and (3) a faculty member to be granted tenure after serving less than a six-year probationary period at a University campus;

10. Granting honorary degrees in accordance with the Board Policy on Honorary Degrees;

11. Policies and procedures governing student conduct and disciplinary actions;

12. Policies or actions relating to the coordination of research, outreach, and economic development functions and activities among the campuses, institutes, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, the University of Tennessee Research Foundation, and other entities affiliated with the University;

13. Policies or actions to enhance the quality and national prominence of the campuses through the promotion of academic programs of distinction, increasing University research and research opportunities for students and faculty, and through the development of world class faculty and scholars;
14. Policies or actions related to non-academic programs other than athletics, including programs related to diversity, and compliance of non-academic programs with federal and state laws, rules, and regulations; and

15. Policies concerning the general welfare and success of students, and the adoption of rules, procedures, rights, and responsibilities governing the academic relationships between the University and its students.

Other Responsibilities

The committee shall assist the Board in carrying out its fiduciary duty to oversee educational quality by reviewing at least annually the following information for each campus and, as applicable, comparable information for peer and aspirational institutions:

1. Enrollment, retention, graduation (completion), and job placement;
2. Student learning goals, how learning is assessed, and learning outcomes data;
3. Academic program reviews; and
4. Institutional and program accreditation.

The committee shall receive reports at least annually on how the University is fulfilling its education, research, and service missions.

The committee chair, in consultation with committee staff, shall review the committee charter prior to each Annual Meeting of the Board to determine whether the committee is carrying out its responsibilities effectively and whether any revisions to the charter should be submitted to the committee for recommendation to the Board.

MEMBERSHIP

The Education, Research, and Service Committee shall consist of the following members:

1. At least three (3) voting members of the Board;
2. Chair of the Board as an ex officio, voting member of the committee.
3. President of the University as an ex officio, voting member of the committee;
4. Non-voting student member of the Board, who shall be a voting member of the committee; and
5. One (1) full-time faculty member appointed from the four campuses on an annually rotating basis, who shall be a voting member of the committee.
Committee members (other than the student and faculty members) and the committee chair shall be appointed by the Board of Trustees at the Annual Meeting on the recommendation of the Chair of the Board. The term of appointment shall be two years, beginning July 1 of the first year and ending June 30 of the second year. If a vacancy occurs prior to expiration of the two-year term, the Chair of the Board shall appoint a voting member of the Board to fill the remainder of the term. If appointments or reappointments to the Board of Trustees are pending at the end of the two-year term, the committee and committee chair appointments shall continue beyond the end of the term until all vacancies on the Board have been filled and the Board has made new standing committee and committee chair appointments. The committee chair may not serve more than three (3) consecutive two-year terms as chair except upon an affirmative roll-call vote of a majority of the total voting membership of the Board.

The non-voting student member of the Board shall serve as a voting member of the committee during his or her one-year term on the Board from July 1 through June 30. The Board shall select and appoint the student member of the Board no later than May 31 of each year (except for the initial appointment). The appointment shall rotate among the campuses in the following sequence: University of Tennessee Health Science Center, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, University of Tennessee at Martin, and University of Tennessee at Chattanooga.

The faculty member of the committee shall be selected and appointed by the Board no later than May 31 of each year (except for the initial appointment); shall rotate among the campuses in the following sequence: University of Tennessee, Knoxville, University of Tennessee at Martin, University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, and University of Tennessee Health Science Center; and shall serve a one-year term beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30.

The Chair of the Board, in consultation with the President, shall designate one or more members of the senior administrative staff to provide staff support to the committee.

MEETINGS

Required Number, Call, and Location

The committee shall meet as often as necessary to carry out its responsibilities but at least once annually. The committee may meet in conjunction with regular meetings of the Board of Trustees, at stated times approved in advance by the committee, or at any other time upon a call by the Chair of the Board, the President, the committee chair, or by the
Secretary of the Board upon the written request of two members of the committee. Committee meetings may be held at any location in the State of Tennessee.

**Notice**

At least five (5) days’ notice shall be given to all committee members when feasible, but less notice may be given when there is a need for urgent action. Notice may be delivered by postal mail, courier, electronic mail, or facsimile transmission. If written notice is not feasible, by reason of urgency or other exigent circumstance, notice may be given by telephone. As required by Tennessee Code Annotated § 8-44-103(a) and (b), adequate public notice shall be given of committee meetings. All meetings of the committee shall be open to the public unless otherwise provided by the Tennessee Open Meetings Act or a judicially-recognized exception to the Act.

**Agenda**

An agenda shall accompany the notice of every meeting of the committee when feasible; but when not feasible, the notice shall state the purpose or purposes for which the meeting is called.

Development of the committee agenda shall be the responsibility of the committee chair, in consultation with the President and committee staff. The agenda shall list in outline form each matter to be considered at the meeting. The committee may use a consent agenda in the manner provided by the Bylaws of the Board. Items not set forth on the agenda or in the meeting notice may be considered only upon an affirmative roll-call vote of a majority of the total voting membership of the committee.

**Quorum**

A quorum shall be a majority (more than one-half) of the voting members of the committee. The Chair of the Board and the President, who are ex officio, voting members of the committee, shall be counted for quorum purposes only when present. In the absence of a quorum, those attending may adjourn the meeting until a quorum is present.

**Minutes**

Committee staff shall prepare minutes of all committee meetings, review the minutes with the committee chair, and provide the minutes to all committee members and the Secretary before the next committee meeting.
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: November 2, 2018
Committee: Education, Research, and Service
Item: Campus Policies and Procedures Governing Application for Tenure before the Sixth Year of the Probationary Period
Type: Action
Presenter(s): Joseph A. DiPietro, President

Note: The following background information applies to all four campus policies and procedures on this subject presented in the materials at Tabs 3-6.

Background

1. In August of 2017, the Board of Trustees held a day-long workshop devoted primarily to the process of reviewing candidates for tenure and the subsequent evaluation of faculty who have been granted tenure.

2. At the end of the workshop, the administration was directed to (1) begin the process of drafting revisions to several parts of the Board Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure (“tenure policy”); (2) submit draft policy revisions to the University Faculty Council for review and comment; and (3) prepare final drafts of policy revisions for recommendation to the Board in March 2018.

3. One of the policy revisions submitted to the Board on March 23, 2018 concerned standardizing across the system the length of the probationary period a tenure-track faculty member must serve before being considered for tenure.

4. The Board approved a revision to the tenure policy requiring a six-year probationary period for all tenure-track faculty at all campuses but allowing a faculty member to request early consideration for tenure after serving at least one year of the probationary period.

5. The policy revision further requires each campus to adopt policies and procedures to govern early application for tenure and the consequences of a candidate’s failure to receive tenure upon early application.

6. The March 23, 2018 Resolution approving the policy revisions requires the campus policies and procedures on early tenure to be submitted to the Board for approval at the 2018 Fall Meeting.
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: November 2, 2018

Committee: Education, Research, and Service

Item: UTC Policies and Procedures Governing Application for Tenure before the Sixth Year of the Probationary Period

Type: Action

Presenter(s): Joseph A. DiPietro, President

Background (See Tab 2)

Summary of UTC Policies and Procedures

As required by the Board’s tenure policy, UTC proposes policies and procedures to govern a faculty member’s application for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period and the consequences of failure to receive tenure upon an early application. The UTC policies and procedures are included in the meeting materials and key points are summarized below:

- Consistent with the Board’s tenure policy, a faculty may request early consideration for tenure only after serving at least one year of the six-year probationary period.
- If a faculty member applies for tenure in years 2, 3, or 4 and is denied, the faculty member must wait one complete annual tenure cycle before reapplying.
- If a faculty member applies for tenure in year 5 and is denied, the faculty member may reapply in the final year of the probationary period.
- Faculty members are advised to seek early tenure consideration only after consulting with the department head and/or dean and departmental Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee, which should include a thorough conversation about the faculty member’s record.

President DiPietro recommends approval of the proposed UTC policies and procedures governing application for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period.

Motion: I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTC policies and procedures governing application for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

[Resolution to approve follows]
Resolved: The Board of Trustees approves the UTC policies and procedures governing application for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period as presented in the meeting materials, which shall be attached to this Resolution after adoption.

Adopted this 2\textsuperscript{nd} day of November, 2018.

\textsuperscript{*} Number will be inserted after adoption.
3.3. PROBATIONARY PERIOD

3.3.2. Applying for Early Tenure

A tenure-track faculty member may request an early consideration for tenure before the sixth year of his or her probationary period ("early tenure") subject to the following limitations:

- A faculty member may apply for early tenure during years 2, 3, and 4 of the probationary period; however, if tenure is not granted, the faculty member must wait for one complete annual tenure cycle before reapplying; and

- A faculty member may apply for early tenure in year 5 of the probationary period. If tenure is not granted, he or she may reapply in the final year of the probationary period.

A faculty member should seek early tenure only after consultation with his or her departmental RTP Committee, department head and/or dean, which should include a thorough conversation about the faculty member's record.
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: November 2, 2018

Committee: Education, Research, and Service

Item: UTHSC Policies and Procedures Governing Application for Tenure before the Sixth Year of the Probationary Period

Type: Action

Presenter(s): Joseph A. DiPietro, President

Background (See Tab 2)

Summary of UTHSC Policies and Procedures
As required by the Board’s tenure policy, UTHSC proposes policies and procedures to govern a faculty member’s application for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period and the consequences of failure to receive tenure upon an early application. The UTHSC policies and procedures are included in the meeting materials and key points are summarized below:

- The same procedures that govern a faculty member’s application for tenure in the final year of the probationary period will govern an early application for tenure. Those procedures are outlined in Appendix L of the UTHSC Faculty Handbook and were previously approved by the Board.
- If a faculty member requests early tenure consideration and is not recommended for tenure by the Chancellor, the faculty member may not request a second early consideration but may reapply in the sixth year of the probationary period.

President DiPietro recommends approval of the proposed UTHSC policies and procedures governing application for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period.

Motion: I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTHSC policies and procedures governing application for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

[Resolution to approve follows]
Resolved: The Board of Trustees approves the UTHSC policies and procedures governing application for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period as presented in the meeting materials, which shall be attached to this Resolution after adoption.

Adopted this 2nd day of November, 2018.
4.8.1 Length of Probationary Period

* * *

A faculty member may request an early consideration for tenure before the sixth year of his or her probationary period but no sooner than the next regular tenure cycle after completion of the first year of the probationary period. The procedures to be used in requesting early consideration for tenure are those set forth in Appendix L. Faculty members who request an early consideration for tenure and who are not recommended for tenure by the Chancellor may seek tenure again on their regular schedule of the sixth year of probationary service, but may not request an early consideration for tenure a second time.

* * *
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: November 2, 2018
Committee: Education, Research, and Service
Item: UTIA/UTK Policies and Procedures Governing Application for Tenure before the Sixth Year of the Probationary Period—Extension of Time for Submission
Type: Action
Presenter(s): Joseph A. DiPietro, President

The Resolution adopted by the Board on March 23, 2018 approving revisions to the tenure policy required that the campuses submit for Board approval, no later than the last regular Board meeting in 2018 (this meeting), policies and procedures to govern a faculty member’s application for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period (“early tenure”).

Because of miscommunication and misunderstanding within the Provost’s office due to leadership transitions, necessary revisions to the UTIA/UTK Faculty Handbook to include the required early tenure policies and procedures were not submitted to the Faculty Senate for review and are not ready for submission to the Board for approval.

The President recommends that the Board approve an extension of time for submission of the required UTIA/UTK policies and procedures until February 15, 2019, which will allow the Board to consider them at the March 1, 2019 meeting.

Motion: I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board approve an extension of time until February 15, 2019 for submission of the UTIA/UTK policies and procedures to govern application for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period.
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: November 2, 2018
Committee: Education, Research, and Service
Item: UTM Policies and Procedures Governing Application for Tenure before the Sixth Year of the Probationary Period
Type: Action
Presenter(s): Joseph A. DiPietro, President

Background (See Tab 2)

Summary of UTM Policies and Procedures
As required by the Board’s tenure policy, UTM proposes policies and procedures to govern a faculty member’s application for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period and the consequences of failure to receive tenure upon an early application. The UTM policies and procedures are included in the meeting materials and key points are summarized below:

- Three categories of consideration for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period are established:
  1. With approval of the Chancellor or chief academic officer on the recommendation of the department chair and dean, faculty members who have prior service without tenure at UTM or another regionally accredited institution may be considered for tenure in the fourth year of the probationary period;
  2. With approval of the Chancellor or chief academic officer on the recommendation of the department chair and dean, faculty members who have prior service with tenure at UTM or another regionally accredited institution may be considered for tenure in the third year of the probationary period; and
  3. With approval of the Chancellor or chief academic officer on the recommendation of the department chair and dean and the additional recommendation of a simple majority of the tenured members of the department or equivalent unit, exceptional faculty members who have prior service with tenure at UTM or another regionally accredited institution may be considered for tenure as early as the next regular tenure cycle after completing the first year of the probationary period.
- The process for requesting early tenure consideration requires the following, all of which must occur before the tenure review process begins: (1) written request by the faculty member; (2) positive recommendation by the faculty member’s enhanced tenure-track review committee and the department chair/dean; and (3) based on those recommendations, written approval of the request by the chief academic officer.
An approved request for early tenure consideration may be rescinded upon mutual agreement of the faculty member, department chair/dean, and chief academic officer, and the rescission must occur by in writing before the tenure review process begins.

A faculty member who is not granted tenure upon early application may not reapply for tenure and will receive a terminal appointment.

President DiPietro recommends approval of the proposed UTM policies and procedures governing application for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period.

Motion: I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTM policies and procedures governing application for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

[Resolution to approve follows]
The University of Tennessee  
Board of Trustees  

Resolution 00_-2018*  
UTM Policies and Procedures Governing Application for Tenure before the  
Sixth Year of the Probationary Period  

Resolved: The Board of Trustees approves the UTM policies and procedures governing application for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period as presented in the meeting materials, which shall be attached to this Resolution after adoption.  

Adopted this 2nd day of November, 2018.  

* Number will be inserted after adoption.
The University of Tennessee at Martin

Change to UT Martin Faculty Handbook

Revision of UT Martin Description of Probationary Period Length in Section 2.8.4 – Probationary Period in the UT Martin Faculty Handbook [Previously Section 2.8.2]

Summary of Change

Revision of information to reflect changes to Board policy.

Submitted for Approval:

October 17, 2018

UT Martin Description of Probationary Period Length

At UT Martin the probationary period normally consists of six academic years of continuous service to UT Martin. Although this appears different from the board policy, the difference is in the terminology used to describe the seventh year. Instead of seven years of probation, with consideration in the sixth year and a terminal (the seventh) year if denied, UT Martin uses a six year probationary period, with consideration in this sixth year, and a terminal year if denied. The probationary period for tenure begins on the first day of the academic year, regardless of the actual appointment date within that same academic year for a faculty member who is hired after January 1 shall begin on August 1 of the upcoming academic year. The probationary period for a faculty member hired after July 1 but before January 1 shall begin upon the effective hire date. Tenure consideration shall occur during the final academic year of the probationary period unless reduced after appointment the faculty member is under consideration for early tenure as specified below. Any faculty member who is considered but not recommended for tenure, including those considered before the probationary period has ended, shall be offered one additional year of employment (see Tenure Denied below).

a. Notification. The probationary faculty member shall be notified as to when his/her tenure review will occur in the appointment letter. Thereafter, in connection with the annual performance-and-planning review (addressed earlier in this chapter) with the dean or chair, the faculty member shall be advised as to the quality of performance in relation to progression toward tenure.

b. Prior Service without Tenure. Exceptions to the probationary period prior to appointment. With approval from the Chancellor or the consent of the faculty member, exceptions to the six-year probationary period may occur as follows: The UT Martin Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA), based and upon the recommendation of the department chair and academic dean, a faculty member may be considered for early tenure in the fourth year of employment if the faculty member joins UT Martin following a department chair, may specify a probationary period of five or four years (with tenure consideration occurring in the fifth or fourth year respectively) by including prior service credit at this or other regionally accredited institutions of higher learning. Such exception shall be specified in the letter of appointment.

c. Prior tenured service. The With approval from the Chancellor or VCAA, and upon the recommendation of the department chair/dean, may specify a three-year probationary period a faculty member may be considered for early tenure in the third year of employment if the faculty member joins UT Martin following prior tenured service at this or other regionally accredited institutions of higher learning. This credit for prior service shall be specified in the letter of appointment.
d. Exceptional Situations. The UT Policy BT0006 states that “A faculty member may request an early consideration for tenure before the sixth year of his or her probationary period but no sooner than the next regular tenure cycle after completion of the first year of the probationary period.” ¹ With approval from the Chancellor or VCAA, the recommendation of the department chair/dean, and in exceptional situations at UT Martin, the probationary period may be specified as one or two years (with tenure consideration occurring during the first or second year respectively), upon the additional recommendation of a simple majority of the tenured members of the department or equivalent unit to which the faculty member will be assigned, an exceptional faculty member may be considered for tenure as early as “the next regular tenure cycle after completion of the first year of the probationary period” if she or he joins UT Martin following prior tenured service at this or other regionally accredited institutions of higher learning. This shall be specified in the letter of appointment.

e. Process for Requesting Early Tenure After Appointment Reduction of the probationary period after appointment. Reduction of Consideration for tenure before the end of the probationary period specified in the appointment letter may occur upon the written request of the non-tenured faculty member and approval of the VCAA based on the recommendations of the chair/dean and a positive recommendation from the faculty member’s ETTR committee, consistent with the procedures for reduction of the probationary period prior to appointment. The change shall be made in writing and must occur prior to the start of the tenure review process of the year in which the faculty member will apply. Any faculty member who is considered for tenure before the end of the probationary period but not granted recommended for tenure will automatically receive an additional terminal appointment for up to one academic year but may not apply for tenure again during this term appointment.

f. Rescission of early tenure consideration, prior probationary period reduction. A previously agreed upon early tenure consideration, reduction of the probationary period may be rescinded upon mutual agreement of the non-tenured faculty member, the chair/dean, and the VCAA. Such rescission shall be made in writing and must occur prior to the start of the tenure review process.

¹ UT Policy BT0006 (III. E. 1.): https://universitytennessee.policytech.com/docview/?docid=318&public=true.
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: November 2, 2018
Committee: Education, Research, and Service
Item: Campus Procedures for Enhanced Tenure-Track Review
Type: Action
Presenter(s): Joseph A. DiPietro, President

Note: The following background information applies to all four campus procedures on this subject presented in the materials at Tabs 8-11.

Background

1. One of the tenure policy revisions approved by the Board on March 23, 2018 requires an enhanced review of tenure-track faculty members during the third or fourth year of the six-year probationary period to assess and inform faculty members of their progress toward the grant of tenure.

2. The policy revision includes certain procedural requirements for the enhanced review and also requires each campus to adopt further procedures, including the required contents of the materials to be reviewed.

3. The Resolution approving the policy revisions requires the campus procedures for the enhanced tenure-track review to be submitted to the Board for approval at the 2018 Fall Meeting.
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: November 2, 2018
Committee: Education, Research, and Service
Item: UTC Procedures for Enhanced Tenure-Track Review
Type: Action
Presenter(s): Joseph A. DiPietro, President

Background (See Tab 7)

Summary of UTC Procedures
As required by the Board’s tenure policy, UTC proposes procedures to incorporate and supplement the minimum requirements of the Board’s policy for an enhanced tenure-track review (ETTR) during the third or fourth year of the probationary period. The UTC procedures are included in the meeting materials and summarized below:

- The faculty member shall assemble a dossier of materials and artifacts beginning with his or her appointment at UTC that demonstrates scholarly, teaching, and service activities.
- The departmental committee shall provide a written report to the department head including: (a) a list of participating tenured faculty members; (b) suggestions for enhancing the faculty member’s progress toward tenure; (c) the majority and minority reports, if applicable; and (d) the anonymous vote regarding whether the faculty member is progressing satisfactorily toward tenure.
- The department head shall present and discuss the committee report and his or her own written assessment with the faculty member and develop a plan to address the suggestions, with copies of all documents provided to the faculty member.
- A favorable ETTR rating does not indicate or ensure there will be a subsequent recommendation for the granting of tenure.
- An ETTR appeal may be made by the faculty member under the same procedures applicable to the appeal of an annual performance rating.

President DiPietro recommends approval of the proposed UTC procedures for enhanced tenure-track review.

Motion: I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTC procedures for enhanced tenure-track review by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

[Resolution to approve follows]
The University of Tennessee
Board of Trustees

Resolution 00_-2018*
UTC Procedures for Enhanced Tenure-Track Review

Resolved: The Board of Trustees approves the UTC procedures for enhanced tenure-track review as presented in the meeting materials, which shall be attached to this Resolution after adoption.

Adopted this 2nd day of November, 2018.

* Number will be inserted after adoption.
3.7.2. Mid-Probationary Review of Probationary Faculty (Enhanced Tenure-Track Review)

In a tenure-track faculty member’s mid-probationary review year (i.e., typically, the third year of the probationary period), before the department head makes his or her recommendation, the departmental RTP Committee shall conduct a full review and evaluation (i.e., Enhanced Tenure-Track Review or ETTR) of the faculty member’s progress towards tenure as part of the reappointment evaluation undertaken for the faculty member for that year. \(^1\)

The faculty member shall assemble a dossier thoroughly documenting progress toward tenure. The dossier must include artifacts, dated after his or her appointment to UTC, that demonstrate work as a teacher; development as a scholar, researcher, or creator; and participation in service and other professional activities. Prior to the beginning of each academic year, the Provost shall provide a list of recommended materials which may be used for such evidence. The faculty member shall submit his or her dossier to the departmental RTP Committee for its review and evaluation.

The reappointment materials reviewed by the departmental RTP Committee and its process for conducting its review are described in the bylaws of the academic department. The departmental RTP Committee shall provide to the department head a written evaluation report that will contain a list of the participating tenured faculty members; suggestions for enhancing the faculty member’s progress toward tenure; the majority and minority report, if applicable; the summary anonymous

---

1 In the discretion of the department head, the ETTR may be performed in the fourth year of the faculty member’s probationary period.

2 In regard to evaluation of librarians, "librarian" should be substituted for the word "teacher".
vote on whether the faculty member is progressing satisfactorily toward the grant of tenure; and of the faculty member's progress toward tenure and include a recommendation for or against reappointment. Upon receipt of the departmental RTP Committee's evaluation report, the department head will present and discuss the departmental RTP Committee's report, as well as his or her own written assessment, and develop a plan to address suggested enhancement from the RTP Committee, with the faculty member. Copies of the ETTR documents will be given to the faculty member. A favorable ETTR does not commit the departmental RTP Committee, the department, or the college to a subsequent recommendation for the grant of tenure.

After meeting with the faculty member, the department head shall submit his or her written recommendation for or against reappointment to the dean along with the departmental RTP Committee's evaluation report and recommendation. The reappointment review for the faculty member's mid-probationary review year otherwise follows the same process as described under Section 3.7.1, above. An appeal regarding an ETTR may be made under the same procedures applicable to the appeal of an annual performance rating as provided under Section 3.4.7, above.
Background (See Tab 7)

Summary of UTHSC Procedures
Before the Board revised its tenure policy to require a six-year probationary period and an enhanced tenure-track review during the third or fourth year, UTHSC was already requiring what it calls a “mandatory interim probationary review” for any faculty member whose probationary period was four years or more. UTHSC’s existing procedures for this interim review are consistent overall with the requirements of the Board policy, and only minor revision of certain text is required to comply with the requirement that the review be conducted for all tenure-track faculty members now that the tenure policy has established six years as the standard probationary period. The revisions are shown in the mark-up included in the meeting materials.

President DiPietro recommends approval of the proposed revisions to the existing UTHSC procedures for an enhanced tenure-track review.

Motion: I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the proposed revisions to the existing UTHSC procedures for enhanced tenure-track review by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

[Resolution to approve follows]
Resolved: The Board of Trustees approves the UTHSC procedures for enhanced tenure-track review as presented in the meeting materials, which shall be attached to this Resolution after adoption.

Adopted this 2nd day of November, 2018.
4.14.3.3 Interim Probationary Review

* * *

At any time during the probationary period, the Chair may request that the tenured faculty review the faculty member’s progress. Any appeal regarding the Interim Probationary Review shall follow the same procedures for an appeal of an annual performance and planning review.

* * *

APPENDIX K – PROCEDURE FOR THE INTERIM PROBATIONARY REVIEW FOR THE AWARD OF TENURE

General Information about the Mandatory Interim Probationary Review

For each tenure-track faculty member, the department and the Chair will conduct an enhanced review to assess and inform the faculty member of his or her progress toward the grant of tenure during the third or fourth year of the probationary period (with the year to be determined in the department chair’s sole discretion). The purpose of the Mandatory Interim Probationary Review is to establish a mutual understanding between the faculty member and the Chair regarding his or her progress toward attainment of tenure whose probationary period is four or more years, a Mandatory Interim Review will be conducted (Faculty Handbook, Section 4.14.3.3). This two-part review will be conducted (1) by the tenured faculty in the department (or division) or the College Promotion and Tenure Committee (CPT Committee), if appropriate, and (2) by the Chair at the same time as the Annual Performance-and-Planning Review. An example of the summary document for the Mandatory Interim Review (Form 2) is attached. If the probationary period is four years, the Mandatory Interim Review occurs in the second year (Faculty Handbook, Section 4.14.3.3). If the probationary period is five, six, or seven years, the Mandatory Interim Review occurs during the third year (Faculty Handbook, Section 4.14.3.3). Annually, the time line for completing this review is the same as that for the Annual Performance-and-Planning Review (Faculty Handbook, Section 4.14.3.3).
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: November 2, 2018
Committee: Education, Research, and Service
Item: UTIA/UTK Procedures for Enhanced Tenure-Track Review—Extension of Time for Submission
Type: Action
Presenter(s): Joseph A. DiPietro, President

The Resolution adopted by the Board on March 23, 2018 approving revisions to the tenure policy required that the campuses submit for Board approval, no later than the last regular Board meeting in 2018 (this meeting), procedures for an enhanced review of tenure-track faculty members in the third or fourth year of the probationary period.

Because of miscommunication and misunderstanding within the Provost’s office due to leadership transitions, necessary revisions to the UTIA/UTK Faculty Handbook to include the required procedures for enhanced tenure-track review were not submitted to the Faculty Senate for review and are not ready for submission to the Board for approval.

The President recommends that the Board approve an extension of time for submission of the required UTIA/UTK procedures until February 15, 2019, which will allow the Board to consider them at the March 1, 2019 meeting.

Motion: I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board approve an extension of time until February 15, 2019 for submission of the UTIA/UTK procedures for enhanced tenure-track review.
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: November 2, 2018
Committee: Education, Research, and Service
Item: UTM Procedures for Enhanced Tenure-Track Review
Type: Action
Presenter(s): Joseph A. DiPietro, President

Background (See Tab 7)

Summary of UTM Procedures
As required by the Board’s tenure policy, UTM proposes procedures to incorporate and supplement the minimum requirements of the Board’s policy for an enhanced tenure-track review during the third or fourth year of the probationary period. The UTM procedures are included in the meeting materials and key points are summarized below:

- Materials to be reviewed and the criteria used to assess the faculty member will be the same as those required for considering a candidate for tenure, except that external reviews of the faculty member will not be required.
- The review committee’s written report will include recommendations for furthering the faculty member’s progress toward tenure; committee members may submit an anonymous vote; and majority and minority reports will be prepared in the event of a split vote.
- The department chair will prepare an independent assessment and meet with the faculty member to share the committee report and the chair’s assessment and create a plan for enhancing the faculty member’s progress toward tenure.

President DiPietro recommends approval of the proposed UTM procedures for enhanced tenure-track review.

Motion: I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTM procedures for enhanced tenure-track review by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

[Resolution to approve follows]
The University of Tennessee
Board of Trustees

Resolution 00_-2018*
UTM Procedures for Enhanced Tenure-Track Review

Resolved: The Board of Trustees approves the UTM procedures for enhanced tenure-track review as presented in the meeting materials, which shall be attached to this Resolution after adoption.

Adopted this 2nd day of November, 2018.

* Number will be inserted after adoption.
The University of Tennessee at Martin

Change to UT Martin Faculty Handbook

Addition of Appendix C – Enhanced Tenure-Track Review (ETTR)

Summary of Change

Addition of procedures for conducting ETTR. Procedures are referenced in section 2.8.6 being added to the UT Martin Faculty Handbook.

Submitted for Approval:

October 17, 2018

APPENDIX C – PROCEDURES FOR ENHANCED TENURE-TRACK REVIEW (ETTR)

UT Policy BT0006 states the following about Enhanced Tenure-Track Review:¹

For each tenure-track faculty member, the department and department head will conduct an enhanced review to assess and inform the faculty member of his or her progress toward the grant of tenure during the third or fourth year of the probationary period (with the year to be determined in the department head’s sole discretion).

In the third or fourth year of a tenure-track faculty member’s probationary period, a dossier shall be submitted for review by department faculty and the department chair. The dossier shall consist of the same materials and address the same criteria required for tenure with the exception that external reviews are not required. Please see College and departmental bylaws for further guidance on timing and the required contents of the dossier.²

The ETTR will follow the same committee structure and voting procedures used during the department-level tenure review.³

After their review, the committee will record their vote and write a report including a recommendation detailing suggestions for furthering the faculty member’s progress towards tenure. All faculty members included in the review process will be noted in the report but shall be allowed to submit an anonymous vote. In the event of a split vote, the committee will provide to the department chair a minority and majority report using the form found on the Academic Affairs website.

The department chair will write up his/her own assessment of the faculty member’s dossier. The department chair will then meet with the faculty member to share the committee’s conclusions and his/her own assessment. The department chair and the faculty member will create a plan for enhancing the faculty member’s progress towards tenure. At the conclusion of the process, the department chair will forward the committee’s report and his/her assessment with the college dean.

¹ UT Policy BT0006 can be found at https://universitytennessee.policytech.com/docview/?docid=318&public=true.
² College and departmental bylaws can be found at https://www.utm.edu/academ.php.
³ Please refer to the bylaws of the specific department at https://www.utm.edu/academ.php.
After the Review

A favorable ETTR does not commit the tenured departmental faculty, the department, or the college to a subsequent recommendation for the grant of tenure. Any appeal regarding the ETTR shall follow the same procedures for an appeal of an annual performance and planning review.
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: November 2, 2018

Committee: Education, Research, and Service

Item: Campus Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Review of all Tenured Faculty

Type: Action

Presenter(s): Joseph A. DiPietro, President

Note: The following background information applies to all campus procedures on this subject presented in the materials at Tabs 13-17. Although UTIA and UTK share a common faculty handbook, UTIA has proposed separate procedures for the periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty.

Background

1. One of several revisions the Board approved to its tenure policy on March 23, 2018 requires a comprehensive performance review of all tenured faculty not less often than every six years. The new policy language reads as follows (emphasis added):

   The Board of Trustees recognizes and affirms the importance of tenure in protecting academic freedom and thus promoting the University’s principal mission of discovery and dissemination of truth through teaching, research, and service. The Board also recognizes its fiduciary responsibility to students, parents, and all citizens of Tennessee to ensure that faculty members effectively serve the needs of students and the University throughout their careers. Therefore, the President shall establish, with Board approval, procedures for each campus under which every tenured faculty member shall receive a comprehensive performance review no less often than every six years. As a minimum, the procedures for this periodic review shall: (1) provide for a peer review committee internal to the campus composed of tenured faculty members at the same or higher academic rank as the faculty member being reviewed, some of whom hold appointments in the same department as the faculty member being reviewed and some of whom do not; (2) provide for external reviews to be solicited when deemed necessary by the peer review committee or the dean; and (3) provide for appropriate staggering of reviews to avoid excessive administrative burden at any given time.

2. The Resolution adopted by the Board to approve this revision to its tenure policy directed the President to recommend post-tenure review procedures for each campus at the 2018 Fall Meeting of the Board.
3. The President and his staff developed a draft template of procedures for periodic post-tenure review after researching and considering post-tenure review procedures at other universities.

4. The draft template was provided to the Chancellors, campus chief academic officers, and the University Faculty Council for review and comment.

5. The final version of the template (which follows this memorandum) was provided to the Chancellors and chief academic officers with instructions to use the template to develop, with input from their Faculty Senates, individual campus/institute procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty.

6. Campus/institute procedures developed in consultation with the respective Faculty Senates were submitted to the President, and the President now recommends the procedures to the Board for approval.
TEMPLE
CAMPUS PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC POST-TENURE PERFORMANCE REVIEW

I. Introduction

In its Policies on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure (Board Policy BT0006), the Board of Trustees has recognized and affirmed the importance of tenure in protecting academic freedom and thus promoting the University’s principal mission of discovery and dissemination of truth through teaching, research, and service. The Board has also recognized its fiduciary responsibility to students, parents, and all citizens of Tennessee to ensure that faculty members effectively serve the needs of students and the University throughout their careers. To implement these principles, [INSERT CAMPUS NAME], with the approval of the President and the Board, has established these procedures under which every tenured faculty member shall receive a comprehensive performance review no less often than every six years.

II. Post-Tenure Review (“PTR”) Period

Except as otherwise provided in these procedures, each tenured faculty member must undergo some form of comprehensive performance review no less often than every six years. The PTR shall not substitute for the Annual Performance and Planning Review in the year a faculty member is scheduled for PTR.

The dean of each college shall develop, and submit to the chief academic officer for approval, an initial plan for staggering post-tenure reviews to avoid excessive administrative burden at any given time. The initial staggering plan may be revised with the approval of the chief academic officer if later developments require changes in order to avoid excessive administrative burden. The post-tenure review period begins at the granting of tenure, and, except as otherwise provided by the staggering plan, a faculty member’s PTR will occur no less often than every six years thereafter unless one of the following circumstances results in a different timetable:

- Suspension of post-tenure review period – A faculty member’s post-tenure review period is suspended during any year in which the faculty member is granted a leave of absence or a modified duties assignment.

- Restarting of post-tenure review period due to alternative comprehensive review – A comprehensive review of a faculty member’s performance restarts the faculty member’s PTR period under the following circumstances:
  - If a tenured faculty member undergoes a successful promotion review or a promotion is in progress during the year scheduled for PTR, the promotion review fulfills the PTR requirement and the PTR period is modified to require PTR six years after the promotion review.
  - If a tenured faculty member undergoes an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR) (generally triggered by annual performance review rating(s)) and is either rated as meeting expectations or successfully completes the terms of the EPPR improvement plan, the EPPR process fulfills the PTR requirement and the PTR cycle is modified to begin with the date of the EPPR committee’s report.
• Start of the PTR period upon conclusion of an administrative appointment — Full time administrators and faculty members with a majority administrative appointment (more than 50%) are not subject to PTR; faculty members holding a less than majority administrative appointment (50% or less) are subject to PTR regarding their faculty duties based on expectations consistent with their faculty duty allocation. When a full-time or majority-time administrator leaves his or her administrative position to assume a tenured faculty position, the faculty member’s initial PTR shall occur within six years after leaving the administrative post.

• **CAMPUSSES MAY ADD AN EXCEPTION FOR FACULTY MEMBERS WHO HAVE MADE A BINDING COMMITMENT TO RETIRE**

• A faculty member’s scheduled PTR may be otherwise deferred or modified only for good cause approved by the chief academic officer.

III. Annual Schedule for Post-Tenure Review

All post-tenure reviews will be conducted and completed during the FALL/SPRING semester according to the following schedule:

• The dean of the faculty member’s college/chief academic officer [CHOOSE WHICH] shall appoint all PTR Committees as set forth in Section IV below no later than ______________ [FILL IN DATE].
• Each PTR Committee shall be provided with the materials required by Section V below no later than ______________ [FILL IN DATE].
• Each PTR Committee shall submit its report required by Section VII below no later than ______________ [FILL IN DATE].
• **INCLUDE OTHER DEADLINES, SUCH AS FOR SOLICITING EXTERNAL REVIEW MATERIALS, AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE**

IV. Appointment and Composition of Post-Tenure Review Committee

All post-tenure reviews must be conducted by a committee established for the sole purpose of post-tenure review. Each PTR Committee shall include _____ members [MINIMUM OF THREE; MUST BE AN ODD NUMBER], appointed by the dean of the faculty member’s college/chief academic officer [CHOOSE WHICH] in the following manner: [INSERT MANNER OF SELECTION OF COMMITTEE; AMONG OTHER THINGS, ADDRESS ASSURING THAT NO PTR COMMITTEE MEMBER WILL HAVE AN ACTUAL OR APPARENT CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND WHAT TO DO IN CASE OF THE NEED FOR AN ALTERNATE MEMBER]. The composition of the PTR Committee must meet the following requirements:

• Each PTR Committee member must be a tenured full-time faculty member who is at the same or higher academic rank, and whose locus of tenure is at the same campus, as the faculty member being reviewed.
• One, and only one, PTR Committee member must hold an appointment in the same department as the faculty member being reviewed, unless there is no such faculty member eligible to serve. **OR** One, and only one, PTR Committee member must hold an appointment in the same division as the faculty member being reviewed, unless there is no such faculty member eligible to serve; provided that no other PTR Committee members may hold an appointment in the same
The chief academic officer, working with the University of Tennessee Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success, will provide instructions, guidelines, and best practices to members of PTR Committees.

V. Materials to be Reviewed by Post-Tenure Review Committee

The PTR Committee must review (1) annual review materials (including the department head’s/chair’s evaluation and rating of the faculty member’s performance, and student and any peer evaluation of teaching) for each year since the last review (to be supplied by the department head/chair); (2) the faculty member’s current CV; a narrative, not to exceed two pages, prepared by the faculty member describing the faculty member’s milestone achievements and accomplishments since the last review as well as goals for the next review period; and (if there has been a previous PTR) a copy of the narrative submitted as a part of the faculty member’s previous PTR (each to be supplied by the faculty member); and (3) external reviews when deemed necessary by the PTR Committee or when deemed necessary by the dean of the faculty member’s college/chief academic officer [CHOOSE WHICH]. [INSERT ANY DESIRED CAMPUS PROCEDURES FOR SOLICITING EXTERNAL REVIEWS] [CAMPUSES MAY ALSO INCLUDE PROVISIONS ALLOWING A FACULTY MEMBER TO REQUEST EXTERNAL REVIEW, INCLUDING ANY NECESSARY PROCEDURES AND APPROVALS FOR SUCH EXTERNAL REVIEW].

VI. Criteria for Post-Tenure Review

The post-tenure review process should ensure the faculty member has demonstrated continued professional growth and productivity in the areas of teaching, research (including scholarly, creative and artistic work), service, and/or clinical care pertinent to his or her faculty responsibilities. The criteria for assessing the faculty member’s performance must be consistent with established expectations of the department, school/college, and campus and provide sufficient flexibility to consider changes in academic responsibilities and/or expectations. 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 sub-discipline. Those expectations 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).

VII. Post-Tenure Review Committee’s Conclusions and Report

The PTR Committee is charged to review the faculty member’s performance during the review period and to conclude whether the faculty member’s performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank. The PTR Committee’s voting must be conducted by anonymous ballots. [CAMPUSES MAY DELETE THIS SENTENCE IF NOT REQUIRING ANONYMOUS VOTING] All conclusions and recommendations shall be adopted upon the vote of a simple majority of the PTR Committee. No member of the PTR Committee may abstain or recuse himself or herself from voting. Based on the judgment of its members, the PTR Committee must conclude either:
That the faculty member’s performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank; or

That the faculty member’s performance does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank.

The committee must report its conclusions and recommendations in writing using a standard format prepared by the chief academic officer, including (1) an enumeration of the anonymously cast vote, (2) the supporting reasons for its conclusion, (3) a dissenting explanation for any conclusion that is not adopted unanimously if a dissenting member chooses to provide one, (4) an identification of any incongruences observed between the faculty member’s performance and his or her annual evaluations, (5) a statement of any additional concerns identified or actions recommended, and (6) if applicable, an identification of areas of extraordinary contribution and/or performance.

The detailed PTR Committee report shall be provided to the faculty member, department head/chair, dean, and chief academic officer.

[CHOOSE ONE OF THE FOLLOWING TWO PROCEDURAL OPTIONS]

[OPTION IF DEAN IS IN CHARGE OF PTR PROCESS] Faculty members and department heads/chairs must have the opportunity to provide a written response to the PTR Committee report. The dean shall either accept or reject the PTR Committee’s determination that the faculty member’s performance satisfies or does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank. The chief academic officer and the Chancellor shall indicate whether or not they concur in the dean’s determination.

If the PTR Committee report is not unanimous, the dean shall provide the supporting reasons for his or her determination. If the dean, the chief academic officer, or the Chancellor do not concur in a determination, then he or she shall provide the supporting reasons for the non-concurrence. The dean’s determination, the chief academic officer’s and Chancellor’s concurrences, and any written responses of the faculty member and department head/chair will be maintained with the PTR Committee report in [INSERT OFFICIAL CAMPUS REPOSITORY – E.G., OFFICIAL PERSONNEL FILE, ONLINE STORAGE SYSTEM, CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER’S OFFICE, ETC.] and submitted electronically to the University of Tennessee Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success.

[OPTION IF CAO IS IN CHARGE OF PTR PROCESS] Faculty members, department heads/chairs, and deans must have the opportunity to provide a written response to the PTR Committee report. The chief academic officer shall either accept or reject the PTR Committee’s determination that the faculty member’s performance satisfies or does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank. The Chancellor shall indicate whether or not he or she concurs in the dean’s determination. If the PTR Committee report is not unanimous, the chief academic officer shall provide the supporting reasons for his or her determination. If the chief academic officer or the Chancellor do not concur in a determination, then he or she shall provide the supporting reasons for the non-concurrence. The chief academic officer’s determination, the Chancellor’s concurrence, and any written responses of the faculty member, department head/chair and the dean will be maintained with the PTR Committee report in [INSERT OFFICIAL CAMPUS REPOSITORY – E.G., OFFICIAL PERSONNEL FILE, ONLINE STORAGE SYSTEM, CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER’S OFFICE, ETC.].
VIII. Appeal

Within thirty days of receipt of the PTR Committee report, the faculty member may appeal any conclusion with which the faculty member disagrees. The procedure for appeal is described in Section ___ [INSERT CAMPUS FACULTY HANDBOOK APPEAL CITATION], except that a final decision on the appeal shall be made within ninety (90) days of the faculty member’s appeal, and the final decision of the Chancellor on an appeal shall not be appealable to the President.

IX. Further Actions

If the PTR Committee concludes that the faculty member’s performance has not satisfied the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and rank, a PTR improvement plan must be developed using the same procedures used for the development of an EPPR improvement plan as detailed in Board Policy BT0006 Appendix E.

If the chief academic officer concludes that deficiencies exist in the departmental annual performance review process (including failure of department heads/chairs to conduct rigorous annual performance reviews) or other incongruences are observed between the PTR performance review and rankings assigned through the annual performance review process, the chief academic officer must develop a process for addressing the issues.

X. Annual Report to the Board of Trustees

The chief academic officer shall prepare an annual assessment report of campus post-tenure review processes, procedures and outcomes for submission by the Chancellor to the Board of Trustees, through the President, no later than June 1 of each year. The report shall include a description of any deficiencies identified in departmental annual performance review processes and the plan for addressing the issues.
Faculty Performance Evaluation:
Modeling Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review
NOTES:

Processes modeled herein are detailed in System-Wide Policy **BT0006 – Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure**

Flowcharts represent a simplified overview; consult respective faculty handbooks for campus-specific processes and procedures.
Education, Research, and Service Committee - Campus Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Review of all Tenured Faculty - Background
Faculty Evaluation Abbreviations

APPR – Annual Performance-and-Planning Review
ETTR – Enhanced Tenure-Track Review (mid-cycle review)
PPPR* – Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review
EPPR – Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review
PRC – Peer Review Committee

*Also referred to as PTR (Post-Tenure Review) or PPPR/PTR
Promotion and Tenure

**Promotion & Tenure Process**
- Review of:
  - Dossier (Scholarly Work, Teaching & Service)
  - Curriculum vitae
  - Supporting materials
  - External Letters
- Independent Reviews & Recommendations:
  - Department Tenured Faculty Committee
  - Department Head
  - College Committee/Second Level of Review
  - Dean
  - Chief Academic Officer
  - Chancellor
  - President (Action or Recommendation)
  - Board of Trustees Action (when required)

*In some instances a faculty member may be granted tenure without promotion or could be promoted without receiving tenure*
Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review/Post-Tenure Review (PPPR/PTR)
**EPPR Triggered by APPR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectation</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tenured Assistant, Associate or Full Professor**

- Faculty member receives one overall annual performance rating of "unsatisfactory".

- Faculty member receives two overall annual performance ratings of "needs improvement" during any four consecutive annual review cycles.

**Diagram**

- APPR → APPR → APPR → EPPR
- APPR → APPR → APPR → EPPR
- APPR → APPR → APPR → EPPR
Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR)

Tenured Assistant, Associate or Full Professor

- EPPR (+)
- EPPR (-)

Satisfies Expectations (no further action needed)

Develop EPPR Improvement Plan

or

Initiate Proceedings to Terminate Tenure

Satisfies Expectations (no further action needed)

PRC (+)

PRC (-)

Initiate Proceedings to Terminate Tenure
Meeting Date: November 2, 2018
Committee: Education, Research, and Service
Item: UTC Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Review of all Tenured Faculty
Type: Action
Presenter(s): Joseph A. DiPietro, President

Background (See Tab 12)

Summary of UTC Procedures
The template for periodic post-tenure review procedures developed by the President and his staff (see Tab 12) leaves to each campus the choice regarding certain issues, primarily: (1) whether to make its chief academic officer or its college deans responsible for overseeing the process; (2) how to select the post-tenure review committee members; (3) how to conduct external review; and (4) whether to conduct committee voting anonymously or non-anonymously. A summary of UTC’s choice on these issues appears below, and the complete set of UTC procedures follows the Resolution for approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility for Post-Tenure Review</th>
<th>College Deans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Selection</td>
<td>Department heads nominate members to serve on a college-wide pool of potential committee members; the dean chooses members of individual committees from this pool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Reviews</td>
<td>The committee selects one reviewer from a list supplied by the faculty member and one reviewer from a list supplied by the committee; the faculty member himself or herself may request external review in addition to a request from the committee or the dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Committee Voting</td>
<td>Non-anonymous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

President DiPietro recommends approval of the proposed UTC procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty members.

Motion: I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTC procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

[Resolution to approve follows]
Resolved: The Board of Trustees approves the UTC procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty as presented in the meeting materials, which shall be attached to this Resolution after adoption.

Adopted this 2nd day of November, 2018.
3.4. FACULTY EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT

3.4.8. Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review

The academic freedom afforded to faculty by a grant of tenure is essential to the University's principal mission of discovery and dissemination of truth through teaching, research, and service. The Board has recognized and affirmed the importance of tenure in UT Policy BT0006. The Board has also recognized its fiduciary responsibility to students, parents, and all citizens of Tennessee to ensure that faculty members effectively serve the needs of students and the University throughout their careers. To balance its dedication to academic freedom with its responsibilities, UTC, with the approval of the President and the Board, has established the procedures under this Section 3.4.8. under which every tenured faculty member shall receive a comprehensive performance review no less often than every six years.

1. Post-Tenure Review Period

Except as otherwise provided in the procedures under this Section 3.4.8., each tenured faculty member must undergo some form of comprehensive performance review ("post-tenure review" or "PTR") no less often than every six years. The PTR shall not substitute for the EDO process in the year a faculty member is scheduled for PTR.

The dean of each college shall develop, and submit to the Provost for approval, an initial plan for staggering post-tenure reviews to avoid excessive administrative burden at any given time. The initial staggering plan may be revised with the approval of the Provost if later developments require changes in order to avoid excessive administrative burden. The post-tenure review period begins at the granting of tenure, and, except as otherwise provided by
the staggering plan, a faculty member’s PTR will occur no less often than every six years thereafter unless one of the following circumstances results in a different timetable:

1. **Suspension of PTR Period**: A faculty member's PTR period is suspended during any year in which the faculty member is granted a leave of absence or a modified duties assignment.

2. **Restarting of PTR Period Due to Alternative Comprehensive Review**: A comprehensive review of a faculty member's performance restarts the faculty member's PTR period under the following circumstances:

   a. If a tenured faculty member undergoes a successful promotion review or a promotion is in progress during the year scheduled for the faculty member's PTR, the promotion review fulfills the PTR requirement and the PTR period is modified to require a PTR six years after the promotion review.

   b. If a tenured faculty member undergoes an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR) (generally triggered by annual performance review rating(s)) and is either rated as meeting expectations or successfully completes the terms of the EPPR improvement plan, the EPPR process fulfills the PTR requirement and the PTR cycle is modified to begin with the date of the EPPR committee’s report.

3. **Start of the PTR Period Upon Conclusion of an Administrative Appointment**: Full-time administrators and faculty members with a majority administrative appointment (more than 50%) are not subject to PTR; faculty members holding a less than majority administrative appointment (50% or less) are subject to PTR regarding their faculty duties based on expectations consistent with their faculty duty allocation. When a full-time or majority-time administrator leaves his or her administrative position to assume a tenured faculty position, the faculty member's initial PTR shall occur within six years after leaving the administrative post.

4. **Commitment to Retire**: When a faculty member submits a letter of resignation with a termination date within the academic year during which a post-tenure review would have taken place, and provided the letter of resignation is accepted by the Provost, the post-tenure review shall be deemed unnecessary.

5. **Good Cause**: A faculty member's scheduled PTR may be otherwise deferred or modified only for good cause approved by the Provost.

2. **Annual Schedule for Post-Tenure Reviews**

   All post-tenure reviews will be conducted and completed during the Fall semester according to the following schedule:

   - The Provost shall notify all faculty members subject to post-tenure review
in a given academic year no later than April 1 of the preceding academic year.

- The dean of the faculty member's college shall appoint all PTR Committees as set forth in Section 3.4.8.3. below no later than May 1 of the preceding academic year.

- Each PTR Committee shall convene and elect a chair and shall be provided with the materials required by Section 3.4.8.3. below no later than September 1.

- When external review is required as part of the post-tenure review by the PTR Committee in accordance with college bylaws or by the dean in accordance with college bylaws, or is requested by the faculty member for his or her post-tenure review, the PTR Committee shall solicit reviews from at least three (3) valid external reviewers no later than October 1.

- Each PTR Committee shall submit its report required under Section 3.4.8.6. below no later than December 15.

3. Appointment and Composition of Post-Tenure Review Committee

(1) All post-tenure reviews must be conducted by college-level committees established for the sole purpose of post-tenure review. Each PTR Committee shall include a minimum of three (3) members, provided the number is odd. Deans of larger colleges may opt to appoint a larger committee. The committee is appointed by the dean of the faculty member's college in the following manner:

- Each department may nominate at least one (1) member, but no more than three (3) members of its tenured faculty, to serve on a college-level PTR Committee. The nominees should include no faculty member who is subject to post-tenure review in that cycle. The department nominee may hold the rank of Associate Professor only with prior approval of the dean and only in the event that no full Professor is eligible or available to serve.

- From among the departmental nominees, the dean shall appoint faculty members to serve on a PTR Committee for any specific faculty member (or group of faculty members) undergoing review. The members of a PTR Committee shall be appointed so as to avoid any conflict of interest with any faculty member (or group of faculty members) undergoing review.

- For the purpose of this process, a conflict of interest shall be defined as any professional or personal consideration between a PTR Committee member and a faculty member undergoing post-tenure review which may compromise, or have the appearance of compromising, the independence of the former's judgment during review of the latter.
The composition of the PTR Committee must meet the following requirements:

- Each PTR Committee member must be a tenured full-time faculty member who is at the same or higher academic rank (except as provided under Section 3.4.8.3.(1) above), and whose locus of tenure is at the same campus as the faculty member being reviewed.

- One, and only one, PTR Committee member must hold an appointment in the same department as the faculty member being reviewed, unless there is no such faculty member eligible to serve.

College bylaws may further define the size and membership of a PTR Committee, accounting for the characteristics of the departments and faculties which constitute the college itself.

The Provost, working with the University of Tennessee Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success, will provide instructions, guidelines, and best practices to members of PTR Committees.

Each PTR Committee shall convene and elect a chair. The chair shall solicit and collect all required materials from each faculty member under review and the department head of each faculty member under review. The chair shall subsequently ensure that the committee meets in person for a thorough review of those materials.

4. Materials to be Reviewed by Post-Tenure Review Committee

The PTR Committee must review:

(1) a completed EDO (including the department head's evaluation and rating of the faculty member's performance, and student and any peer evaluation of teaching) for each year since the last review;

(2) EDO goals for the current review period;

(3) the faculty member's current Curriculum Vitae;

(4) a narrative, not to exceed two pages, prepared by the faculty member describing the faculty member's milestone achievements and accomplishments since the last review as well as goals for the next post-tenure review period; and

(5) if there has been a previous PTR, a copy of the narrative submitted as a part of the faculty member's previous PTR.

Items (1) – (2) above should be supplied by the faculty member's department head. Items (3) – (5) above should be supplied by the faculty member.

The PTR Committee may also review:
(6) external reviews, when external reviews are deemed necessary by the PTR Committee in accordance with college bylaws or when external reviews are deemed necessary by the dean of the faculty member's college in accordance with college bylaws. In the event that an external review is not deemed necessary by the PTR Committee or dean, external reviews may be requested by the faculty member undergoing post-tenure review.

When an external review is deemed necessary, or is requested, for a faculty member's post-tenure review, the materials to be reviewed for that faculty member (i.e., the materials listed under (1) – (5) above), will be sent to no fewer than three external reviewers. At least two external reviewers must provide written reviews.

The selection of the external reviewers for a faculty member is a collaboration between that faculty member and the PTR Committee conducting the review. The faculty member shall submit to the PTR Committee two lists: one list of no fewer than five names of valid reviewers, and a second list of names of individuals who must be excluded from the external review. Relying on its own counsel and expertise, the PTR Committee will create its own list of no fewer than five valid reviewers.

A valid reviewer is a tenured faculty member at a comparable institution of higher education holding the rank of full Professor and a terminal degree in the same discipline, or sufficiently-related discipline, as the faculty member undergoing post-tenure review. Preference should be given to valid reviewers from institutional peers of UTC.

From these two lists, the PTR Committee shall select exactly one name of a valid reviewer from the faculty member's list and two names of valid reviewers from its own list. From this panel of three reviewers, the PTR Committee shall solicit external reviews using a form letter provided by the Provost for this purpose. Each reviewer shall receive the same packet of materials (i.e., the materials listed under (1) – (5) as above), along with clear instructions on timely return of a review to the PTR Committee. Should a reviewer decline to review a candidate for post-tenure review, the PTR Committee may return to the two lists of valid reviewers and select another valid reviewer from whom to solicit a review.

At least two valid external reviewers must supply reviews to the PTR Committee reviewing a candidate for post-tenure review. In the event that two reviews from valid external reviewers cannot be secured, the chair of a PTR Committee may appeal to the Provost for a waiver of this requirement.

The reviews of external reviewers are advisory to the PTR Committee. In its conclusions and report, the PTR Committee should highlight relevant observations made by external reviewers, and describe the role that those observations played in the PTR Committee's conclusions and report.

5. Criteria for Post-Tenure Review
The post-tenure review process should ensure the faculty member has demonstrated continued professional growth and productivity in the areas of teaching, research (including published scholarship and creative achievement), service, and/or clinical care pertinent to his or her faculty responsibilities. The criteria for assessing the faculty member's performance must be consistent with established expectations of the department, college, and UTC and provide sufficient flexibility to consider changes in academic responsibilities and/or expectations. The expectations for faculty performance may differ by college, department, and even among sub-disciplines within a department or program. Those expectations may be commonly-held standards in the discipline or sub-discipline. Those expectations 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, this Handbook (including without limitation this Section 3.4.8.), and in other generally-applicable policies and procedures (for example, fiscal, human resources, safety, research, or information technology policies and procedures).

6. PTR Committee's Conclusions and Report

The PTR Committee is charged to review the faculty member's performance during the review period and to conclude whether the faculty member's performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank. All conclusions and recommendations shall be adopted upon the vote of a simple majority of the PTR Committee. No member of the PTR Committee may abstain or recuse himself or herself from voting. Based on the judgment of its members, the PTR Committee must conclude either:

- That the faculty member's performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank; or
- That the faculty member's performance does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank.

The committee must report its conclusions and recommendations in writing using a standard format prepared by the Provost, including (a) an enumeration of the vote, (b) the supporting reasons for its conclusion, (c) a dissenting explanation for any conclusion that is not adopted unanimously, (d) an identification of any incongruences observed between the faculty member's performance and his or her annual evaluations, (e) a statement of any additional concerns identified or actions recommended, and (f) if applicable, an identification of areas of extraordinary contribution and/or performance.

The detailed PTR Committee report shall be provided to the faculty member, department head, dean, and Provost.

Faculty members and department heads must have the opportunity to provide a written response to the PTR Committee report. The dean shall either accept or reject the PTR Committee's determination that the faculty member's performance satisfies or does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank. The Provost and the Chancellor shall
indicate whether or not they concur in the dean's determination. If the PTR Committee report is not unanimous, the dean shall provide the supporting reasons for his or her determination. If the dean, the Provost, or the Chancellor do not concur in a determination, then he or she shall provide the supporting reasons for the non-concurrence. The dean's determination, the Provost's and Chancellor's concurrences, and any written responses of the faculty member and department head will be maintained with the PTR Committee report in UTC Faculty Records and submitted electronically to the University of Tennessee Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success.

7. Appeal

Within thirty (30) days of receipt of the PTR Committee report, the faculty member may appeal any conclusion with which the faculty member disagrees. The procedure for appeal is described in Section 5.3. of this Handbook, except that a final decision on the appeal shall be made within ninety (90) days of the faculty member's appeal, and the decision of the Chancellor on an appeal shall be final and not be appealable to the President.

8. Further Actions

If the PTR Committee concludes that the faculty member's performance has not satisfied the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and rank, a PTR improvement plan must be developed using the same procedures used for the development of an EPPR improvement plan as detailed in Appendix E to UT Policy BT0006.

If the Provost concludes that deficiencies exist in the departmental annual performance review process (including failure of department heads to conduct rigorous annual performance reviews) or other incongruences are observed between the PTR performance review and rankings assigned through the annual performance review process, the Provost must develop a process for addressing the issues.

9. Annual Report to the Board

The Provost shall prepare an annual assessment report of campus post-tenure review processes, procedures and outcomes for submission by the Chancellor to the Board, through the President, no later than June 1 of each year. The report shall include a description of any deficiencies identified in departmental annual performance review processes and the plan for addressing the issues.
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: November 2, 2018
Committee: Education, Research, and Service
Item: UTHSC Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Review of all Tenured Faculty
Type: Action
Presenter(s): Joseph A. DiPietro, President

Background (See Tab 12)

Summary of UTHSC Procedures
The template for periodic post-tenure review procedures developed by the President and his staff (see Tab 12) leaves to each campus the choice regarding certain issues, primarily: (1) whether to make its chief academic officer or its college deans responsible for overseeing the process; (2) how to select the post-tenure review committee members; (3) how to conduct external review; and (4) whether to conduct committee voting anonymously or non-anonymously. A summary of UTHSC’s choice on these issues appears below, and the complete set of UTHSC procedures follows the Resolution for approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility for Post-Tenure Review</th>
<th>Chief Academic Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Selection</td>
<td>The chief academic officer selects committee members from list compiled by the faculty member undergoing review and the faculty member’s department chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Reviews</td>
<td>External reviewers are selected based on the mutual agreement of the faculty member undergoing review and the chair of the review committee; if agreement cannot be reached, the chief academic officer selects reviewer from a list in which the faculty member and the committee chair each place three names.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Committee Voting</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Significant Campus-Level Decisions</td>
<td>- UTHSC has several large departments that are broken down into divisions that resemble departments on other campuses; the committee may contain two members from the same department as long as they are from different divisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to specifying whether the faculty member’s performance meets expectations for discipline and academic rank, the committee must specify whether the faculty member’s six annual performance reviews satisfy the expectations of being reasonably, fair, accurate, and of high quality.

President DiPietro recommends approval of the proposed UTHSC procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty members.

Motion: I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTHSC procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

[Resolution to approve follows]
The University of Tennessee
Board of Trustees

Resolution 00_-2018*
UTHSC Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Review of all Tenured Faculty

Resolved: The Board of Trustees approves the UTHSC procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty as presented in the meeting materials, which shall be attached to this Resolution after adoption.

Adopted this 2nd day of November, 2018.

* Number will be inserted after adoption.
UT HEALTH SCIENCE CENTER
PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC POST-TENURE PERFORMANCE REVIEW

I. Introduction

In its Policies on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure (Board Policy BT0006), the Board of Trustees has recognized and affirmed the importance of tenure in protecting academic freedom and thus promoting the University’s principal mission of discovery and dissemination of truth through teaching, research, and service. The Board has also recognized its fiduciary responsibility to students, parents, and all citizens of Tennessee to ensure that faculty members effectively serve the needs of students and the University throughout their careers. To implement these principles, The University of Tennessee Health Science Center (UTHSC), with the approval of the President and the Board, has established these procedures under which every tenured faculty member shall receive a comprehensive performance review no less often than every six (6) years.

II. Post-Tenure Review (“PTR”) Period

Except as otherwise provided in these procedures, each tenured faculty member must undergo comprehensive performance review as described below no less often than every six (6) years. The PTR shall not substitute for the Annual Performance and Planning Review in the year a faculty member is scheduled for PTR.

The chief academic officer shall develop, and submit to the dean of each college for review, an initial plan for staggering post-tenure reviews to avoid excessive administrative burden at any given time. The initial staggering plan may be revised by the chief academic officer if later developments require changes in order to avoid excessive administrative burden. Selection of faculty members to undergo review in any given year shall be determined during the first six (6) years by an annual random selection procedure to be conducted by the chief academic officer with participation of the Faculty Senate in order to select each year an approximately equal number of faculty members meeting the criteria for undergoing PTR.

The post-tenure review period begins at the granting of tenure, and, except as otherwise provided by the staggering plan, a faculty member’s PTR will occur no less often than every six (6) years thereafter unless one of the following circumstances results in a different timetable:

1. Suspension of post-tenure review period – A faculty member’s post-tenure review period is suspended during any year in which the faculty member is granted a leave of absence or a modified duties assignment.

2. Restarting of post-tenure review period due to alternative comprehensive review – A comprehensive review of a faculty member’s performance restarts the faculty member’s PTR period under the following circumstances:

   a. If a tenured faculty member undergoes a successful promotion review or a promotion is in progress during the year scheduled for PTR, the promotion review fulfills the PTR requirement and the PTR period is modified to require PTR six (6) years after the promotion review.

   b. If a tenured faculty member undergoes an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR) (generally triggered by annual performance review rating(s)) and is either rated as
meeting expectations or successfully completes the terms of the EPPR improvement plan, the EPPR process fulfills the PTR requirement and the PTR cycle is modified to begin with the date of the EPPR committee’s report.

3. Start of the PTR period upon conclusion of an administrative appointment – Full time administrators and faculty members with a majority administrative appointment (more than 50%) are not subject to PTR; faculty members holding a less than majority administrative appointment (50% or less) are subject to PTR regarding their faculty duties based on expectations consistent with their faculty duty allocation. When a full-time or majority-time administrator leaves his or her administrative position to assume a tenured faculty position, the faculty member’s initial PTR shall occur within six (6) years after leaving the administrative post.

4. Exception of the scheduled PTR for retirement - A faculty member who has made a binding commitment to retire within the next twelve (12) months and whose retirement date has been accepted by UTHSC will be exempted from a PTR if the PTR is scheduled in the year during which their retirement is to take place. Should the faculty member’s retirement be renegotiated with the approval of UTHSC, the faculty member’s originally scheduled PTR will take place during the next cycle of PTR reviews.

5. A faculty member’s scheduled PTR may be otherwise deferred or modified only for good cause approved by the chief academic officer.

III. Annual Schedule for Post-Tenure Review

All post-tenure reviews will be conducted and completed during the academic year according to the following schedule:

1. The chief academic officer shall appoint all PTR Committees as set forth in Section IV below no later than mid-August.
2. Each PTR Committee shall be provided with the materials required by Section V below no later than September 1.
3. When external reviews are necessary, identification of the evaluator should take no more than fourteen (14) days and there should be no more than four (4) weeks between the request to the evaluator and the evaluator’s decision.
4. Each PTR Committee shall submit its report required by Section VII below no later than March 1. Section XI provides a timeline for conducting the PTR, indicating the steps in the process, typical timing of each step, as well as additional timelines if external review materials are required or if a PTR improvement plan is required.

IV. Appointment and Composition of Post-Tenure Review Committee

A. Appointment of the PTR Committee

All post-tenure reviews must be conducted by a committee established for the sole purpose of post-tenure review. Each PTR Committee shall include three (3) members, appointed by the chief academic officer in the following manner:

1. In the case of departments with formally recognized divisions, the division serves as the organizing unit.
2. The faculty member under review nominates three (3) committee members: one (1) from within division/department and two (2) from outside division/department. The department chair, in consultation with the division chief and dean, nominates six (6), two (2) from within the division/department and four (4) from outside the division/department (either in the college or outside the college).

3. The faculty member can ask that one (1) of the nominees from the chair’s list be removed.

4. Nominations will be forwarded to the chief academic officer for selection.

5. One (1) of the three (3) committee members must be from the faculty member’s list of nominees.

6. To prevent conflict of interest in decision-making due to factors of kinship among employees, no faculty members who are relatives as defined in the HR0115: Employment of Relatives policy will be placed on the PTR Committee of the faculty member under review.

B. Composition of the PTR Committee

The composition of the PTR Committee must meet the following requirements:

1. Each PTR Committee member must be a tenured full-time faculty member who is at the same or higher academic rank, and whose locus of tenure is at UTHSC.

2. Committee members shall have sufficient expertise in the field of and/or similarity of activities to those of the faculty member whose progress is being evaluated.

3. For faculty members undergoing PTR who are in departments without recognized divisions, one (1), and only one (1), PTR Committee member must hold an appointment in the same department as the faculty member being reviewed, unless there is no such faculty member eligible to serve, in which case the choice defaults to the college. For faculty members undergoing PTR who are in departments organized into recognized divisions, one (1), and only one (1), PTR Committee member must hold an appointment in the same division as the faculty member being reviewed, unless there is no such faculty member eligible to serve, in which case the choice defaults to the department; provided that no other PTR Committee members may hold an appointment in the same division.

4. At least one (1) PTR Committee member must hold an appointment in a different division/department from the faculty member being reviewed, but from the same college. For purposes of PTR Committee membership, College of Medicine basic science and clinical departments are considered as different colleges.

5. The final PTR Committee member may hold an appointment in a different college from the faculty member being reviewed or, if in the same college, must hold an appointment in a different department from the faculty member being reviewed.

The chief academic officer, working with the University of Tennessee Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success, will provide instructions, guidelines, and best practices to members of PTR Committees.

Members of the PTR Committee will select their committee’s chair. The chair of the PTR Committee will (1) ensure adherence to the timeline for the PTR Committee’s work; (2) draft the initial report of the PTR Committee, using a standardized template; (3) edit, distribute, revise and obtain Committee approval of the PTR Committee’s report; and (4) serve as the official communicator of the PTR Committee with the chief academic officer. In the event that an external review is deemed necessary or requested, the chair of the PTR Committee will be responsible for managing this process.

V. Materials to be Reviewed by Post-Tenure Review Committee

A. Materials to be Reviewed by the PTR Committee
The PTR Committee must review:

1. annual review materials (including the division chief’s and/or department chair’s evaluation(s) and rating(s) of the faculty member’s performance, and student and any peer evaluation of teaching) for each year of the last six (6) years or since the last PTR review (to be supplied by the division chief and/or department chair);
2. the faculty member’s current CV; a narrative, not to exceed two (2) pages, prepared by the faculty member describing the faculty member’s milestone achievements and accomplishments for each of the last six (6) years or since the last PTR review as well as goals for the next PTR review period; and (if there has been a previous PTR) a copy of the narrative submitted as a part of the faculty member’s previous PTR (each to be supplied by the faculty member); and
3. external reviews when deemed necessary by the PTR Committee or the chief academic officer, or when requested by the faculty member undergoing PTR.

B. Procedures and Approvals for External Reviews

External review may be requested by any member of the PTR Committee, chief academic officer or by the faculty member undergoing PTR. Typically, an external review is requested when sufficient expertise is lacking among the members of the PTR Committee to make an appropriate judgment as to whether the performance of the faculty member undergoing PTR satisfies the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank. In the rare instance that external reviews are deemed necessary or requested, the following procedures will apply.

Qualifications of external evaluators include the following:

1. External evaluators are individuals who are not employed by or affiliated with UTHSC or UTHSC’s affiliated institutions.
2. External evaluators should be distinguished individuals in the faculty member’s field who are in a position to provide an assessment of the faculty member’s continued professional growth and productivity based on the materials provided in V.A. (above).
3. External evaluators must themselves hold tenure if offered at their institution or the equivalent if tenure is not offered.
4. External evaluators must be at or above the faculty member’s current rank (or equivalent).
5. External evaluators should not hold any conflict of interest, as defined in the National Institutes of Health (NIH) definition of conflict of interest, or who would be in any professional or personal relationship with the faculty member that could reduce objectivity. In cases where conflict of interest is raised, the chief academic officer will make the final determination as to the external evaluator’s appropriateness.
6. Whenever possible, external evaluators should be individuals (a) at UTHSC’s comparable or aspirational peer institutions or (b) from an outside institution similar to UTHSC (e.g., academic health science center or research-intensive institution).

External evaluators are to be identified by mutual agreement of the faculty member undergoing PTR and the chair of the PTR Committee. The faculty member and chair of the PTR Committee independently identify three (3) prospective external evaluators and exchange their lists with each other. Within five (5) days the faculty member and PTR Committee chair should agree on a priority ranking of three (3) evaluators, allowing for options in obtaining an external review if the top ranked evaluator is unable to participate in the appropriate time frame (four [4] weeks). If the faculty member and PTR Committee chair cannot agree within five (5) days, upon receiving the reasoning for/against each potential evaluator, the chief academic officer will decide the disposition of the issue by selecting one (1) of the six (6) prospective external evaluators from the identified lists.
The chair of the PTR Committee solicits the external review, using the following guidance. A standard form letter must be used for all external review requests.

1. **Materials to be sent to external evaluators:**
   a. Required materials submitted by the division chief (if relevant) and/or department chair
   b. Required materials submitted by the faculty member
   c. UTHSC Faculty Handbook statements about PTR and, if available/developed, college and (if present) departmental bylaws about PTR

2. **General information to provide to external evaluators in the request for evaluation:**
   a. Faculty member’s name
   b. Description of the PTR process
   c. The external evaluator will be asked to review the materials submitted (see item #1 above) and conclude that the faculty member’s performance (a) satisfies the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and rank or (b) does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline, rank, effort distribution, and expectations listed in the annual reviews provided. The external evaluator will also be asked to provide a one-paragraph explanation of his or her conclusion.
   d. Request for evaluator to state the nature of any association with the faculty member
   e. Request for the evaluator's letter to be submitted on institutional letterhead with the evaluator’s signature that includes rank as well as tenure status
   f. Date when the letter must be received
   g. Thank you

3. External reviews should be addressed to the PTR Committee chair who requested the review.

4. Letters should be submitted via email.

5. Any letters solicited and received must be included in the PTR Committee’s report.

**VI. Criteria for Post-Tenure Review**

The post-tenure review process should ensure the faculty member has demonstrated continued professional growth and productivity in the areas of teaching, research (including creative and other scholarly activities), service, and/or clinical care pertinent to his or her faculty responsibilities. The criteria for assessing the faculty member’s performance must be consistent with established expectations of the division, department, and college and provide sufficient flexibility to consider changes in academic responsibilities and/or expectations. The expectations for faculty performance may differ by college, department, and even among sub-disciplines within a department or program. Those expectations may be commonly-held standards in the discipline or sub-discipline. Those expectations may be stated explicitly in the faculty member’s own six (6) past annual performance reviews, work assignments, goals or other planning tools (however identified), as well as department or college bylaws, the UTHSC 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).

**VII. Post-Tenure Review Committee’s Conclusions and Report**

The PTR Committee is charged to review the faculty member’s performance during the review period and to conclude whether the faculty member’s performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty
member’s discipline and academic rank. The PTR Committee’s voting must be conducted by anonymous ballots. All conclusions, the supporting reasons for the conclusions, and recommendations shall be adopted upon the vote of a simple majority of the PTR Committee. No member of the PTR Committee may abstain or recuse himself or herself from voting. Based on the judgment of its members, the PTR Committee must conclude for the candidate’s performance either:

- That the faculty member’s performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank; or

- That the faculty member’s performance does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank.

The PTR Committee must conclude for the annual reviews either:

- That the faculty member’s six (6) annual performance reviews satisfy the expectations of being reasonable, fair, accurate and high quality.

- That the faculty member’s six (6) annual performance reviews do not satisfy the expectations of being reasonable, fair, accurate and high quality.

The committee must report its conclusions, the supporting reasons for the conclusions, and recommendations in writing using a standard format prepared by the chief academic officer, including (1) an enumeration of the anonymously cast vote, (2) the supporting reasons for its conclusion, (3) a dissenting explanation for any conclusion that is not adopted unanimously if a dissenting member chooses to provide one, (4) an identification of any incongruences observed between the faculty member’s performance and his or her annual evaluations, (5) a statement of any additional concerns identified or actions recommended, and (6) if applicable, an identification of areas of extraordinary contribution and/or performance.

The detailed PTR Committee report shall be provided to the faculty member, division chief, department chair, dean, and chief academic officer.

The faculty member under review, his or her division chief, department chair, and dean must have the opportunity to provide a written response to the PTR Committee report. These responses must be submitted to the chief academic officer with copies to the faculty member, the division chief, department chair, dean, and Committee. The chief academic officer shall either accept or reject the PTR Committee’s determination that the faculty member’s performance satisfies or does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank. Additionally, the chief academic officer shall either accept or reject the PTR Committee’s determination that annual performance reviews satisfy or do not satisfy the expectations for the conduct of reasonable, fair, accurate and high quality reviews. The Chancellor shall indicate in writing whether or not he or she concurs in the chief academic officer’s determination. If the PTR Committee report is not unanimous, the chief academic officer shall provide the supporting reasons for his or her determination. If the chief academic officer or the Chancellor do not concur in a determination, then he or she shall provide the supporting reasons for the non-concurrence. The chief academic officer’s determination, the Chancellor’s concurrence, and any written responses of the faculty member, division chief, department chair and the dean will be maintained with the PTR Committee report in the official faculty file located in the chief academic officer’s office and, upon request, submitted electronically to the University of Tennessee Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success.
VIII. Appeal

Within thirty (30) days of receipt of the PTR Committee report, the faculty member may appeal any conclusion with which the faculty member disagrees. The procedure for appeal is described in Section 7 of the UTHSC Faculty Handbook, except that a final decision on the appeal shall be made within ninety (90) days of the faculty member’s appeal, and the final decision of the Chancellor on an appeal shall not be appealable to the President.

IX. Further Actions

If the PTR Committee concludes that the faculty member’s performance has not satisfied the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and rank, a PTR improvement plan must be developed using the same procedures used for the development of an EPPR improvement plan as detailed in Board Policy BT0006 Appendix E Section 7.b. The PTR improvement plan will be evaluated quarterly for a minimum of four (4) quarters. The evaluation of the PTR improvement plan will be conducted as part of the faculty member’s next annual performance review.

If the chief academic officer, based on the PTR Committee’s report, concludes that deficiencies exist in the departmental annual performance review process (including failure of division chiefs or department chairs to conduct rigorous (i.e., reasonable, fair, accurate, high quality) annual performance reviews) or other incongruences are observed between the PTR performance review and rankings assigned through the annual performance review process, the chief academic officer must develop a process for addressing the issues.

X. Annual Report to the Board of Trustees

The chief academic officer shall prepare an annual assessment report of campus post-tenure review processes, procedures and outcomes for submission by the Chancellor to the Board of Trustees, through the President, no later than June 1 of each year. The report shall include a description of any deficiencies identified in departmental annual performance review processes and the plan for addressing the issues.

The outcomes of the PTR process will be evaluated on an annual basis, with data reported to the Board of Trustees also shared with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, deans, department chairs, and division chiefs.

XI. Timelines for Conducting the PTR

All PTR 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 (5) business days or longer (such as the administrative closure between fall and spring semesters or an extended weather-related closure). The following tables summarize key events in the PTR process that have deadlines.

**Timeline for Conducting the PTR (using the EPPR process as a basis)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Dates</th>
<th>Event begins</th>
<th>Days (Weeks)</th>
<th>Event ends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>Written notice from the chief academic officer that the faculty member is required to have a PTR – normally will occur by July 1.</td>
<td>42 (6)</td>
<td>PTR Committee is selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 12</td>
<td>PTR Committee is selected.</td>
<td>7 (1)</td>
<td>Chief academic officer provides instructions, guidelines, template for report, and best practices to the PTR Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 19</td>
<td>Chief academic officer provides instructions, guidelines, template for report, and best practices to the PTR Committee.</td>
<td>7 (1)</td>
<td>PTR Committee receives all required materials from division chief (if relevant), department chair, from faculty member, and determines if external reviews are needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 26</td>
<td>PTR Committee receives all required materials from division chief (if relevant), department chair, from faculty member, and determines if external reviews are needed.</td>
<td>42 (6)</td>
<td>PTR Committee report is prepared; dissenting explanation prepared if a dissenting member chooses to provide one. Report is distributed for review by the faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, and dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 7</td>
<td>PTR Committee report is prepared; dissenting explanation prepared if a dissenting member chooses to provide one. Report is distributed for review by the faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, and dean.</td>
<td>14 (2)</td>
<td>Faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, and dean submit written responses to the chief academic officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 21</td>
<td>Faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, and dean submit written responses to the chief academic officer.</td>
<td>14 (2)</td>
<td>Chief academic officer reviews timely responses to the report and makes an independent evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 4</td>
<td>Chief academic officer reviews timely responses to the report and makes an independent evaluation.</td>
<td>14 (2)</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>Nov. 18</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>
<td>14 (2)</td>
<td>Chancellor indicates whether or not he or she concurs in the chief academic officer’s determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 2</td>
<td>Chancellor indicates whether or not he or she concurs in the chief academic officer’s determination.</td>
<td>30 (4+)</td>
<td>(1) Within 30 days of the receipt of the PTR Committee report, the faculty member may appeal any conclusion with which he or she disagrees (note: the PTR procedure does not halt based on a faculty member’s appeal).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) If the PTR Committee concludes that the faculty member has not satisfied the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and rank, a PTR improvement plan must be developed using the procedures using for development of an EPPR improvement plan (see next table: Additional Timeline Required if a PTR improvement plan is required).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1</td>
<td>Within 30 days of the receipt of the PTR Committee report, the faculty member may appeal any conclusion with which he or she disagrees.</td>
<td>90 (13)</td>
<td>Within 90 days of the faculty member’s appeal, the Chancellor renders a final decision on the faculty member’s appeal. The decision is not appealable to the President. Within 90 days would be by March 31, 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Timeline for Conducting the PTR (using the tenure process as a basis) – if EXTERNAL REVIEWS are required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Dates</th>
<th>Event begins</th>
<th>Days (Weeks)</th>
<th>Event ends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>Written notice from the chief academic officer that the faculty member is required to have a PTR – normally will occur by July 1.</td>
<td>42 (6)</td>
<td>PTR Committee is selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 12</td>
<td>PTR Committee is selected.</td>
<td>7 (1)</td>
<td>Chief academic officer provides instructions, guidelines, template for report, and best practices to the PTR Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 19</td>
<td>Chief academic officer provides instructions, guidelines, template for report, and best practices to the PTR Committee.</td>
<td>7 (1)</td>
<td>PTR Committee receives all required materials from division chief (if relevant), department chair, from faculty member, and determines if external reviews are needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 26</td>
<td>PTR Committee receives all required materials from division chief (if relevant), department chair, from faculty member, and determines if external reviews are needed.</td>
<td>42 (6)</td>
<td>Allow 2 weeks for deciding if external reviews are required and who will provide external review. Require any external reviews to be received within 4 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 7</td>
<td>Allow 2 weeks for deciding if external reviews are required and who will provide external review. Require any external reviews to be received within 4 weeks.</td>
<td>21 (3)</td>
<td>PTR Committee report is prepared; dissenting explanation prepared if a dissenting member chooses to provide one. Report is distributed for review by the faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, and dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 28</td>
<td>PTR Committee report is prepared; dissenting explanation prepared if a dissenting member chooses to provide one. Report is distributed for review by the faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, and dean.</td>
<td>14 (2)</td>
<td>Faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, and dean submit written responses to the chief academic officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 11</td>
<td>Faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, and dean submit written responses to the chief academic officer.</td>
<td>14 (2)</td>
<td>Chief academic officer reviews timely responses to the report and makes an independent evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 25</td>
<td>Chief academic officer reviews timely responses to the report and makes an independent evaluation.</td>
<td>14 (2)</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>Dec. 9</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>
<td>14 (2)</td>
<td>Chancellor indicates whether or not he or she concurs in the chief academic officer’s determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 23</td>
<td>Chancellor indicates whether or not he or she concurs in the chief academic officer’s determination.</td>
<td>30 (4+)</td>
<td>(1) Within 30 days of the receipt of the PTR Committee report, the faculty member may appeal any conclusion with which he or she disagrees (<em>note: the PTR procedure does not halt based on a faculty member’s appeal</em>). (2) If the PTR Committee concludes that the faculty member has not satisfied the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and rank, a PTR improvement plan must be developed using the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Timeline Required if a PTR Improvement Plan is Required (using the EPPR process as a basis)

If the PTR Committee concludes that the faculty member has not satisfied the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and rank, a PTR improvement plan must be developed using the procedures used for development of an EPPR improvement plan.

The division chief (if relevant) and department chair are encouraged to engage the faculty member in the early stages of development of the PTR improvement plan. If development of the PTR improvement plan becomes the responsibility of the PTR Committee, the committee is encouraged to engage the faculty member in the plan’s development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020 Dates</th>
<th>Event Begins</th>
<th>Days (Weeks)</th>
<th>Event Ends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 6</td>
<td>If a PTR improvement plan is required, the chief academic officer provides written notice to all parties (faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, dean, PTR Committee.</td>
<td>21 (3)</td>
<td>Division chief (if relevant) and department chair submit to the chief academic officer a proposed improvement plan supported by the dean, chief academic officer, and a majority of the PTR Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 27</td>
<td>Division chief (if relevant) and department chair submit to the chief academic officer a proposed improvement plan supported by the dean, chief academic officer, and a majority of the PTR Committee.</td>
<td>14 (2)</td>
<td>If the division chief (if relevant) and department chair fail to produce an improvement plan supported by the dean, chief academic officer, and a majority of the PTR Committee, then the PTR Committee assumes responsibility for drafting a plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 10</td>
<td>If the division chief (if relevant) and department chair fail to produce an improvement plan supported by the dean, chief academic officer, and a majority of the PTR Committee, then the PTR Committee assumes responsibility for drafting a plan.</td>
<td>14 (2)</td>
<td>PTR Committee submits the proposed PTR improvement plan to the dean and chief academic officer for review and approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 24</td>
<td>PTR Committee submits the proposed PTR improvement plan to the dean and chief academic officer for review and approval.</td>
<td>14 (2)</td>
<td>Upon approval by the chief academic officer, the proposed PTR improvement plan is sent to the faculty member for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 9</td>
<td>Upon approval by the chief academic officer, the proposed PTR improvement plan is sent to the faculty member for review.</td>
<td>14 (2)</td>
<td>Faculty member submits to the PTR Committee any written response (including any requested modifications to the improvement plan).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 23</td>
<td>Faculty member submits to the PTR Committee any written response (including any requested modifications to the improvement plan).</td>
<td>14 (2)</td>
<td>PTR Committee considers faculty member’s response and may revise the proposed PTR improvement plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 6</td>
<td>PTR Committee considers faculty member’s response and may revise the proposed PTR improvement plan.</td>
<td>14 (2)</td>
<td>PTR Committee submits the proposed PTR improvement plan to the chief academic officer for review and approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 20</td>
<td>PTR Committee submits the proposed PTR improvement plan to the chief academic officer for review and approval.</td>
<td>7 (1) Chief academic officer reviews the proposed PTR improvement plan, responds to the PTR Committee as needed, and approves a final PTR improvement plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 27</td>
<td>Chief academic officer reviews the proposed PTR improvement plan, responds to the PTR Committee as needed, and approves a final PTR improvement plan.</td>
<td>7 (1) Chief academic officer sends the approved PTR improvement plan to the faculty member, division chief (if relevant), department chair, and dean for implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY
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Committee: Education, Research, and Service
Item: UTIA Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Review of all Tenured Faculty
Type: Action
Presenter(s): Joseph A. DiPietro, President

Background (See Tab 12)

Summary of UTIA Procedures
The template for periodic post-tenure review procedures developed by the President and his staff (see Tab 12) leaves to each campus the choice regarding certain issues, primarily: (1) whether to make its chief academic officer or its college deans responsible for overseeing the process; (2) how to select the post-tenure review committee members; (3) how to conduct external review; and (4) whether to conduct committee voting anonymously or non-anonymously. A summary of UTIA’s choice on these issues appears below, and the complete set of UTIA procedures follows the Resolution for approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility for Post-Tenure Review</th>
<th>Chief Academic Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Selection</td>
<td>The chief academic officer will appoint the committee members after consultation with the faculty member undergoing review and the faculty member’s department head.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Reviews</td>
<td>The chief academic officer selects one reviewer from a list supplied by the faculty member and one reviewer from a list supplied by the tenured faculty in the faculty member’s department; the faculty member himself or herself may request external review in addition to a request from the committee or the dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Committee Voting</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Significant Campus-Level Decisions</td>
<td>If a faculty member receives a rating of does not satisfy expectations for discipline and rank, the faculty member’s improvement plan will be developed using the same procedures as for the Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR) process, including a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
President DiPietro recommends approval of the proposed UTIA’s procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty members.

Motion: I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTIA procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

[Resolution to approve follows]
The University of Tennessee
Board of Trustees

Resolution 00_-2018*
UTIA Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Review of all Tenured Faculty

Resolved: The Board of Trustees approves the UTIA procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty as presented in the meeting materials, which shall be attached to this Resolution after adoption.

Adopted this 2nd day of November, 2018.

* Number will be inserted after adoption.
TEMPLATE
CAMPUS PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC POST-TENURE PERFORMANCE REVIEW

I. Introduction

In its Policies on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure (Board Policy BT0006), the Board of Trustees has recognized and affirmed the importance of tenure in protecting academic freedom and thus promoting the University’s principal mission of discovery and dissemination of knowledge through teaching, research, and service. The Board has also recognized its fiduciary responsibility to students, parents, and all citizens of Tennessee to ensure that faculty members effectively serve the needs of students and the University throughout their careers. To implement these principles, the University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture (UTIA), with the approval of the President and the Board, has established these procedures under which every tenured faculty member shall receive a comprehensive performance review no less often than every six years.

II. Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Period

Except as otherwise provided in these procedures, each tenured faculty member must undergo some form of comprehensive performance review no less often than every six years. The Post-Tenure Review (PTR) shall not substitute for the Annual Performance and Planning Review in the year a faculty member is scheduled for PTR.

The dean(s) of each college or unit shall develop, and submit to the chief academic officer for approval, an initial plan for staggering PTR to avoid excessive administrative burden at any given time. The initial staggering plan may be revised with the approval of the chief academic officer (Chancellor of UTIA) if later developments require changes in order to avoid excessive administrative burden. The PTR period begins at the granting of tenure, and, except as otherwise provided by the staggering plan, a faculty member’s PTR will occur no less often than every six years thereafter unless one of the following circumstances results in a different timetable:

- Suspension of PTR period: A faculty member’s PTR period is suspended during any year in which the faculty member is granted a leave of absence or a modified duties assignment, such as a temporary assignment that differs from the primary, regular appointment.

- Restarting of PTR period due to alternative comprehensive review: A comprehensive review of a faculty member’s performance restarts the faculty member’s PTR period under the following circumstances:
  - If a tenured faculty member undergoes a successful promotion review or a promotion is in progress during the year scheduled for PTR, the promotion review fulfills the PTR requirement and the PTR period is modified to require PTR six years after the promotion review. Since promotions are effective July 1 of each year, the next PTR review must be conducted beginning with the review period that is initiated 5.5 years after the promotion (e.g., promotion on July 1, 2019, results in a PTR beginning in December 2024 and completed in March 2025).
  - If a tenured faculty member undergoes an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR) (generally triggered by annual performance review rating(s)) and is either rated as

...
meeting expectations or successfully completes the terms of the EPPR improvement plan, the EPPR process fulfills the PTR requirement and the PTR cycle is modified to begin with the date of the EPPR Committee’s report.

- Start of the PTR period upon conclusion of an administrative appointment: Full-time administrators and faculty members with a majority administrative appointment (more than 50 percent, as determined by the chief academic officer) are not subject to PTR; faculty members holding a less-than-majority administrative appointment (50 percent or less, as determined by the chief academic officer) are subject to PTR regarding their faculty duties based on expectations consistent with their faculty duty allocation. When a full-time or majority-time administrator leaves his or her administrative position to assume a tenured faculty position, the faculty member’s initial PTR shall occur within six years after leaving the administrative post.

- A faculty member’s scheduled PTR may be waived if the faculty member submits a written and binding commitment to retire no later than one year after the year in which the PTR was scheduled.

- A faculty member’s scheduled PTR may be otherwise deferred or modified only for good cause approved by the chief academic officer.

III. Annual Schedule for Post-Tenure Review (PTR)

All Post-Tenure Reviews (PTR) will be conducted and completed during the spring semester according to the following schedule:

- The chief academic officer shall appoint all PTR Committees as set forth in Section IV below no later than December 1 prior to the spring semester in which the review will occur.

- Each PTR Committee shall be provided with the materials required by Section V below no later than December 31.

- Each PTR Committee shall submit its report required by Section VII below no later than March 31.

- Extensions of these deadlines will be granted only for good cause approved by the chief academic officer.

IV. Appointment and Composition of Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Committee

All Post-Tenure Reviews (PTR) must be conducted by a committee established for the sole purpose of PTR. Each PTR Committee shall include three members, appointed by the chief academic officer after consultation with the faculty member under review and her or his department head. The chief academic officer shall avoid choosing PTR Committee members who have an obvious or apparent conflict of interest. Faculty members who hold administrative appointments at 50 percent or greater, as determined by the chief academic officer, are not eligible to serve. In addition to these general principles of inclusion, the composition of the PTR Committee must meet the following requirements:

- Each PTR Committee member must be a tenured, full-time faculty member who is at the same or higher academic rank and whose locus of tenure is at the same campus as the faculty member being reviewed.
One, and only one, PTR Committee member must hold an appointment in the same department as the faculty member being reviewed, unless there is no such faculty member eligible to serve.

The committee chair will be chosen by the chief academic officer from among the members of the committee who are not from the same department as the faculty member being reviewed.

The three-member PTR Committee for a given faculty member under review is selected from a standing pool of UTIA faculty of full professorial rank serving a three-year term selected by the deans and appointed by the chief academic officer. The pool shall include at least one member from each department. The PTR Committee will include one departmental representative and balanced representation of the responsibilities (e.g., teaching, research, Extension, clinical practice) associated with the faculty member’s appointment. For example, a faculty member with a majority research appointment will have at least one PTR Committee member appointed who also has a majority research appointment.

The chief academic officer will provide a written charge to members of PTR Committees. The charge will include the following elements:

1. Purpose of PTR, as described in Part I of this document;
2. Scope of PTR, as described in Part VI of this document;
3. Process of PTR, as described in Part VII of this document;
4. Obligation to provide a fair and objective review;
5. Obligation to keep confidential the committee’s deliberations and findings; and
6. Any other instructions that the chief academic officer deems necessary to carry out the review.

These elements will be discussed with the pool of faculty members serving on PTR Committees to promote consistency and clarity of the charge, the responsibilities, and the outcomes of the reviews.

Meetings of the PTR Committees shall follow Robert’s Rules of Order. The chair is responsible for organizing and running the meetings. The chair shall ensure committee members have access to all pertinent review documents and will liaise with the chief academic officer, including transmitting committee findings in writing.

V. Materials to be Reviewed by Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Committee

The Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Committee must review the following documents:

1. Annual review materials for each year since the last review or for the last six years in cases where this is the first review, including the following for the time frame spanning the previous six years (to be supplied by the department head):
• Two Annual Performance Review documents for each year of the review period submitted by faculty—one Annual Expectations Form and one Faculty Annual Report for each year;
• Any and all evaluation narratives written by the department head, as well as the Faculty Annual Review Report Form with final performance ratings for each year;
• Any and all responses by the faculty member, deans, and chief academic officer for each Annual Performance Review; and
• Any student and peer evaluation of teaching.

2. Copies of the appropriate department’s and college’s performance criteria for faculty according to rank, as published in the bylaws of the respective units (to be supplied by the department head);
3. A current curriculum vitae of the faculty member under review (to be supplied by the faculty member);
4. A narrative, not to exceed two pages of 12-point text, prepared by the faculty member describing the faculty member’s milestone achievements and accomplishments since the last review as well as goals for the next review period (to be supplied by the faculty member);
5. A copy of the narrative submitted as a part of the faculty member’s previous PTR (to be supplied by the faculty member);
6. External reviews when deemed necessary by the PTR Committee, or the dean of the faculty member’s majority appointment, or when requested by the faculty member undergoing PTR.
   • Letters from no more than three external reviewers may be considered by the PTR Committee;
   • Requests for external letters by faculty undergoing PTR must be made in writing to the committee chair at the time their materials are submitted to the PTR Committee;
   • The chief academic officer, or their designee, shall request the external reviews, in conformity with the following requirements:
     • One reviewer will be chosen from a list provided by the faculty member undergoing PTR;
     • One or more reviewers will be chosen from a list provided by the tenured faculty in the department of the faculty member undergoing PTR;
     • Reviewers shall be selected in accord with the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, Part IV;
   • Each member of the PTR Committees will record the time devoted to the review process.

VI. Criteria for Post-Tenure Review (PTR)

The Post-Tenure Review (PTR) process must assess the faculty member’s continuing professional growth and productivity in the areas of teaching, research (including scholarly, creative, and artistic work), service, and/or clinical care pertinent to his or her faculty responsibilities. The criteria for assessing the faculty member’s performance must be consistent with established expectations of the department, school/college, and campus and provide sufficient flexibility to consider changes in academic responsibilities and/or expectations. The expectations for faculty performance may differ by college, department, and even among subdisciplines within a department or program. Those expectations may be commonly held standards in the discipline or subdiscipline. Those expectations 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 *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).

VII. Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Committee’s Conclusions and Report

The Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Committee is charged to assess the faculty member’s performance during the review period and to conclude whether the faculty member’s performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank. The PTR Committee’s voting must be conducted by anonymous ballots. Voting is to be done in person as part of a committee’s deliberations; neither proxies or in absentia votes are allowed. All conclusions and recommendations shall be adopted upon the vote of a simple majority of the PTR Committee. No member of the PTR Committee may abstain or recuse himself or herself from voting. Based on the judgment of its members, the PTR Committee must conclude either

- That the faculty member’s performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank, or
- That the faculty member’s performance does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank.

The committee must report its conclusions and recommendations in writing using a standard format prepared by the chief academic officer, including (1) an enumeration of the anonymously cast vote, (2) the supporting reasons for its conclusion, (3) a dissenting explanation for any conclusion that is not adopted unanimously if a dissenting member chooses to provide one, (4) identification of any incongruences observed between the faculty member’s performance and his or her annual evaluations, (5) a statement of any additional concerns identified or actions recommended, (6) if applicable, an identification of areas of extraordinary contribution and/or performance, and (7) a summary of the time spent by the PTR Committee in conducting the report and developing the report and recommendation.

The detailed PTR Committee report shall be provided to the faculty member, department head, appropriate deans, and chief academic officer. The department head will write a response indicating support or dissent with the PTR Committee report and send it to the faculty member, appropriate deans, and the chief academic officer. Following the receipt of the department head letter, the appropriate deans will write a response indicating support or dissent with the PTR Committee report and the department head, and send it to the faculty member, the department head, and the chief academic officer.

Upon receipt of the report and each subsequent response by department heads and deans, faculty members, department heads, and deans must have the opportunity to provide a written response to the PTR Committee report. The chief academic officer shall either accept or reject the PTR Committee’s determination that the faculty member’s performance satisfies or does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank after considering the responses of the department head and the dean(s). If the PTR Committee report is not unanimous, the chief academic officer shall provide the supporting reasons for his or her determination. If the chief academic officer does not concur in a determination, then he or she shall provide the supporting reasons for the non-concurrence. The chief academic officer’s determination—and any written responses of the faculty member, department head/chair, and the dean—will be maintained with the PTR Committee report in the chief academic officer’s office, and submitted electronically to the University of Tennessee Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success, with copies provided to the dean(s) and the department head.
VIII. Further Actions

If, as a result of Post-Tenure Review (PTR), the chief academic officer concludes that the faculty member’s performance has not satisfied the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and rank, a PTR improvement plan must be developed. A peer review committee to develop the improvement plan will be appointed as specified in Section 3 of Board Policy BT0006, Appendix E. This committee will be provided the review materials submitted as outlined in Section V above and the results of the PTR Review as outlined in Section VII above. This peer review committee will be charged with the development of an improvement plan, following the procedures and timeline as detailed in Board Policy BT0006, Appendix E, as included in Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook.

If, as a result of PTR, the chief academic officer concludes that deficiencies exist in the departmental annual performance review process (including failure of department heads to conduct rigorous annual performance reviews) or other incongruences are observed between the PTR performance review and rankings assigned through the annual performance review process, the chief academic officer must develop a process for addressing the issues. Any such process developed by the chief academic officer will have no bearing on the requirement that a PTR improvement plan be developed for a faculty member who has not satisfied expectations for rank.

All documents related to the PTR process will be submitted electronically to the University of Tennessee Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success.

IX. Appeal

The faculty member under review may appeal the chief academic officer’s determination regarding the outcome of Post-Tenure Review (PTR) within thirty days of notification of that outcome. The procedure for appeal is described in Chapter 5 of the Faculty Handbook, except that a final decision on the appeal shall be made within ninety days of the faculty member’s appeal, and the final decision of the Chancellor on an appeal shall not be appealable to the President.

X. Annual Report to the Board of Trustees

The chief academic officer shall prepare an annual assessment report of campus Post-Tenure Review (PTR) processes, procedures, and outcomes for submission by the Chancellor to the Board of Trustees, through the President, no later than June 1 of each year. The report shall include a description of any deficiencies identified in departmental annual performance review processes and the plan for addressing the issues.

The annual report will also include a summary of the time and resources devoted to PTRs conducted during the year. A public version of the report will be produced that protects individual identities of PTR results. The public version will be made available to all faculty.
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: November 2, 2018
Committee: Education, Research, and Service
Item: UTK Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Review of all Tenured Faculty
Type: Action
Presenter(s): Joseph A. DiPietro, President

Background (See Tab 12)

Summary of UTK Procedures
The template for periodic post-tenure review procedures developed by the President and his staff (see Tab 12) leaves to each campus the choice regarding certain issues, primarily: (1) whether to make its chief academic officer or its college deans responsible for overseeing the process; (2) how to select the post-tenure review committee members; (3) how to conduct external review; and (4) whether to conduct committee voting anonymously or non-anonymously. A summary of UTK’s choice on these issues appears below, and the complete set of UTK procedures follows the Resolution for approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility for Post-Tenure Review</th>
<th>Chief Academic Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Selection</td>
<td>College deans nominate members to serve on a campus-wide pool of potential committee members; the chief academic officer chooses members of individual committees from this pool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Reviews</td>
<td>No method for selecting external reviewers is specified - UTK will use the selection method used for selecting external reviewers for tenure decisions as set forth in its Manual for Faculty Evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Type of Committee Voting             | Anonymous |
| Other Significant Campus-Level Decisions | If a faculty member receives a rating of “does not satisfy expectations for discipline and rank,” the faculty member enters the Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review process. |

[continued on next page]
President DiPietro recommends approval of the proposed UTK procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty members.

Motion: I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTK procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

[Resolution to approve follows]
The University of Tennessee  
Board of Trustees  

Resolution 00_-2018*  
UTK Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Review of all Tenured Faculty

Resolved: The Board of Trustees approves the UTK procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty as presented in the meeting materials, which shall be attached to this Resolution after adoption.

Adopted this 2nd day of November, 2018.

* Number will be inserted after adoption.
UTK PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC POST-TENURE PERFORMANCE REVIEW

I. Introduction

In its Policies on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure (Board Policy BT0006), the Board of Trustees has recognized and affirmed the importance of tenure in protecting academic freedom and thus promoting the University’s principal mission of discovery and dissemination of knowledge through teaching, research, and service. The Board has also recognized its fiduciary responsibility to students, parents, and all citizens of Tennessee to ensure that faculty members effectively serve the needs of students and the University throughout their careers. In order to affirm the importance of tenure and carry out its fiduciary responsibilities, the Board revised BT0006 and established mandatory periodic comprehensive performance reviews for eligible tenured faculty. In compliance with this requirement, UTK, with the approval of the President and the Board, has established the following procedures under which each eligible tenured faculty member shall receive a comprehensive performance review no less often than every six years.

II. Post-Tenure Review ("PTR") Period

Except as otherwise provided in these procedures, each tenured faculty member must undergo some form of comprehensive performance review no less often than every six years. The PTR shall not substitute for the Annual Performance and Planning Review in the year a faculty member is scheduled for PTR.

The dean of each college shall develop, and submit to the chief academic officer for approval, an initial plan for staggering post-tenure reviews. The initial staggering plan may be revised with the approval of the chief academic officer if later developments require changes in order to avoid excessive administrative burden. The post-tenure review period begins at the granting of tenure, and, except as otherwise provided by the staggering plan, a faculty member’s PTR will occur no less often than every six years thereafter unless one of the following circumstances results in a different timetable:

- **Suspension of post-tenure review period**: A faculty member’s post-tenure review period is suspended during any year in which the faculty member is granted a leave of absence or a modified duties assignment under UTK’s Family Care Policy.

- **Restarting of post-tenure review period due to alternative comprehensive review**: A comprehensive review of a faculty member’s performance restarts the faculty member’s PTR period under the following circumstances:
  - If a tenured faculty member undergoes a successful promotion review or a promotion is in progress during the year scheduled for PTR, the promotion review fulfills the PTR requirement and the PTR period is modified to require PTR six years after the promotion review.
  - If a tenured faculty member undergoes an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR) (generally triggered by annual performance review rating(s)) and is either rated as meeting expectations or successfully completes the terms of the EPPR improvement plan,

Knoxville PPPR Procedures Final.docx  October 3, 2018
the EPPR process fulfills the PTR requirement and the PTR cycle is modified to begin with the date of the EPPR committee’s report.

- **Start of the PTR period upon conclusion of an administrative appointment:** Full time administrators and faculty members with a majority administrative appointment (including, but not limited to, deans, associate deans, directors, and department heads, or as determined by the chief academic officer) are not subject to PTR; faculty members holding a less-than-majority administrative appointment (as determined by the chief academic officer) are subject to PTR regarding their faculty duties based on expectations consistent with their faculty duty allocation. When a full-time or majority-time administrator leaves his or her administrative position to assume a tenured faculty position, the faculty member’s initial PTR shall occur within six years after leaving the administrative position.

- A faculty member’s scheduled PTR may be waived if the faculty member submits a written and binding commitment to retire no later than one year after the year in which the PTR was scheduled.

- A faculty member’s scheduled PTR may be otherwise deferred or modified only for good cause, as determined and approved by the chief academic officer.

**III. Annual Schedule for Post-Tenure Review**

All post-tenure reviews will be conducted and completed during the spring semester according to the following schedule:

- The chief academic officer, in consultation with the dean of each college, shall appoint all PTR Committees as set forth in Section IV below no later than December 1 prior to the spring semester in which the review will occur.

- The chief academic officer shall provide each PTR Committee and the faculty member under review with the materials required by Section V below no later than January 15.

- Each PTR Committee shall submit its report required by Section VII below no later than March 31.

- Extensions of these deadlines will be granted only for good cause approved by the chief academic officer.

**IV. Appointment and Composition of Post-Tenure Review Committee**

All post-tenure reviews will be conducted by a committee established for the sole purpose of post-tenure review. Each PTR Committee will include three (3) members, appointed by the chief academic officer, who will avoid choosing PTR Committee members with obvious or apparent conflicts of interest. Faculty members who hold administrative appointments, as determined by the chief academic officer, are not eligible to serve.
In addition to these general principles of inclusion, the composition of the PTR Committee must meet the following requirements:

- Each PTR Committee member must be a tenured full-time faculty member who is at the same or higher academic rank, and whose locus of tenure is at the same campus, as the faculty member being reviewed.

- One, and only one, PTR Committee member must hold an appointment in the same department as the faculty member being reviewed, unless there is no such faculty member eligible to serve.

- The committee chair will be appointed by the chief academic officer from among the members of the committee who are not from the same department as the faculty member being reviewed.

The chief academic officer will also be responsible for establishing a university-wide pool of faculty members to serve on PTR committees. The pool will be constituted in the following manner:

- Each college dean will provide nominees to the chief academic officer, according to the following considerations:
  
  - In colleges with departments, the dean will nominate individuals who are eligible to serve on a PTR committee of any colleague from the same department who is scheduled to be reviewed in that academic year. The total number of nominees put forward by the dean will be determined by the number of faculty from unique departments who are scheduled for review in that academic year. For example, if there are 20 faculty members in 14 unique departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, the dean of the college will submit 14 nominees, one from each of the unique departments. A college with departments must nominate at least one faculty member even if no faculty from that college are scheduled to undergo PPPR in a given year.
  
  - In colleges without departments, each dean will nominate one faculty member for the university-wide pool.

  - Each college will determine the process whereby nominees are selected and recommended to the chief academic officer.

  - Nominees will serve for a minimum of one year, and they may serve for up to three years, as recommended by the deans.

  - At his or her discretion, the chief academic officer may ask deans to provide additional nominees or replacements for those nominated.

In consultation with the dean of the college of the faculty member under review, the chief academic officer will appoint and provide a written charge to the committee. The charge will include the following elements:

1. Purpose of PTR, as described in Part I of this document;

2. Scope of PTR, as described in Part VI of this document;
3. Process of PTR, as described in Part VII of this document;

4. Materials to be reviewed in PTR, as described in Part V of this document; the chief academic officer will emphasize that only in rare circumstances, and where expertise to evaluate the faculty member’s scholarly output cannot otherwise be obtained, will the committee request external letters of assessment.

5. Obligation to provide a fair and objective review;

6. Obligation to keep confidential the committee’s deliberations and findings;

7. Any other instructions that the chief academic officer deems necessary to carry out the review.

V. Materials to be Reviewed by Post-Tenure Review Committee

The PTR Committee must review the following documents:

1. Annual review materials for each year since the last review or for the last six years in cases where this is the first review, including the following:
   a. APPR summary rating forms from the UTK Online Faculty Review System;
   b. Any and all evaluation narratives written by department head during the PTR period;
   c. Any and all responses by the faculty member, dean, and chief academic officer for each APPR;
   d. SAIS / End of Course Survey forms for the PTR period;
   e. Any peer evaluation of teaching for the PTR period;

   A, b, and c will be supplied by the Office of the Chief Academic Officer. D and e will be supplied by the department head.

2. Copies of the appropriate department’s and college’s performance expectations for faculty according to rank, as published in the bylaws of the respective units (to be supplied by the department head);

3. A current curriculum vitae of the faculty member under review (to be supplied by the faculty member);

4. A narrative, not to exceed two pages, prepared by the faculty member describing the faculty member’s milestone achievements and accomplishments for the review period as well as goals for the next review period (to be supplied by the faculty member);

5. If this is not the first PTR, a copy of the narrative submitted as a part of the faculty member’s previous PTR (to be supplied by the faculty member);

6. External reviews only when deemed necessary by the PTR Committee or the chief academic officer.

VI. Criteria for Post-Tenure Review

The post-tenure review process must assess the faculty member’s continuing professional growth and productivity in the areas of teaching, research (including scholarly, creative and artistic work), service, and/or clinical care pertinent to his or her faculty responsibilities. The criteria for assessing the faculty
member’s performance must be consistent with established expectations of the department, school/college, and campus and provide sufficient flexibility to consider changes over time in the faculty member’s academic responsibilities and/or the department’s expectations. The expectations for faculty performance may differ by campus, college, department, and even within a department or program. Those expectations may be commonly held standards in the discipline or sub-discipline, and should be published in the unit’s bylaws. In addition, they may be stated explicitly in the faculty member’s past annual performance reviews, work assignments, goals, or other planning tools (however identified). They may also be found in college bylaws, the Faculty Handbook, and in other generally applicable policies and procedures (for example, fiscal, human resources, safety, research, or information technology policies and procedures).

VII. Post-Tenure Review Committee’s Conclusions and Report

The PTR Committee is charged to assess the faculty member’s performance during the review period and to conclude whether the faculty member’s performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank. The PTR Committee’s voting must be conducted by anonymous ballots. All conclusions and recommendations shall be adopted upon the vote of a simple majority of the PTR Committee. No member of the PTR Committee may abstain or recuse himself or herself from voting. Based on the judgment of its members, the PTR Committee must conclude either

- That the faculty member’s performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank, or

- That the faculty member’s performance does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank.

The committee must report its conclusions and recommendations in writing using a standard format prepared by the chief academic officer, including (1) an enumeration of the anonymously cast vote; (2) the supporting reasons for its conclusion; (3) in cases where there is a dissenting vote, the report shall include a record of the grounds for the dissenting vote, as those grounds were expressed in the committee’s deliberations; (4) identification of any incongruences observed between the faculty member’s performance and his or her annual evaluations, (5) a statement of any additional concerns identified or actions recommended; (6) if appropriate, an identification of areas of extraordinary contribution or performance; and (7) a summary of the time spent by the PTR committee in conducting the PPPR.

The detailed PTR Committee report shall be provided to the faculty member, department head, dean, and chief academic officer.

1. Upon receipt of the report, faculty members and department heads have fourteen (14) calendar days to provide the dean with a written response to the PTR Committee report.

2. The dean will consider any written responses in a decision to either accept or reject the PTR Committee’s determination that the faculty member’s performance satisfies or does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank. If the PTR Committee report is not unanimous, or if the dean does not accept the PTR Committee’s determination, the dean shall provide supporting reasons for his or her determination. Within fourteen (14) calendar days of the end of the response period for the faculty member’s and department head’s
responses, if any, the dean will provide his or her recommendation and any supporting reasons to the chief academic officer regarding the PTR Committee report, with a copy to the faculty member and the department head.

3. Upon receipt of the dean’s recommendation, the faculty member has fourteen (14) calendar days to provide the chief academic officer with a written response to the dean’s recommendation.

4. At the end of the fourteen-calendar-day response period, the chief academic officer shall notify the candidate under review whether he or she concurs or does not concur in the dean’s determination. If the chief academic officer does not concur in a determination, then he or she shall provide the supporting reasons for the non-concurrence.

VIII. Further Actions

If, as a result of PTR, the chief academic officer concludes that the faculty member’s performance has not satisfied the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and rank, an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR) will be initiated, as detailed in Board Policy BT0006, Appendix E, as included in Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook. The triggering of EPPR will run concurrently with any appeal undertaken by the faculty member, as described in section IX, below.

If, upon review of the PTR report, the chief academic officer believes that deficiencies exist in the departmental annual performance review process (including failure of department heads to conduct rigorous annual performance reviews) or observes incongruences between the PTR performance review and rankings assigned through the annual performance review process, the chief academic officer must develop a process for addressing the issues. Any such process developed by the chief academic officer will have no bearing on the requirement that an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review be initiated for a faculty member who has not satisfied expectations for rank.

All documents related to the PTR process will be maintained in the Online Faculty Review and submitted electronically to the University of Tennessee Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success.

IX. Appeal

The faculty member under review may appeal the chief academic officer’s determination regarding the outcome of PTR within thirty (30) calendar days of notification of that outcome. The procedure for appeal is described in Chapter 5 of the Faculty Handbook, except that the administrative appeal is to the Chancellor, a final decision on the appeal shall be made within ninety (90) days of the faculty member’s appeal, and the final decision of the Chancellor on an appeal shall not be appealable to the President.

X. Annual Report to the Board of Trustees

The chief academic officer shall prepare an annual assessment report of campus post-tenure review processes, procedures and outcomes for submission by the Chancellor to the Board of Trustees, through the President, no later than June 1 of each year. The report shall include a description of any deficiencies identified in departmental annual performance review processes and the plan for addressing the issues.

The annual report will also include a summary of the time and resources devoted to the post-tenure reviews conducted during the year. A public version of the report that protects individual identities will be made available to all faculty.
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: November 2, 2018

Committee: Education, Research, and Service

Item: UTM Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Review of all Tenured Faculty

Type: Action

Presenter(s): Joseph A. DiPietro, President

**Background (See Tab 12)**

**Summary of UTM Procedures**

The template for periodic post-tenure review procedures developed by the President and his staff (see Tab 12) leaves to each campus the choice regarding certain issues, primarily: (1) whether to make its chief academic officer or its college deans responsible for overseeing the process; (2) how to select the post-tenure review committee members; (3) how to conduct external review; and (4) whether to conduct committee voting anonymously or non-anonymously. A summary of UTM’s choice on these issues appears below, and the complete set of UTM procedures follows the Resolution for approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility for Post-Tenure Review</th>
<th>College Deans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Selection</td>
<td>The dean selects the members of the committees without any stated restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Reviews</td>
<td>The dean selects external reviewers from a list supplied by the faculty member undergoing review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Committee Voting</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

President DiPietro recommends approval of the proposed UTM procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty members.

**Motion:** I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTM procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

[Resolution to approve follows]
Resolved: The Board of Trustees approves the UTM procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty as presented in the meeting materials, which shall be attached to this Resolution after adoption.

Adopted this 2nd day of November, 2018.

* Number will be inserted after adoption.
The University of Tennessee at Martin

Change to UT Martin Faculty Handbook

Addition of Appendix B – Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review (PPPR)

Summary of Change

Addition of procedures for conducting PPPR. Procedures are referenced in section 2.5.5 being added to the UT Martin Faculty Handbook.

Submitted for Approval:

October 17, 2018

APPENDIX B – PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC POST-TENURE PERFORMANCE REVIEW (PPPR)

I. Introduction

In its Policies on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure (Board Policy BT0006), the Board of Trustees has recognized and affirmed the importance of tenure in protecting academic freedom and thus promoting the University’s principal mission of discovery and dissemination of truth through teaching, research, and service. The Board has also recognized its fiduciary responsibility to students, parents, and all citizens of Tennessee to ensure that faculty members effectively serve the needs of students and the University throughout their careers. To implement these principles, the University of Tennessee at Martin, with the approval of the President and the Board, has established these procedures under which every tenured faculty member shall receive a comprehensive performance review no less often than every six years.

II. Post-Tenure Review (“PTR”) Period

Except as otherwise provided in these procedures, each tenured faculty member must undergo some form of comprehensive performance review no less often than every six years. The PTR shall not substitute for the Annual Performance and Planning Review in the year a faculty member is scheduled for PTR.

The dean of each college shall develop, and submit to the chief academic officer for approval, an initial plan for staggering post-tenure reviews to avoid excessive administrative burden at any given time. The initial staggering plan may be revised with the approval of the chief academic officer if later developments require changes in order to avoid excessive administrative burden. The post-tenure review period begins at the granting of tenure, and, except as otherwise provided by the staggering plan, a faculty member’s PTR will occur no less often than every six years thereafter unless one of the following circumstances results in a different timetable:

1 See also sections 2.5.4 and 2.5.5 of the Faculty Handbook on post-tenure review under “PPPR.”
• Suspension of post-tenure review period – A faculty member’s post-tenure review period is suspended during any year in which the faculty member is granted a leave of absence or a modified duties assignment.

• Restarting of post-tenure review period due to alternative comprehensive review – A comprehensive review of a faculty member’s performance restarts the faculty member’s PTR period under the following circumstances:
  o If a tenured faculty member undergoes a successful promotion review or a promotion is in progress during the year scheduled for PTR, the promotion review fulfills the PTR requirement and the PTR period is modified to require PTR six years after the promotion review.
  o If a tenured faculty member undergoes an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR) (generally triggered by annual performance review rating(s)) and is either rated as meeting expectations or successfully completes the terms of the EPPR improvement plan, the EPPR process fulfills the PTR requirement and the PTR cycle is modified to begin with the date of the EPPR committee’s report.

• Start of the PTR period upon conclusion of an administrative appointment – Full time administrators and faculty members with a majority administrative appointment (more than 50%) are not subject to PTR; faculty members holding a less than majority administrative appointment (50% or less) are subject to PTR regarding their faculty duties based on expectations consistent with their faculty duty allocation. When a full-time or majority-time administrator leaves his or her administrative position to assume a tenured faculty position, the faculty member’s initial PTR shall occur within six years after leaving the administrative post.

• Faculty members who have made a binding commitment to retire, within 12 months of the scheduled PTR, following the procedures determined by the Human Resources Office, are exempt from the scheduled PTR.

• A faculty member’s scheduled PTR may be otherwise deferred or modified only for good cause approved by the chief academic officer.

III. Annual Schedule for Post-Tenure Review

All post-tenure reviews will be conducted and completed during the Spring semester according to the following schedule:

• The dean of the faculty member’s college shall appoint all PTR Committees as set forth in Section IV below no later than November 15.

• Each PTR Committee shall be provided with the materials required by Section V below no later than January 15.

• Each PTR Committee shall submit its report required by Section VII below no later than March 31.

• If the dean or the committee request an external review, the request must be made no later than February 15.
IV. Appointment and Composition of Post-Tenure Review Committee

All post-tenure reviews must be conducted by a committee established for the sole purpose of post-tenure review. Each PTR Committee shall include three members, appointed by the dean of the faculty member’s college in the following manner: The Dean in the faculty member’s college will appoint a review committee and instruct the committee’s members on review procedures. The dean will ensure that no faculty member who has an actual or apparent conflict of interest is selected. In the event that a conflict of interest for one of the committee members is identified during the committee’s review, the dean will appoint an alternate faculty member to replace that committee member.

The composition of the PTR Committee must meet the following requirements:

- Each PTR Committee member must be a tenured full-time faculty member who is at the same or higher academic rank, and whose locus of tenure is at the same campus, as the faculty member being reviewed.
- One, and only one, PTR Committee member must hold an appointment in the same department as the faculty member being reviewed, unless there is no such faculty member eligible to serve.

The chief academic officer, working with the University of Tennessee Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success, will provide instructions, guidelines, and best practices to members of PTR Committees.

V. Materials to be Reviewed by Post-Tenure Review Committee

The PTR Committee must review (1) annual review materials (including the department head’s/chair’s evaluation and rating of the faculty member’s performance, and student and any peer evaluation of teaching) for each year since the last review (to be supplied by the department head/chair); (2) the faculty member’s current CV; a narrative, not to exceed two pages, prepared by the faculty member describing the faculty member’s milestone achievements and accomplishments since the last review as well as goals for the next review period; and (if there has been a previous PTR) a copy of the narrative submitted as a part of the faculty member’s previous PTR (each to be supplied by the faculty member); and (3) external reviews when deemed necessary by the PTR Committee or when deemed necessary by the dean of the faculty member’s college. If a request for an external review is approved by the VCAA, the candidate will each provide a list of three potential reviewers and a description of why they are qualified. The dean will select the reviewers. In the event of a disagreement between the faculty member and the dean about the selection, the VCAA will make the selection. The dean will be responsible for requesting the letters from the reviewers.

VI. Criteria for Post-Tenure Review

The post-tenure review process should ensure the faculty member has demonstrated continued professional growth and productivity in the areas of teaching, research (including scholarly, creative and artistic work), service, and/or clinical care pertinent to his or her faculty responsibilities. The criteria for assessing the faculty member’s performance must be consistent with established expectations of the department, school/college, and campus and provide sufficient flexibility to consider changes in academic responsibilities and/or expectations. 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 sub-discipline. Those expectations 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).

VII. **Post-Tenure Review Committee’s Conclusions and Report**

The PTR Committee is charged to review the faculty member’s performance during the review period and to conclude whether the faculty member’s performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank. The PTR Committee’s voting must be conducted by anonymous ballots. All conclusions and recommendations shall be adopted upon the vote of a simple majority of the PTR Committee. No member of the PTR Committee may abstain or recuse himself or herself from voting. Based on the judgment of its members, the PTR Committee must conclude either:

- That the faculty member’s performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank; or

- That the faculty member’s performance does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank.

The committee must report its conclusions and recommendations in writing using a standard format prepared by the chief academic officer, including (1) an enumeration of the anonymously cast vote, (2) the supporting reasons for its conclusion, (3) a dissenting explanation from the committee if the vote is not unanimous, (4) an identification of any incongruences observed between the faculty member’s performance and his or her annual evaluations, (5) a statement of any additional concerns identified or actions recommended, and (6) if applicable, an identification of areas of extraordinary contribution and/or performance.

The detailed PTR Committee report shall be provided to the faculty member, department head/chair, dean, and chief academic officer.

Faculty members and department heads/chairs must have the opportunity to provide a written response to the PTR Committee report. The dean shall either accept or reject the PTR Committee’s determination that the faculty member’s performance satisfies or does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank. The VCAA and the Chancellor shall indicate whether or not they concur in the dean’s determination. If the PTR Committee report is not unanimous, the dean shall provide the supporting reasons for his or her determination. If the dean, the VCAA, or the Chancellor do not concur in a determination, then he or she shall provide the supporting reasons for the non-concurrence. The dean’s determination, the VCAA’s and Chancellor’s concurrences, and any written responses of the faculty member and department head/chair will be maintained with the PTR Committee report in the VCAA’s office and submitted electronically to the University of Tennessee Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success.

VIII. **Appeal**

Within thirty days of receipt of the PTR Committee report, the faculty member may appeal any conclusion with which the faculty member disagrees. The procedure for appeal is described in Section 4.4.3, except that a final decision on the appeal shall be made within ninety (90) days of the faculty member’s appeal, and the final decision of the Chancellor on an appeal shall not be appealable to the President.

IX. **Further Actions**

If the PTR Committee concludes that the faculty member’s performance has not satisfied the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and rank, a PTR improvement plan must be developed using the same
procedures used for the development of an EPPR improvement plan as detailed in Board Policy BT0006 Appendix E.

If the VCAA concludes that deficiencies exist in the departmental annual performance review process (including failure of department heads/chairs to conduct rigorous annual performance reviews) or other incongruences are observed between the PTR performance review and rankings assigned through the annual performance review process, the VCAA will develop a process for addressing the issues.

X. Annual Report to the Board of Trustees

The VCAA shall prepare an annual assessment report of campus post-tenure review processes, procedures and outcomes for submission by the Chancellor to the Board of Trustees, through the President, no later than June 1 of each year. The report shall include a description of any deficiencies identified in departmental annual performance review processes and the plan for addressing the issues.
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: November 2, 2018
Committee: Education, Research, and Service
Item: Tenure upon Initial Appointment at UTHSC
Type: Action
Presenter(s): Joseph A. DiPietro, President

Note: The following background information applies to all three candidates for tenure upon initial appointment at UTHSC presented at Tabs 19-21.

Background

1. One of several revisions the Board approved to its tenure policy on March 23, 2018 delegated to the President authority to grant tenure to faculty members except in the following three cases:
   - Officers of the University (as defined by the Bylaws of the Board) who concurrently hold a faculty appointment;
   - Any faculty member who is to be granted tenure upon initial appointment without serving a probationary period at a University campus; and
   - Any faculty member to be tenured after serving less than a six-year probationary period.

2. The revisions to the Board’s tenure policy include the following additional requirements for granting tenure upon initial appointment:
   - The Board will grant tenure upon initial appointment only if (1) the candidate was tenured at the institution from which he or she was recruited and could not have been successfully recruited without being considered for tenure upon initial appointment; or (2) other exceptional circumstances warrant the grant of tenure upon initial appointment.
   - The President’s recommendation to the Board for tenure upon initial appointment must include (1) documentation that the candidate would not have been successfully recruited without being considered for tenure upon initial appointment; and (2) documentation of compliance with the minimum tenure review and recommendation procedures required by the Board’s tenure policy and any further requirements established by the campus.
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: November 2, 2018
Committee: Education, Research, and Service
Item: Tenure upon Initial Appointment at UTHSC – Paul Hauptman, M.D.
Type: Action
Presenter(s): Joseph A. DiPietro, President

Background (See Tab 18)

Summary
On October 1, 2018, Paul Hauptman, M.D., began employment with the UT Health Science Center as Dean of the Graduate School of Medicine at the UT Medical Center in Knoxville, with a concurrent faculty appointment in the Department of Medicine (within the College of Medicine). Chancellor Schwab has recommended to the President that tenure be granted to Dr. Hauptman in his faculty appointment without serving a probationary period. Dr. Hauptman was recruited from the Saint Louis University School of Medicine, where he was a tenured Professor in the Department of Internal Medicine and Assistant Dean for Clinical and Translational Research.

Dr. Hauptman has published over 90 peer-reviewed publications, four book chapters, and 80 peer-reviewed abstracts. He is co-editor of a book focused on congestive heart failure and serves as editor-in-chief of the Journal of Cardiac Failure. He currently has funding for three grants as principal or co-principal investigator and two industry-sponsored clinical trials. He has a total of more than $7 million in completed funding. Dr. Hauptman has lectured medical students, fellows, and residents and has received awards and recognition for his teaching.

The President has confirmed that Dr. Hauptman satisfies all requirements for tenure upon initial appointment, including (1) that he could not have been successfully recruited from his faculty appointment, with tenure, as Professor of Internal Medicine in the Saint Louis University School of Medicine without being considered for tenure upon initial appointment at UTHSC; and (2) that all required tenure review and recommendation procedures were followed by the campus. Dr. Hauptman received the unanimous positive vote of both the departmental and college tenure committees, as well as the positive recommendation of the Acting Dean of the College of Medicine, the Chief Academic Officer, and Chancellor Schwab.
After his independent review of Dr. Hauptman’s tenure dossier, the President recommends that the Board grant tenure to Dr. Hauptman in his faculty appointment in the Department of Medicine within the UTHSC College of Medicine. Dr. Hauptman’s curriculum vitae is included in the meeting materials.

Motion: I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend to the Board that tenure be granted to Paul Hauptman, M.D., in his faculty appointment in the Department of Medicine within the UTHSC College of Medicine by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

[Resolution follows]
The University of Tennessee
Board of Trustees

Resolution 00_-2018*
Grant of Tenure upon Initial Appointment to Paul Hauptman, M.D.

Resolved: Upon the recommendation of the President, the Board of Trustees grants tenure to Paul Hauptman, M.D., in his faculty appointment in the Department of Medicine within the UTHSC College of Medicine.

Adopted this 2nd day of November, 2018.

* Number will be inserted after adoption.
October 2, 2018

MEMORANDUM

TO:        Joe DiPietro, President
            University of Tennessee

FR:        Steve J. Schwab, Chancellor
            University of Tennessee Health Science Center

RE:        Recommendation for Expedited Tenure for Dr. Paul J. Hauptman

On October 1, 2018, Dr. Paul J. Hauptman, MD, will assume his role as Professor in the Department of Medicine. He will also serve as the Dean of the Graduate School of Medicine and Senior Vice President and Chief Academic Officer at the University of Tennessee Medical Center. We are seeking your approval for an expedited tenure request for Dr. Hauptman, given his exceptional qualifications in academic leadership, teaching, research and patient care and service.

Dr. Hauptman received his undergraduate degree from Columbia University and his medical degree from Cornell University Medical College. He completed his residency and fellowship in internal medicine at Brigham and Women's Hospital in Boston. He served as a clinical fellow in Medicine at Harvard and as a clinical fellow in Cardiology at Mount Sinai Hospital. He also served as a research/clinical fellow in Medicine in the Cardiovascular Division at Brigham and Women's Hospital and as a research fellow in Medicine at Harvard Medical School. He is board certified in advanced Heart Failure and Transplant Cardiology.

Dr. Hauptman comes to UTHSC from the Saint Louis University School of Medicine where he is a tenured professor in the Department of Internal Medicine and the Assistant Dean for Clinical and Translational Research. He has taught at Harvard Medical School and Saint Louis University Schools of Medicine and Public Health.

As noted in his attached CV, Dr. Hauptman has an extensive publication history, reflecting primarily senior author status, with over 90 peer-reviewed publications, 4 book chapters, and 80 peer-reviewed abstracts. He is co-editor of one book focused on congestive heart failure. He serves on review panels for research and clinical trials. He holds a number of leadership roles at national and international cardiovascular societies and is on the editorial board of Heart Failure Reviews and is Editor-in-chief for the Journal of Cardiac Failure. He has served as chair or member of 17 Clinical Trial and Registry Committees. Dr. Hauptman has an active research history. Currently, he lists, as Principal Investigator, Co-Principal
Investigator, active funding for three grants and also has two active industry-sponsored clinical trials (3/4 of that from NIH sources, the remainder from non-federal sources) and completed funding of more than $7 million.

Dr. Hauptman has lectured medical students, fellows and residents. His work as a teacher has been recognized with teaching awards and recognition. He served on dissertation committees in the School of Public Health at St. Louis and has mentored students, residents, fellows and faculty.

Dr. Hauptman’s external letters of recommendation are from distinguished tenured professors at Baylor University Medical Center at Dallas, University of Colorado School of Medicine, and Saint Louis University (three recommendations). The reviewers speak to his excellence across mission areas – “he has generated both local and national reputation as a skilled physician, substantial scholar and content expert in heart failure.” He has “built a regional, national and international reputation, based on his multidimensional talents, as a researcher, clinical scientist, administrator, and as a journal editor.”

Dr. Hauptman’s academic appointment will be in the Department of Medicine in the College of Medicine. His future colleagues within that department have overwhelmingly supported his receipt of tenure (4 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions). The College of Medicine’s Collegiate Promotion and Tenure Committee gave their unanimous positive vote in support of tenure (2 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain), as well as a positive vote for rank of professor (3 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain). Dr. Rajiv Dhand, Chair of the Department and Dr. Polly Hofmann, the Senior Executive Associate Dean and Acting Dean for Promotion and Tenure in the College of Medicine offered their strong support of Dr. Hauptman’s expedited tenure. Clearly, I am strongly supportive of the award of expedited tenure to Dr. Hauptman. He is well-positioned to continue his exceptional work in cardiovascular treatment and transplantation and I am confident he will make extraordinary contributions to our institution.

Sincerely,

Steve Schwab, MD
Chancellor
University of Tennessee Health Science Center

cc: Lori Gonzalez, PhD, Chief Academic Officer
    Polly Hofmann, PhD, Senior Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs
    Rajiv Dhand, MD, Chair, Department of Medicine
CURRICULUM VITAE

Paul J. Hauptman, M.D. FHFSA

Office Address: Division of Cardiology
Saint Louis University Hospital, FDT-15
3635 Vista Avenue at Grand Boulevard
St. Louis MO 63110
Telephone: 314-268-5293
Fax: 314-577-8861
E-mail: hauptmpj@slu.edu

Personal Data: Place of Birth: New York, New York
Married: Debra I. Hauptman, MS, MSW

Education: 1983 B.A. Columbia University
1987 M.D. Cornell University Medical College

Postdoctoral Training
Internship and Residencies
1987-1988 Intern in Internal Medicine, Brigham and Women’s Hospital, Boston
1988-1990 Resident in Internal Medicine, Brigham and Women’s Hospital, Boston

Clinical and Research Fellowships
1987-1990 Clinical Fellow in Medicine, Harvard Medical School
1990-1992 Clinical Fellow in Cardiology, Mount Sinai Hospital, New York
1992-1993 Research/Clinical Fellow in Medicine, Cardiovascular Division, Brigham and Women’s Hospital, Boston and Research Fellow in Medicine, Harvard Medical School

Licensure and Certification
1989 Commonwealth of Massachusetts (71023), inactive
1990 New York State (182095), inactive
1990-2000 Diplomate, American Board of Internal Medicine (133833)
1993-2003 Diplomate, American Board of Internal Medicine, Cardiovascular Disease
1998 State of Missouri (MD 115045), active
2003-2013 Diplomate (ABIM Recertification), Cardiovascular Disease
2013-2023 Diplomate (ABIM Recertification), Cardiovascular Disease
2014-2024 Diplomate, (ABIM Certification), Advanced Heart Failure and Transplant Cardiology
2015-2017 Diplomate, Cardiovascular Disease and Advanced Heart Failure and Transplant, National Board of Physicians and Surgeons

Academic Appointments
1993-97 Instructor in Medicine, Harvard Medical School
1997-98 Assistant Professor of Medicine, Harvard Medical School
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1998-2004  Associate Professor of Internal Medicine, Saint Louis University School of Medicine
1998-2007  Adjunct Associate Professor of Health Services Research, School of Public Health, Saint Louis University
2004-present Professor of Internal Medicine, Saint Louis University School of Medicine
2007-present Professor (secondary appointment), Health Management and Policy, College for Public Health, Saint Louis University
2007 Visiting Professor, Institute of Medicine, Sahlgrenska Academy, Göteborg University, Sweden (July-December)
2009-present Assistant Dean for Clinical and Translational Research, Saint Louis University School of Medicine

Hospital Appointments
1993-98  Associate Physician, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston MA
1995-98  Attending Physician, Carney Hospital, Dorchester MA
1998-present Attending Physician and Director of Heart Failure and Transplantation, Saint Louis University Hospital, St. Louis Missouri

Other Appointments
2010-present  Director, Clinical Trials Office, Saint Louis University School of Medicine

Industry Positions
2007-2011  Medical Director (part-time), BioControl Medical Ltd, Yehud Israel

Professional Development
2014  Participant, Executive Development Seminar for Interim and Aspiring Leaders, American Association of Medical Colleges, Washington DC

Awards and Honors
1983  Phi Beta Kappa
1985  CIBA Award for Outstanding Community Service
1987  Paul Sherlock Prize in Clinical Medicine and the Alfred M. Michaelis Prize for Efficiency in Medicine, Cornell University Medical College
1987  Alpha Omega Alpha
1998  Award for Teaching Excellence, Carney Hospital, Dorchester MA
2006, 2011  Teacher of the Year Award, Division of Cardiology, Saint Louis University
2007  Caring Physician Award, Saint Louis University Hospital
2016  Inaugural Fellow, Heart Failure Society of America

Major Committee Assignments
Grant and Promotions Review Committees
2001-02  Member, Grant Peer Review Committee (National), CV Pathophysiology, American Heart Association
2001  Grant Reviewer (ad hoc), Health Services Research Dissemination Implementation Study Section, Agency for Health Research and Quality (AHRQ)
2000-02  Member, Grant Review Committee, Great America Consortium Study
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Group, American Heart Association, M Creager MD, Chairman

Grant Reviewer, RFA 05-003 Study Section: “Heart Failure Clinical Research Network”, National Heart Lung and Blood Institute (NHLBI);
Scientific Review Administrator (SRA): Y Li-Smerin MD, PhD

Grant Reviewer, RFA-HL-07-009 Study Section: “Ancillary Studies in Clinical Trials”, National Heart Lung and Blood Institute (NHLBI); SRA: Y Li-Smerin MD, PhD

Grant Reviewer, NHLBI Translational Research Implementation Program (TRIP), Special Emphasis Panel, Research Infrastructure Grand Opportunities RFA-OD-09-004 Study section; SRA: Holly Krull, PhD.

Grant Reviewer (ad hoc), Health Research Award Committee, Health Research Board (Dublin, Ireland). Chair T Maguire PhD

Ad hoc Member, Appointments Committee of the Toronto General Research Institute, for evaluation of faculty promotion to Senior Scientist

Clinical Trials and Registries

2003-06 Member, Clinical Events Committee, Phase III Mortality Trial of Torvaptan in Heart Failure: EVEREST. Sponsor: Otsuka Maryland Research Institute (OMRI), Bethesda MD

2005-07 Member, Steering Committee, Prospective Randomized Controlled Assessment of Once-Daily Controlled Release Coreg CR vs Twice-Daily Coreg IR on Measures of Compliance and Quality of Life in Patients with Heart Failure and Left Ventricular Systolic Dysfunction: CASPER. Sponsor: GlaxoSmithKline, Philadelphia PA

2006-2009 Member, Clinical Events Committee, Phase II Outcomes Trial of A1-Selective Adenosine Receptor Antagonist for Patients Hospitalized with Acute Heart Failure. PROTECT. Sponsor: NovaCardia, San Diego CA.

2008-2009 Member, Clinical Events Committee, International Multicenter Large Simple Trial to Evaluate the Long-Term Pulmonary and Cardiovascular Safety of Exubera in Patients with Diabetes Mellitus: VOLUME. Sponsor: Pfizer, New York, NY

2009-2010 Member, Clinical Events Committee, Treatment of Hyponatremia Based on Lixivaptan in NYHA Class III/IV Cardiac Patient Evaluation. The BALANCE Study. Sponsor: CardioKine Biopharma, Philadelphia PA

2010 Member, Clinical Events Committee, Evaluation of the HeartWare VAS for the Treatment of Advanced Heart Failure. Sponsor: HeartWare, Inc., Framingham MA

2010-2015 Member, Steering Committee, IN Registry: an observational prospective registry to identify demographic and clinical characteristics of patients hospitalized with euvoelmic and hypervolemic hyponatremia and assess the comparative effectiveness of available treatments and the impact on resource utilization; Sponsor: Otsuka America Pharmaceutical, Rockville MD

2011-2016 Member, Steering Committee, INcrease Of Vagal TonE in Heart Failure (INOvatie-HF) Study; Sponsor: BioControl Medical, Yehud Israel

2012-2016 Member, Data Safety Monitoring Committee, “Randomized double blind placebo controlled study of the short term clinical effects of tolvaptan in...
patients hospitalized for worsening heart failure with challenging fluid management (SECRET of CHF Trial); Sponsor: Cardiovascular Clinical Science Foundation and Otsuka Pharmaceutical

2013-2016 Member, Clinical Events Committee, International Study of Comparative Health Effectiveness with Medical and Invasive Approaches: ISCHEMIA. Sponsor: NHLBI

2014 Member, Clinical Events Committee, “Adipose-derived regenerative cells in the Treatment of patients with chronic Heart disease Not Amenable to surgical or interventional revascularization- The ATHENA Clinical Trial. Sponsor: Cytori.

Member, Clinical Events Committee, “AMR-001 Versus Placebo Post ST Segment Elevation Myocardial Infarction: PreSERVE-AMI Trial”. Sponsor: NeoStem.

2015-present Member, Clinical Events Committee, “CardioMEMS HF Post Approval Study Protocol Number: CIP-10035”. Sponsor: St. Jude Medical

2016-2017 Chair, Data Safety Monitoring Committee, “REDUCE LAP HF Randomized Trial”, Sponsor: Corvia Medical.

2016-present Member, Clinical Events Committee, “Sensible Medical Innovations Lung fLuid Status Monitor Allows rEducating Readmission Rate of Heart Failure Patients: the SMILE study”, Sponsor: Sensible-Medical.

2017-present Chair, Data Monitoring Committee, REDUCE LAP-HF RANDOMIZED TRIAL-II: “A study to evaluate the Corvia Medical, Inc. IASD® System II to REDUCE Elevated Left Atrial Pressure in Patients with Heart Failure”, Sponsor: Corvia Medical.

National Committees/ Panels

2001-06 Member, Care Standards Committee, Heart Failure Society of America

2005-07 Consultant, Circulatory System Devices Panel of the Medical Devices Advisory Committee, CDRH, Food and Drug Administration

2005-07 Member, Program Committee, 10th and 11th Annual Meetings, HFSA

2006-2009 Chairman, Quality of Care Committee (formerly: Care Standards), HFSA

2009-2014 Member (appointed), Education Committee, HFSA

2012 HFSA Representative, Technical Panel of the American College of Cardiology: “Appropriate Use Criteria for Implantable Cardioverter-Defibrillators and Cardiac Resynchronization Therapy”

2013-14 Subcommittee on Continuing Medical Education, HFSA

2013 Member, NHLBI-ODS Working Group on “Designing Studies to Evaluate the Role of Nutrition and Diet in Heart Failure Management”.

2013-2017 Member (appointed), Development Committee, HFSA

2013-present Member, Group on Research Advancement and Development (GRAND), American Association of Medical Colleges (AAMC)

2013-present Co-Chair, Cardiac Disease Palliation Working Group of the Geriatric Cardiology Section, American College of Cardiology

2014-present Member (appointed), Lifetime Achievement Award Committee, HFSA

2015-present Member (ex officio), Executive Board, HFSA

2017-present GRAND 2018 Program Committee Member, Association of American Medical Colleges
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National Meetings
2001  Abstract Grader, 74th Annual Scientific Sessions-American Heart
Association (AHA)
2002  Abstract Grader, 75th Annual Scientific Sessions- AHA
2003  Abstract Grader, 7th Annual Scientific Meeting-HFSA and 76th Annual
Scientific Sessions, AHA
Heart Failure Society of America representative to the Program
Cardiology
2004  Abstract Grader, 77th Annual Scientific Sessions, AHA; 25th Annual
Meeting and Scientific Sessions of the International Society for Heart and
Lung Transplantation; 8th Annual Scientific Meeting of the HFSA; and
54th Annual Scientific Session, American College of Cardiology (ACC)
2005  Abstract Grader, 9th Annual Scientific Meeting, HFSA
2006  Abstract Grader, 79th Annual Scientific Sessions-AHA, 10th Annual
Scientific Sessions of the HFSA and 56th Annual Sessions of the ACC
2007  Abstract Grader, 11th Annual Scientific Sessions of the HFSA
2008  Abstract Grader, 12th Annual Scientific Sessions of the HFSA; 81st Annual
Scientific Sessions of the AHA
2009  Abstract Grader, 13th Annual Scientific Sessions of the HFSA, 82nd
Annual Scientific Sessions of the AHA
2010  Abstract Grader, 14th Annual Scientific Sessions of the HFSA, 83rd
Annual Scientific Sessions of the AHA
2011  Abstract Grader, 15th Annual Scientific Sessions of the HFSA
2012  Abstract Grader, 85th Annual Scientific Sessions of the AHA
2013  Abstract Grader, 86th Annual Scientific Sessions of the AHA
2014  Abstract Grader, 87th Annual Scientific Sessions of the AHA

Regional:
1994  Chairman, Central Selection Committee, Boston Center for Heart
Transplantation
1995-96  Advisor, Committee on Congestive Heart Failure, Massachusetts Hospital-
Health Plan Information Partnership
1999  Alternate, UNOS Heart Region 8 Review Board
2001-02  Member, UNOS Heart Region 8 Review Board
2003-05  Board Member, American Heart Association, Heartland Affiliate/Greater
St. Louis Division
2004-05  Member (Appointed), Medical Affairs Executive Committee, Mid-
America Transplant Services, St. Louis Missouri
2009-2013  University Coordinator (Appointed), Regional Health Commission on
Community/University Health Research Partnerships (CUHREP), St. Louis
2014-present  Saint Louis University representative to the Executive Committee of the
Institute for Clinical and Translational Science (Washington University)
2016-present  Saint Louis University representative to the Southern Illinois University-
Edwardsville NIH BRAD Project Steering Committee
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Saint Louis University Hospital:
1999-2005 Pharmacy, Therapeutics, Nutrition and Transfusion Committee
2006 Physician Advisor: In-patient general cardiology; cardiac care units

Saint Louis University School of Medicine:
1999-2007 Fellow Selection Committee, Division of Cardiology
2000-02 Resident Education Committee, Department of Medicine
2001-05 At-large Member (elected), Executive Committee of the Faculty Assembly
2004 Faculty Representative (appointed), Internal Analysis and Evaluation Committee review of the Department of Surgery
2005-2011 Member (elected), Faculty Affairs Committee
2008-2011 Member, Dean’s Planning and Advisory Committee
2009-2010 Member, Search Committee, Division Director-Cardiology
2009-2010 Study Section Chair, President’s Research Fund Seed Grant Programs
2011 Member (ad hoc), Research Integrity Inquiry Committee
2010-12 Member, University Research Compliance Committee
2010-present Member (Ex Officio), Research Planning Committee
2012-2013 Co-Chair, Task Force on Sustainability of Research
2012-present Co-Director, Grant Review Committee: Summer Research Fellowship for Medical Students
2012-present Member, Internal Grant Review Committee: President’s Research Fund
2012-present Member, Conflict of Interest in Research Committee
2013 Member, Search Committee, Associate Chief of Service for Research, John Cochran VA Medical Center (St. Louis)
2014-present Co-director, Medical Student Summer Research Fellowship Program
2015-2017 Faculty representative (Faculty Senate appointment) to the Clinical Affairs Committee of the Saint Louis University Board of Trustees
2016-present Member, AMC Network Development Plan Committee
2016 Member (ad hoc), Research Integrity Inquiry Committee
2016-present Member, Continuing Medical Education Committee
2017 Member, Search Committee for Department Chair, Dermatology

Cornell University Medical College:
1984-1987 Professional Conduct Appeals Committee

Other
2015-present Advisory Board, MEDLaunch (non-profit biomedical incubator)

Editorial Boards
2005-2008 Journal of the International Society of Heart and Lung Transplantation
2005-2011 Journal of Cardiac Failure
2012-2014 Cardiology News
2008-2011 Circulation: Heart Failure
2006-present Heart Failure Reviews

Editorial Positions

P.J. Hauptman December 2017
2007-2009  Associate Editor, European Journal of Heart Failure
2011-2014  Associate Editor, Circulation: Heart Failure
2015-present Editor-in-Chief, Journal of Cardiac Failure (2016 Impact Factor: 3.765)

Guest Editor
2012  Archives of Internal Medicine

Invited Journal Reviewer (alphabetical order):
American Heart Journal (year of most recent review: 2009)
American Journal of Cardiology (2006)
American Journal of Cardiovascular Drugs (2010)
American Journal of Managed Care (2004)
Archives of Internal Medicine (2012)
Catheterization and Cardiovascular Diagnosis (1999)
Circulation (2008)
Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes (2009)
Circulation: Heart Failure (2013)
Coronary Artery Disease (2002)
European Journal of Heart Failure (2009)
Expert Review of Cardiovascular Therapy (2007)
Heart Failure Reviews (2014)
Indian Journal of Medical Research (2007)
JAMA (2017)
JAMA Internal Medicine (2016)
JAMA Cardiology (2017)
Journal of the American College of Cardiology (2012)
Journal of Cardiac Failure (2017)
Journal of Pain and Symptom Management (2013)
Progress in Palliative Care (2008)
The Lancet (2001)
Transplantation (2005)

Peer Review Activities (non-grant, non-journal review):
External Peer Reviewer, "Systematic Review of Decision Tools and their Suitability for Patient-centered Decision-making regarding Electronic Cardiac Devices", produced by the Technology Assessment Program (TAP), Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality at the request of the Coverage and Analysis Group at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (2011)


**Memberships in Professional Societies**

1994-08 Member, International Society of Heart and Lung Transplantation
1995-96 Member, Association for Health Services Research
1996-present Member, Heart Failure Society of America (inaugural year)
2013-present Member, Group on Research Advancement and Development (GRAND), American Association of Medical Colleges

**Research Interests:**

1. Outcomes research in cardiovascular diseases
2. Physician decision-making in advanced heart failure
3. Clinical trials in congestive heart failure

**Research Funding Information:**

*Federal or Foundation Grants*

1993-1995 NIH: National Research Service Award: Role of anti-endothelial cell antibodies in heart transplantation ($69,100)

1994 Investigator: The Consequences of Variation in the Treatment of Acute Myocardial Infarction, AHCPR HHS6341 (PI: Barbara McNeil, MD, PhD)

1995-97 Investigator: Improving Compliance with Acute MI Practice Guidelines, AHCPR 07357-03 (PI: Steven Soumerai, PhD)

1994-98 Investigator: Validating Guidelines for the Care of AMI Patients,
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AHCPR HS08071 (PI: Barbara McNeil, MD, PhD)

1996-98 Charles King Trust Postdoctoral Fellowship-The Medical Foundation ($64,000)

1996-2000 Investigator: Quality of Care Measures for Cardiovascular Patients, AHCPR HS09487 (PI: Barbara McNeil, MD, PhD)

2002-2003 Grant-in-Aid, “Use of Inotropic Therapy in End-Stage Heart Failure”, American Heart Association Heartland Affiliate (direct $110,998, indirect $10,000), declined second year of support

2003-2007 RO1 AG021515, “Decision Making in End-Stage Heart Failure”, National Institute on Aging/NIH (direct $525,000; indirect $195,549)

2007 Visiting Professor Scholarship, The Wenner-Gren Foundation - Stockholm Sweden (120,000SEK = $17,300 US)

2012-18 Co-Investigator, Heart Failure Clinical Research Network, NHLBI U10HL110309, 5% effort (PI: V. Davila Roman and D. Mann)

**Institutional Grants**

2011-12 President’s Research Fund, “Collaborative Decision Making in Cardiac Device Therapy”, Saint Louis University School of Medicine (direct: $24,780)

2017 Spark micro grant, “Addressing the social determinants of health in shared decision-making for heart failure treatment”, co-PI Kim Enard PhD, MBA, MSHA (direct: $1000) and Health Sciences Small Research Grant Opportunity, “A Systematic Review and Exploration of what is Missing from SDM Processes Among Diverse HF Populations” (direct: $5002)

**Industry Grants (unrestricted, non-clinical trial or PI-initiated)**

2000-01 Educational grant: Development of protocols with intravenous beta blockade in class IV heart failure patients (Sponsor: Baxter Pharmaceuticals; $25,000)

2006-07 Research grant: Economics of in-patient care for acute decompensated heart failure (Sponsor: Orqis Medical; $60,000)

2011-2012 Co-Investigator, clinical research grant: “Prognostic Utility of 123I-mIBG and Established Heart Failure Risk Models,” (Sponsor: GE Healthcare: $30,000)

2016-2018 Co-Investigator, clinical research grant: “Frequency of Cardiac Arrhythmias in Dialysis Patients as a function of hyperkalemia,
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interdialytic duration, and other clinical attributes” (Sponsor: Relypsa, $234,434, 5%/7.5% effort)

Federally Sponsored Clinical Trials
2012-2014 Local Principal Investigator, Xanthine Oxidase Inhibition for Hyperuricemic Heart Failure Patients: EXACT-HF. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT00987415 (Sponsor: Duke University/NHLBI Heart Failure Network)

2013-2015 Local Principal Investigator, Functional Impact of GLP-1 for Heart Failure Treatment: FIGHT. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT01800968 (Sponsor: Duke University/NHLBI HF Network)

2015-2016 Local Principal Investigator, Oral Iron Repletion Effects On Oxygen Uptake in Heart Failure: IRONOUT. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT02188784 (Sponsor: Duke University/NHLBI HF Network)

2015-2016 Local Principal Investigator, Study of High-dose Spironolactone vs. Placebo Therapy in Acute Heart Failure: ATHENA-HF. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT02235077 (Sponsor: Duke University/NHLBI HF Network)

2017-present Local Principal Investigator, LCZ696 In Advanced Heart Failure: LIFE Study. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT02816736 (Sponsor: Duke University/NHLBI HF Network)

2017-2020 External Advisory Board member. The inorganic nitrate for exercise in heart failure (INIX-HF) trial. 1 R34 HL138253-01 (Linda Peterson MD, PI)

Industry Sponsored Clinical Trials and Grants (initiation-end date)
1993-1995 Principal Investigator: Trial of Pentoxifylline to Prevent Renal Failure in Cardiac Transplant Recipients on Cyclosporine (Investigator-initiated; Supported by: Hoechst-Roussel, Inc.)

1993-97 Local Principal Investigator: Randomized, Double-Blind Comparative Trial of Mycophenolate Mofetil or Azathioprine each in combination with Cyclosporine and Corticosteroids for the Prevention of Rejection in Cardiac Allograft Recipients, (Sponsor: Roche BioScience; $534,705)

1996-98 Local Principal Investigator, Neoral versus Sandimmune in Heart Transplant Recipients. (Sponsor: Sandoz Pharmaceutical Corp; $94,763)

1998-99 Local Principal Investigator: Natrecor versus Dobutamine Therapy for Symptomatic Decompensated CHF: A Safety Study using 24-hour
Holter Monitoring: “PRECEDENT”. (Sponsor: Scios, Inc; $32,190)

Local Principal Investigator: Safety and efficacy study of intravenous administration of YM087. (Sponsor: Parke-Davis; $92,432)

Local Principal Investigator: Carvedilol Prospective Randomized Cumulative Survival trial, the “COPERNICUS” Trial. (Sponsor: Smith Kline Beecham; $6,067)

Local Principal Investigator: Weight monitoring in Heart Failure (“WHARF”), a pilot randomized trial of the DayLink monitor to determine outpatient efficacy in patients with decompensated CHF. (Sponsor: Alere Medical Corp.; $9,600)

1998-07

Local Principal Investigator, Study of the Efficacy and Safety of SDZ RAD versus Azathioprine as part of a Triple Immunosuppressive Therapy Regimen in de novo Heart Transplant Recipients. (Sponsor: Novartis Pharmaceutical Corporation; $238,591) and B254 Extension Study (Novartis; $5050)

2000

Local Principal Investigator: A Phase II Multi-center, Randomized Double-Blind Pilot Trial Evaluating the Effects of Infliximab (Remicade) in patients with class III and IV congestive heart failure The ATTACH Trial. (Sponsor: Centocor; $25,000)

Local Principal Investigator: Candesartan Cilexetil in Heart Failure: Assessment of Reduction in Mortality and Morbidity. “CHARM” protocols (Sponsor: AstraZeneca; $7,000)

Local Principal Investigator: Study to Evaluate the Effects of Oral Administration of Tolvaptan (OPC-41061) when Compared to Furosemide and the Combination of Tolvaptan and Furosemide in Patients with CHF. The VICTOR Study. (Sponsor: Otsuka America Pharmaceutical, Inc; $126,000)

2001

Local Principal Investigator, Prospective Evaluation and Identification of Cardiac Decompensation in Patients with Heart Failure by Impedance Cardiography Test. The PREDICT Study, (Sponsor: CardioDynamics Inc.; $11,502)

Local Principal Investigator, Study to Assess the Effect of Valsartan on Heart Rate Variability in patients with chronic CHF. CVAL-489. (Sponsor: Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp; $6,495).

Local Principal Investigator, Phase II, Double Blind Dose Comparative Study of the Efficacy, Tolerability and Safety of MCC-135 in Patients with Chronic Congestive Heart Failure (Sponsor:
2002
Local Principal Investigator, Cardiac Support Device Randomized Trial and Continued Access Protocol (“CAP”) (Sponsor: Acorn Cardiovascular; $174,270)

Local Principal Investigator, Randomized Evaluation of Intravenous Levosimendan Efficacy versus Placebo in the Short Term Treatment of Decompensated Chronic Heart Failure- The REVIVE Study. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier NCT00048425 (Sponsor: Orion, $120,000+).

Local Principal Investigator, Tolvaptan (OPC-41061) dose finding study (Sponsor: Otsuka America Pharmaceutical, Inc; $32,500)

Principal Investigator, Predicting Cardiac Events using B-type Natriuretic Peptide, a Time-Insensitive Predictive Instrument and Visual Analog Scale in Patients with Congestive Heart Failure (Investigator-initiated, Saint Louis University IRB# 12219), inactive

2003-7
Local Principal Investigator, Efficacy of Vasopressin Antagonism in Heart Failure: Outcome Study with Tolvaptan- The EVEREST Study. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier NCT00071331 (Sponsor: Otsuka America Pharmaceutical, Inc., $115,600)

2004-6
Local Principal Investigator, Randomized Double Blind Study Evaluating the Effects of Eplerenone on Ventricular Remodeling in Patients with LV Systolic Dysfunction and Mild to Moderate Heart Failure Remodeling Study-REMODEL. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier NCT00082589 (Sponsor: Pfizer, $32,390)

2004-7
Local Principal Investigator, Multicenter Trial of the Orquis Medical Cancion Therapy for the Enhanced Treatment of CHF Unresponsive to Medical Therapy-MOMENTUM. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier NCT00357591 (Sponsor: Orquis Medical, $35,000+)

2005-6
Local Principal Investigator, Open Label Non Randomized Comparison of the Pharmacokinetic Profiles of Carvedilol CR and IR on Repeat Dosing in Chronic CHF Patients and Survivors of AMI. Coreg SKF 105517-369 Study. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier NCT00272805 (Sponsor: GSK; $34,763).

2006-9
Local Principal Investigator, Multicenter, Randomized Double-blind Study of the effects of KW-3902 Injectable Emulsion on Heart Failure Signs and Symptoms and Renal Function in Patients with Acute Heart Failure and Renal Impairment who are Hospitalized for Volume Overload and Require Intravenous Diuretic Therapy-The PROTECT
study. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier NCT00354458 (Sponsor: NovaCardia, Inc; $90,000+)

2007-2010 Local Principal Investigator, Reduction of Events with Darbepoetin alfa in Heart Failure Trial- RED-HF Trial. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier NCT00358215 (Sponsor: Amgen; $9050)

2008-2010 Local Principal Investigator, The BALANCE Study: Treatment of Hyponatremia Based on Lixivaptan in NYHA class III-IV Cardiac Patient Evaluation. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT00578695 (Sponsor: Cardiokine: $8000)

2008-2010 Local Principal Investigator, Calcium Upregulation by Percutaneous Administration of Gene Therapy in Cardiac Disease: CUPID. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT00454818 (Sponsor: Celladon Corp: $76,564)

2012-2015 Local Principal Investigator, Calcium Up-Regulation by Percutaneous Administration of Gene Therapy In Cardiac Disease Phase 2b: CUPID Phase 2b Trial. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT01643330 (Sponsor: Celladon Corp: $138,661)

2015-2016 Local Principal Investigator, Study Examining the Prevalence of TTR Mutations in Subjects Suspected of Having Cardiac Amyloidosis: DISCOVERY. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT02252653 (Sponsor: Alnylam: $21,000)

2015-2017 Local Principal Investigator, Phase 3 Multicenter Study of Revusiran (ALN-TTRSC) in Patients With Transthyretin-Mediated Familial Amyloidotic Cardiomyopathy: ENDEAVOUR. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT02319005 (Sponsor: Alnylam: $89,955)

2017-present Local Principal Investigator, A Multicenter, Randomized, Double-Blind, Parallel-Group, Placebo-Controlled, Dose-Ranging, Phase 2b Study of the Safety and Efficacy of Continuous 48-Hour Intravenous Infusions of BMS-986231 in Hospitalized Patients with Heart Failure: STANDUP AHF. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT03016325 (Sponsor: Bristol-Myers Squibb)

2017-present Local Principal Investigator, Empagliflozin Outcome Trial in Patients With Chronic Heart Failure With Reduced and Preserved Ejection Fraction (EMPEROR-Reduced and Preserved; ClinicalTrials.gov Identifiers: NCT03057977 and NCT03057951 (Sponsor: Boehringer-Ingelheim)

Other Research Funding (Grateful Patient fund)
2013-present The Joseph C. Sansone Research Fund in Cardiovascular Outcomes
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Research ($47,850 in total gifts)

**Self-Report of Teaching and Mentoring:**

*Harvard Medical School*
1994, 1995  Section Leader, cardiovascular pathophysiology for 2nd year students

*Saint Louis University School of Medicine*
1998-present  Cardiovascular fellowship and Internal Medicine housestaff lectures
1998-2008  Heart Failure and Transplantation Program- academic program development for 1st and 2nd year cardiology fellows: design and update of educational syllabus; monthly teaching sessions for fellows
1998-2003  Faculty, Annual Internal Medicine Board Review course
2000-2006  Participating Faculty, Internal Medicine Resident morning report
2000  Research Advisor, Internal Medicine Residency Program: Samer Alkaade, MD: “Quality of Life Measurement in Heart Failure Trials”
2001, 2003  Faculty, *Death and Dying unit*, 2nd year medical students: “Patient, Physician and Society” course
2003-present  Mentor for Senior Medical Resident theses
2005-2013  Faculty Judge, Annual AOA Medical Student Research Forum
2006,2004-16  Faculty, Cardiovascular Physiology section for 2nd year medical students
2010-2012  Faculty Mentor, Department of Medicine Mentoring Program
2012-2015  Preceptor, Internal Medicine, Year 3 Medical Students
2013  Faculty Judge, GME Research Poster Competition
2013-present  Faculty Mentor, Wilson King MD, Assistant Professor, Division of Cardiology, Department of Pediatrics, Cardinal Glennon Children’s Hospital
2014-present  Director, Annual AOA Medical Student Research Forum
2017  Research supervisor for Margaret Brandon, Class of 2020

*Saint Louis University School of Public Health*
2009  Faculty, “Introduction to Medicine” course for MPH/PhD candidates
2009  Dissertation Committee Member, Jason Swindle MPH, PhD candidate in Public Health Studies (health services research): “Relating resource utilization and outcomes among a heterogeneous heart failure population”
2011  Dissertation Committee Member, Lauren Garfield MPH, PhD candidate in Public Health Studies (health services research): “Depression pharmacotherapy, comorbid anxiety and the incidence of cardiovascular outcomes in a VA population”
2012-2015  Dissertation Committee Member, Jiaojing Chen MPH, PhD candidate in Public Health Studies: “Risks and benefits associated with exenatide in type 2 diabetes: clinical and economic implications”
2014-2015  Dissertation Committee Member, Caress Dean MPH, PhD candidate: “Physician’s use of the AHA Guidelines as a guide to preventing cardiovascular disease”
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Saint Louis University School of Nursing

2011-2012  Research Mentor, Joanne Thanavaro, DNP, APRN, currently Associate Dean for Graduate Education

Trainees in Heart Failure and Transplant Cardiology
Michael Givertz MD (Brigham and Women’s Hospital)
James Fang MD (University of Utah)
Patrick McCann MD (University of South Carolina)
Andrija Vidić DO (Florida Hospital Cardiovascular Institute)
Timothy Gong MD (Baylor University Medical Center-Dallas)

Invited CME Presentations and Course Directorships (selected from 100s):
1993  Thoracic Organ Transplantation course, Minneapolis Heart Institute, Tucson, AZ. “Endovascular Biology”.
1994  Cardiology Grand Rounds, University of Pisa, Italy. “Graft Arteriosclerosis: Issues and Controversies”.
1995  Second Symposium on Cardiac Allograft Vasculopathy, St. Louis MO. “Non-immune Risk Factors for Allograft Coronary Artery Disease”.
1996  Cardiology Grand Rounds, University of Massachusetts Medical Center, Worcester MA. “Heart Transplantation: The Beginning and the End”.
Cardiology Grand Rounds, Good Samaritan Medical Center, Brockton MA and Maine Medical Center, Portland ME. “Long term Complications of Heart Transplantation”.
1997  Presenter, UNOS Thoracic Organ Committee national meeting, Kansas City MO. “The New England Organ Bank Variance: Insights into National Heart Allocation”.
1998  Medical Grand Rounds, Carney Hospital, Dorchester MA. “Update on Congestive Heart Failure” and “Health Services Research in Cardiovascular Diseases”
Transplant Grand Rounds, Allegheny General Hospital, Pittsburgh PA. “Acute Rejection and other Complications of Heart Transplantation”.
Medical Grand Rounds, Saint Louis University Health Sciences Center. “Update in the Management of Congestive Heart Failure, 1998”
Course Director, Continuing Medical Education program, “Therapeutic Advances in Congestive Heart Failure Management”, Saint Louis University School of Medicine

1999  Course Director, Continuing Medical Education breakfast series (5) for physicians, Saint Louis University School of Medicine
Faculty participant, annual meeting of the American College of Physicians-Missouri chapter, Osage MO. “Congestive Heart Failure: Management Update”

2000  Faculty, 10th Annual Symposium, Advances in Medicine, Kneibert Clinic, Poplar Bluffs, MO. “Essential Hypertension: Clinical Overview”
Course Co-Director, Continuing Medical Education program, “Cardiology for the Primary Care Physician in the New Millennium”, Saint Louis University School of Medicine.
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2001
Visiting Professor, Cardiology Grand Rounds, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Little Rock, AR. “Measuring Health-Related Quality of Life and Other Challenges in Heart Failure Trials”.
Visiting Professor, Medical College of Virginia, Richmond, VA. “Transplantation and Immunosuppression: Overview and Update”
Cardiology Grand Rounds, Albert Einstein Hospital, Philadelphia PA. “Beta-Blockade in Heart Failure: Insights and Commentary on Challenges for Clinical Trial Design”

2002
Cardiology Grand Rounds, New York Hospital/Cornell, Mount Sinai Medical Center (New York), University of Chicago and Temple University. “Measuring Health-Related Quality of Life and Other Challenges in Heart Failure Trials”
Faculty presenter, “Measurement of Outcomes in Advanced Heart Failure and Evaluation of Approaches to Care”, Consensus Conference on Supportive and Palliative Care for Advanced Heart Failure, Salt Lake City

2003
Cardiology Grand Rounds, University of Illinois, Chicago, January. “Measuring Health Related Quality of Life in Heart Failure Trials”
Faculty presenter, “Defining the Patient for Palliative Care: The HFSA Position”, Second Consensus Conference on Supportive and Palliative Care for Advanced Heart Failure, Salt Lake City
Faculty presenter, “Will Laboratory Examination Supplant the Physical for Diagnosis and Follow-up of Heart Failure” and “Overcoming Barriers to Treatment by the Guidelines”, 14th Annual Symposium of the Management of Cardiovascular Disease, University of Kansas School of Medicine, Wichita KS
Faculty presenter, “Congestive Heart Failure”, 1st Annual Northeast Kansas Primary Care Physician Conference, Kansas City KS
Cardiology Grand Rounds, Henry Ford Hospital, Detroit MI. “Measurement of Endpoints in Heart Failure Trials: Jousting at Windmills?”

2004
Visiting Professor, Cardiology Grand Rounds, Tufts-New England Medical Center, Boston MA. “Living and Dying with Heart Failure: A Treatise on What We Know and What We Don’t Know”.
Faculty, Updates in Cardiology sponsored by Saint Louis University. “New Approaches to Decompensated Heart Failure”
Cardiology Grand Rounds, Ochsner Clinic, New Orleans LA. “Living and Dying with Heart Failure”.
Cardiology Grand Rounds, Krannert Heart Institute, Indianapolis IN. “Evidence Based Approaches to Reducing the Risk of CV Events”

2005
Cardiology Grand Rounds, Baystate Medical Center, Springfield MA and the University of Maryland, Baltimore MD. “Living with End-Stage Heart Failure”

2006
Faculty, Symposium: “Key Topics in Current Cardiovascular Clinical Research”, sponsored by Cardiovascular Clinical Studies: “Efficacy to Effectiveness in Drug Therapy”, Atlanta
Faculty, Symposium, Clinical Concepts in Heart Failure, Midwest Heart
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2007
Faculty, Kynett Symposium, Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia PA. "Palliative Care in Heart Failure: An Unmet Need"
Cardiology Grand Rounds, Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia PA. "Drugs versus Devices in Advanced Heart Failure"
Faculty, Ponte Vedra Cardiovascular Symposium, Ponte Vedra FL. "Pathophysiology of Heart Failure"

2008
Cardiology Grand Rounds, University of Colorado Health Sciences Center, Denver CO, Henry Ford Hospital-Detroit and University of Missouri, Kansas City. "Implantable Devices in Advanced Heart Failure: Difficult Decisions, Difficult Discussions"
Faculty, 7th Annual Primary Care Conference of the HFSA: "What to Do and When: Managing Heart Failure in 2008"

2009
Medical Grand Rounds, Saint Louis University School of Medicine and Cardiology Grand Rounds, Washington University School of Medicine: "Implantable Devices in Advanced Heart Failure: Difficult Decisions, Difficult Discussions"
Faculty, 2009 Forum on Heart Failure, Spectrum Health and Henry Ford Health Care System, Traverse City MI. "ACE inhibitors and Beta Blockers: What you may not know"

2010
Medical Grand Rounds, St. Anthony’s Medical Center, St. Louis MO. "Device therapy in Advanced Heart Failure"
Anandi L. Shama Visiting Professorship and the Simon Dack MD Memorial Lecture. Mount Sinai Hospital, New York: "Implantable Devices in Advanced Heart Failure".

2011
Cardiology Grand Rounds, Case Western, New York University and Tulane University Medical Centers. "Device Therapy in Advanced Heart Failure: Too Much Too Late?"
Faculty, Heart Failure Management-2011, Sponsor: University of North Carolina. "Optimizing Patient Selection for Device Therapy- Focus on the Elderly"

2012
Visiting Professor, Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, Vanderbilt University; lecture "Palliative Care in Heart Failure"
Faculty, Ponte Vedra Cardiovascular Symposium-2012, Ponte Vedra FL. "Advanced Heart Failure in the Elderly"
Faculty, Seminar Series, Office for Faculty Affairs and Professional Development (SLU); "How to be a Clinical Trialist"
Faculty, Medscape CME programs, "Digoxin Toxicity: Awareness, Recognition and Treatment" and "The Different Faces of Hyponatremia: Multifaceted Patients"

2013
17th Annual William S. Pierce Lecture, Penn State University Heart and Vascular Institute, Milton S. Hershey Medical Center: "Palliative Care in Heart Failure"
Medicine Grand Rounds, Vista Medical Center, Waukegan IL: "Hyponatremia in Heart Failure"
Cardiology Grand Rounds, University of Utah Health Sciences Center:
“The Heart Failure Readmissions Obsession”
Heart Failure Symposium, Prairie Heart Institute, Springfield IL: “Heart Failure Quality Care in an Era of Diminishing Resources”
Faculty, Medscape CME program, “Addressing the Risk for Sudden Cardiac Death in Heart Failure”

2014
Faculty, Heart Failure Management Symposium: Personalized Medicine to Optimize Care, U of Florida. “Managing Hyponatremia in Heart Failure”
Faculty, Medscape CME programs, “The Newly Diagnosed Ischemic Heart Failure Patient”, “Navigating the Treatment Algorithm for Hyponatremia”, Strategies for Recognition and Management of Digoxin Toxicity: Updates from HFSA” and “Using a Team Approach to Biomarker-guided Therapy in Heart Failure”

2015
Cardiology Grand Rounds, Case Western Reserve-University Hospitals: “Prognostication in Heart Failure”
Faculty, Medscape CME program: “Practical Tools for Sudden Cardiac Arrest Screening: Taking Ownership of Your Patient’s Risk”
Visiting Professor, Keio University School of Medicine. Tokyo Japan and lecture “Prognostication in Heart Failure”
Faculty, CME programs, “Improving Long-Term Outcomes in Chronic Heart Failure”, Louisiana, Mississippi and Missouri Academies of Family Physicians
Faculty, 11th Annual Heart Failure Symposium, Northwestern University, CME “When to Call the Clergy and How to Handle End-of-Life Issues”, “Readmission Obsession: What is All the Fuss About?”

2016
Cardiology Grand Rounds, Massachusetts General Hospital and Medical Grand Rounds, SUNY Downstate Medical Center: “Heart Failure Readmissions”
Moderator/Presenter, Society of Critical Care Medicine Annual Congress, “Chronic Heart Failure Impact and Outcomes”, Orlando FL
Faculty, Medscape CME programs: “Shifting Currents in Hyperkalemia Management” and “Closing the Gap in Heart Failure Care: Role of the Healthcare Provider in Patient Education”
Keynote Speaker, Heart Failure Symposium (St Louis): Navigating Transitions in Care, American Association of HF Nurses. “Heart Failure Readmissions: Clinical, Policy, and Economic Implications”
Cardiology Rounds, Landspitali University Hospital, University of Iceland, Reykjavik. “Future Challenges in Heart Failure”.
Cardiology Grand Rounds, Seoul National University Hospital, Seoul, Republic of Korea. “Management of Water Excess Status in Heart Failure”
Faculty Presenter, Westchester Cardiovascular Symposium, Westchester Medical Center Heart and Vascular Center, “Medical Therapy for HFrEF: Why Doesn’t It Last Forever?”

2017
Cardiology Grand Rounds, University of Missouri; Cardiology Grand Rounds, the Lahey Clinic (Burlington MA); Internal Medicine Grand Rounds, University of Florida (Gainesville) and 36th Annual
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Cardiovascular Symposium, St. John Heart Institute (Tulsa OK). “The Heart Failure Readmission Controversy: Update”.
Co-chair, 2017 American Heart Association Midwest Affiliate Heart Failure Boot Camp. April 28th 2017
Faculty, New Frontiers in Cardiovascular Disease. Sponsored by Community Hospital and Foundation for Cardiovascular Research (Munster IN): “Heart Failure Pot Pourri: Comorbidities, Readmissions and Precision Medicine”.

International / National Meetings
Faculty Participant, Symposium: Update on Cardiac Transplantation. 50th Scientific Sessions of the American College of Cardiology, “Are Defibrillators and Left Ventricular Assist Devices the New Tools of the Trade?” Orlando FL, March 2001
Faculty Facilitator, Featured Poster Session, 6th Annual Heart Failure Society of America meeting, Boca Raton FL, September 2002
Moderator, Abstract Presentations: Understanding Outcomes in Heart Failure. 75th Scientific Session of the American Heart Association, Chicago IL, November 2002
Moderator, How-to Seminar: How to Manage the Patient with a Heart Transplant and Abstract Presentations: Evolving Concepts in the Management of Severe and Acute Heart Failure. 76th Scientific Session of the American Heart Association, Orlando FL, November 2003
Faculty and Featured Presenter, Debate Protagonist: Is end-of-life care an appropriate component of management of most elderly patients with chronic severe heart failure and who should do it- the cardiologist or the geriatrician? Annual Session of the American Society of Geriatric Cardiology, New Orleans LA March 2004.
Panelist, Key Issues in Trial Design for Devices in Heart Failure, Sponsor: Heart Failure Society of America, Washington DC, April 2004
Moderator, How To Session: How to Manage the Elderly Patient with Heart Failure, 8th Annual Scientific Meeting, Heart Failure Society of America, Toronto, Sept 2004.
Panelist, Lunchtime Panel, Who is an Appropriate Candidate for Destination Left Ventricular Device Therapy? 54th Scientific Sessions of the American College of Cardiology, Orlando FL March 2005
Moderator, Symposium, (1) Addressing Health Disparities in Heart Failure and (2)
Improving Quality of Life Through Symptom Management. 9th Annual Scientific Meeting, Heart Failure Society of America, Boca Raton, September 2005

Co-Chair, Meet the Experts, Issues in Palliative Care of Heart Disease, 55th Scientific Sessions of the American College of Cardiology, Atlanta GA, March 2006

Moderator, Panel Discussion, “Are We Focusing on the Right Things?” 1st Meeting on Ethical Issues in Care for Persons with Advanced Heart Failure (PC-HEART), Washington DC, April 2006


Moderator, “Autoimmunity in Cardiomyopathy and Heart Failure: from patients to molecules and back to patients” First Annual International conference, sponsor: Swedish Research Council, Göteborg Sweden, November 2007

Moderator, “Difficult Decisions in End Stage Heart Failure”, 57th Scientific Sessions of the American College of Cardiology, Chicago IL, Mar 2008

Moderator/Panelist, “How to Facilitate Patient-Provider Communication in Heart Failure”, Twelfth Annual Scientific Meeting, HFSA, Toronto Sept 2008

Moderator, “Who Should Manage End-of-Life Care”?; Poster Discusant, “Cardiac Transplantation/Assist Devices--Basic and Clinical; Myocardial Function/Heart Failure”, 58th Annual Scientific Session of the American College of Cardiology, Orlando FL, Mar 2009

Panelist, How-To Session, “How To Conduct Disease Management in the Outpatient Setting”, 13th Annual Scientific Meeting, HFSA, Boston, September 2009

Moderator, “Heart Failure Outcomes in Community Settings”. Scientific Session of the American Heart Association, Orlando FL, Nov 2009

Panelist, “Cardiac Resynchronization Therapy in Advanced Heart Failure: Too Late?” and Discussant, “Risk Stratification in Heart Failure”, 59th Annual Scientific Session of the American College of Cardiology, Atlanta, Mar 2010

Faculty/Presenter, “Unresolved Issues and Future Directions with Diastolic Heart Failure”, XXth World Congress of the International Society for Heart Research, Kyoto Japan, May 2010

Lecturer, “Device Therapy in Advanced Heart Failure” and “New Strategy of Treatment for Heart Failure”, 14th Annual Scientific Meeting of the Japanese Heart Failure Society, Tokyo Japan, October 2010

Panelist, “Decision-Making along the Continuum of Care for Heart Failure”, 60th Annual Scientific Session of the ACC, New Orleans, March 2011

Faculty/Presenter, “How to Integrate Monitoring by Implantable Sensors into Routine Clinical Workflow” and Moderator, “Surgery and device intervention for the
elderly with heart failure: assessing the need”, 2011 Congress of the Heart Failure Association of the European Society of Cardiology, Göteborg Sweden, May 2011
Faculty, Implantable Defibrillation Devices Symposium: “Preparing for Death with a Device”, 15th annual meeting of the HFSA, Boston MA September 2011
Faculty/Presenter, “Consequences of Poor Adherence”, 16th annual meeting of the HFSA, Seattle, WA September 2012
Faculty, Symposium “Patient-Centered Care in Heart Failure” and Panelist, Meet the Experts “Advanced Heart Failure in the Older Patient: Transplant versus DT versus Neither”, ACC.13, March 2013
Faculty/Moderator: Rapid Fire Abstract and Hyde Park Presentations, 17th annual meeting of the HFSA, Orlando FL September 2013
Faculty, 62nd Annual Conference of the Israel Heart Society, and lecture “The Hospital Readmission Obsession in the USA”, Tel Aviv Israel, April 2015.
Faculty/Presenter, “Hidden Gems of Heart Failure Publishing” and “Should the Patient be Placed on a Low Salt and Fluid Restriction Diet?” 19th annual meeting of the HFSA.
Faculty, 50th Annual Lake Kawaguchi Conference of Cardiology, and lecture “Heart Failure: Challenges for the Future”, Fukuoka Japan, September 2016
Faculty/Moderator, “Primary Palliative Care in HF” and “Meet the Experts: Q&A with HF Journal Editors”, 20th annual meeting of the HFSA, Orlando FL, September 2016.

Competitive Submissions: Featured Presentations
Hyde Park Plenary sessions of the Heart Failure Society of America:
“Quality of Life should not be Measured in Heart Failure Trials”, 4th annual scientific meeting, Boca Raton, September 2000
“Leader pricing: Why Sam Walton would save the day”, 6th annual scientific meeting, Boca Raton, September 2002
“United States Presidents and Cardiovascular Disease: What Bush, Nader and Kerry Should Know”, 8th annual scientific meeting, Toronto Canada, September 2004
“Texas No-Limit Hold ‘Em: Dealing with Patient Preferences and Uncertainty”. 10th annual scientific meeting, Seattle, September 2006
“As if Global Warming Were Not Enough: How Patients are Wrecking Clinical Trials in Heart Failure by Making Too Much Noise”. 13th annual scientific meeting, Boston, September 2009
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Summary
John Lynn Jefferies, M.D., was named Co-Director of the newly formed UT Methodist Institute for Cardiovascular Science and Chief of the Division of Cardiovascular Diseases, effective July 1, 2018, with a concurrent faculty appointment as Professor in the Department of Medicine, within the College of Medicine. Professor Jefferies was recruited from the University of Cincinnati, where he was Professor of Adult Cardiovascular Disease and Pediatric Cardiology, an untenured appointment, and also Director of the Advanced Heart Failure and Cardiomyopathy Services in the Heart Institute at Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center.

Chancellor Schwab has recommended to the President that tenure be granted to Dr. Jefferies in his faculty appointment without serving a probationary period. Because Dr. Jefferies held an untenured faculty appointment at the University of Cincinnati, the Board’s tenure policy requires articulation of another exceptional circumstance warranting the grant of tenure upon initial appointment.

Chancellor Schwab explains that the primary focus of Dr. Jefferies’ recruitment was to serve as Director of the newly formed UT Methodist Institute for Cardiovascular Science, a position requiring status as a world-famous clinician. As Director of the Institute, Dr. Jefferies is not only responsible for leading current faculty members who have tenure, but also for recruiting exceptional faculty members who are tenured at another institution and for recruiting and making tenure recommendations with respect to tenure-track faculty. For this reason, Chancellor Schwab explains, it is essential that the Director of the Institute hold a tenured faculty appointment. Further, as described below and in Chancellor Schwab’s recommendation to the President, Dr. Jefferies’ academic credentials unquestionably meet, and even exceed, the criteria for tenure at UTHSC.

Dr. Jefferies has published 195 peer-reviewed publications, 17 book chapters, and three edited textbooks in cardiology. He has presented 101 abstracts and published 49. He serves as a reviewer
for more than 45 journals and is on the editorial board of three. He currently serves as principal or senior investigator on eight funded research grants and as co-investigator or investigator on two others. Professor Jefferies is a Fellow of the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American College of Cardiology, the American Health Association, and the Heart Failure Society of America. Professor Jefferies has mentored thirteen cardiology fellows and has served as a research mentor for students, residents, and fellows.

One of the external reviewers of the tenure dossier asserted that Dr. Jefferies would be granted tenure at his institution and most likely at “virtually every institution in the United States.” Another reviewer said essentially the same and described Dr. Jefferies as having “a reputation of being a master clinician, an internationally known and well published investigator, and a physician educator with a stellar reputation for programmatic success.”

The President has confirmed that all required tenure review and recommendation procedures were followed by the campus. Dr. Jefferies received the unanimous positive vote of both the departmental and college tenure committees, as well as the positive recommendation of the Acting Dean of the College of Medicine, the Chief Academic Officer, and Chancellor Schwab.

Based on Chancellor Schwab’s explanation of the exceptional circumstance warranting the grant of tenure upon initial appointment, and after his independent review of Dr. Jefferies’ tenure dossier, the President recommends that the Board grant tenure to Dr. Jefferies in his faculty appointment in the Department of Medicine within the College of Medicine. Dr. Jefferies’ curriculum vitae is included in the meeting materials.

Motion: I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend to the Board that tenure be granted to John Lynn Jefferies, M.D., in his faculty appointment in the Department of Medicine within the UTHSC College of Medicine by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

[Resolution follows]
The University of Tennessee
Board of Trustees

Resolution 00_-2018*
Grant of Tenure upon Initial Appointment to John Lynn Jefferies, M.D.

Resolved: Upon the recommendation of the President, the Board of Trustees grants tenure to John Lynn Jefferies, M.D., in his faculty appointment in the Department of Medicine within the UTHSC College of Medicine.

Adopted this 2nd day of November, 2018.

* Number will be inserted after adoption.
October 2, 2018

MEMORANDUM

TO: Joe DiPietro, President
   University of Tennessee

FR: Steve J. Schwab, Chancellor
   University of Tennessee Health Science Center

RE: Recommendation for Expedited Tenure for Dr. John Lynn Jefferies

Dr. J. Lynn Jefferies currently serves as Professor and Chief of the Division of Adult Cardiovascular Diseases in the Department of Medicine at UTHSC. He holds the Jay Michael Sullivan distinguished Chair in Cardiology and co-directs the Methodist University of Tennessee Cardiovascular Institute. He has an outstanding record in teaching, research, and service that qualifies him to be recommended for expedited tenure. Thus, we are seeking your approval for this expedited tenure request.

Dr. Jefferies received his medical degree from UTHSC. He served as an intern and resident at the University of Kentucky Department of Internal Medicine/Pediatrics. There he worked with Dr. Jacqueline A. Noonan, chair emeritus, and world-renowned pediatric cardiologist. While at the University of Kentucky, he received a Master of Public Health degree. He did a fellowship at University of Kentucky in General Internal Medicine and a combined adult and pediatric fellowship in cardiology at the Baylor College of Medicine, Texas Children’s Hospital, St. Luke’s Episcopal Hospital and the Texas Heart Institute. Follow the combined fellowship, he also completed a fellowship in Pediatric Cardiac Transplantation at Texas Children’s Hospital and Baylor College of Medicine.

Dr. Jefferies came to UTHSC from the Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center at the University of Cincinnati with his last appointment being as Professor of Adult Cardiovascular Diseases and Pediatric Cardiology. Prior to his work at the University of Cincinnati, he served as an assistant Professor at the Baylor College of Medicine and M.D. Anderson Cancer Center followed by the position of Associate Professor at Baylor College of Medicine.

As you can see from his attached CV, Dr. Jefferies has published widely with 195 peer-reviewed publications, 17 book chapters and 3 edited textbooks in his disciplinary field of cardiology. He has presented 101 abstracts and has published 49. He serves as Principle or Senior Investigator eight funded research grants and as Co-Investigator or Investigator on
two others. He has a long history of funded research and clinical trials. Dr. Jefferies has mentored thirteen cardiology fellows and has served as a research mentor for students, residents and fellows. Dr. Jefferies is a Fellow of the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American College of Cardiology, the American Health Association and the Heart Failure Society of America. He serves as a reviewer for more than 45 journals and is on the editorial boards of 3 journals.

His external letters of recommendation are from well-known physicians and scientists located at University of Cincinnati College of Medicine, University of Kentucky College of Medicine, LSU Health New Orleans School of Medicine and University of Tennessee Health Science Center. They describe Dr. Jefferies as “a well-known and respected clinical, education and clinical investigator.” One of the authors stated Dr. Jefferies is a quadruple threat” referring to his accomplishments in patient care, research and education along with administration and leadership. Dr. Jefferies’s accomplishments and international recognition will support UTHSC’s ongoing efforts to fully actualize our initiatives in cardiovascular research and patient care.

Dr. Jefferies’ academic appointment is in the Department of Medicine (Division of Cardiology) in the College of Medicine. His departmental colleagues have unanimously supported his receipt of tenure (23 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions). The College of Medicine’s Collegiate Promotion and Tenure Committee gave their unanimous positive vote in support of tenure (12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain), as did Dr. Samuel Dagogo-Jack, the interim chair of the Department of Medicine and Dr. Polly Hofmann, the Senior Executive Associate Dean and Acting Dean for Promotion and Tenure in the College of Medicine.

Clearly, I am strongly supportive of the award of expedited tenure to Dr. Jefferies. We believe he will make important contributions at UTHSC, advance the treatment of cardiovascular. Dr. Jefferies will be a transformational leader at UTHSC and in Memphis.

Sincerely,

Steve Schwab, MD
Chancellor
University of Tennessee Health Science Center

cc: Lori Gonzalez, PhD, Chief Academic Officer
    Polly Hofmann, PhD, Senior Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs
    Samuel Dagogo-Jack, Interim Chair, Department of Medicine
CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME: John Lynn Jefferies, MD, MPH, FACC, FAHA, FAAP, FHFSA

TITLE: Professor, Adult Cardiovascular Diseases and Pediatric Cardiology
Director, Advanced Heart Failure and Cardiomyopathy
Professor, Department of Human Genetics
The Heart Institute
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center

MAILING ADDRESS:

Hospitals: University of Cincinnati Medical Center
234 Goodman Street
Cincinnati, OH 45219

The Christ Hospital
2139 Auburn Avenue
Cincinnati, OH 45219

Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center
MLC 2003, 3333 Burnet Avenue
Cincinnati, Ohio 45229-3039

Phone (513)803-1675
Fax (513)803-3315
Email john.jefferies@cchmc.org

Residence: 10 Camargo Pines Lane
Cincinnati, Ohio 45243

BIRTHDATE: March 6, 1970

BIRTHPLACE: Charleston, West Virginia

MARITAL STATUS: Married, two children, John Parker and Caroline Grace Jefferies

CITIZENSHIP: United States

EDUCATION:

1984-1988 Campbell County Comprehensive High School
Jacksboro, Tennessee

1988-1992 University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee
B.S. in Microbiology

1992-1996 University of Tennessee College of Medicine
Memphis, Tennessee
M.D.
1996-1997  Intern, Internal Medicine/Pediatrics  
University of Kentucky  
Lexington, Kentucky  
Chairman: James E. Muller, M.D.  
Chairman Emeritus: Jacqueline A. Noonan, M.D.

1997-2000  Resident, Internal Medicine/Pediatrics  
University of Kentucky  
Lexington, Kentucky  
Chairman: Jay W. Mason, M.D.  
Chairman Emeritus: Jacqueline A. Noonan, M.D.

2000-2001  Masters of Public Health  
University of Kentucky  
Lexington, Kentucky

FELLOWSHIP:

2000-2001  General Internal Medicine  
University of Kentucky  
Lexington, Kentucky  
Chairman: Jay W. Mason, M.D.  
(This training was part of training for Master of Public Health degree.)

FELLOWSHIP:

2001-2006  Combined Adult and Pediatric Fellowship in Cardiology  
Division of Cardiovascular Medicine  
Division of Pediatric Cardiology  
Texas Heart Institute  
St. Luke’s Episcopal Hospital  
Texas Children’s Hospital  
Baylor College of Medicine  
Director: James T. Willerson, M.D.  
Director: Robert J. Hall, M.D.  
Director: J. Timothy Bricker, M.D.  
Director: Jeffrey A. Towbin, M.D.

2003-2006  Pediatric Cardiac Transplantation  
Division of Pediatric Cardiology  
Texas Children’s Hospital  
Baylor College of Medicine  
Houston, Texas  
Director: Jeffrey A. Towbin, M.D.
ACADEMIC POSITION:

2015-present  Professor  
    Adult Cardiovascular Diseases and Pediatric Cardiology  
    University of Cincinnati College of Medicine  

FACULTY POSITIONS:

2006-2010  Assistant Professor  
    Medicine/Adult Cardiovascular Diseases  
    Baylor College of Medicine  
    Texas Institute at St. Luke’s Episcopal Hospital  
    Houston, Texas  

2006-2010  Assistant Professor  
    Pediatrics/Pediatric Cardiology  
    Texas Children’s Hospital  
    Baylor College of Medicine  
    Houston, Texas  

2008-2010  Assistant Professor  
    Adult Cardiovascular Diseases and Pediatric Cardiology  
    M.D. Anderson Cancer Center  
    University of Texas  
    Houston, Texas  

2010-2015  Associate Professor  
    Medicine/Adult Cardiovascular Diseases  
    Baylor College of Medicine  
    Texas Institute at St. Luke’s Episcopal Hospital  
    Houston, Texas  

2010-2015  Associate Professor  
    Pediatric Cardiology  
    Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
    Cincinnati, Ohio  

2015-present  Professor  
    Adult Cardiovascular Diseases  
    University of Cincinnati  
    Cincinnati, Ohio  

2015-present  Professor  
    Pediatric Cardiology  
    Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
    Cincinnati, Ohio
2015-present  Professor, Division of Human Genetics  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
Cincinnati, Ohio

FACULTY SERVICE:

2006-2010  Adult Cardiovascular Diseases  
Texas Heart Institute  
Baylor College of Medicine  
Houston, Texas

2006-2010  Pediatric Cardiac Intensivist  
Texas Children’s Hospital  
Baylor College of Medicine  
Houston, Texas

2006-2010  Pediatric Cardiomyopathy Service  
Texas Children’s Hospital  
Baylor College of Medicine  
Houston, Texas

2006-2010  Pediatric Cardiac Transplant Service  
UNOS Certified (2007)  
Texas Children’s Hospital  
Baylor College of Medicine  
Houston, Texas

2006-2010  Cardiovascular Genetics Service  
Texas Children’s Hospital  
Baylor College of Medicine  
Houston, Texas

2006-2010  Pediatric Cardiologist  
St. Luke’s Episcopal Hospital  
Baylor College of Medicine  
Houston, Texas

2006-2010  Cardiologist  
M.D. Anderson Hospital  
University of Texas  
Houston, Texas

2008-2010  Director, Cardiomyopathy/Heart Failure Program  
Texas Children’s Hospital  
Baylor College of Medicine  
Houston, Texas
2009-2010  Co-Director, Cardiovascular Genetics  
Texas Children’s Hospital  
Baylor College of Medicine  
Houston, Texas

2010-present  Director, Advanced Heart Failure and Cardiomyopathy  
The Heart Institute  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
Cincinnati, Ohio

2010-2011  Medical Director, Cardiac Transplantation  
The Heart Institute  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
Cincinnati, Ohio

2010-  Attending, Advanced Heart Failure Service  
Ohio Heart and Vascular  
The Christ Hospital  
Cincinnati, Ohio

2010-2013  Co-Director, Cardiovascular Genetics  
The Heart Institute  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
Cincinnati, Ohio

2010-2013  Associate Director, Heart Institute Research Core  
The Heart Institute  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
Cincinnati, Ohio

2013-  Associate Professor, Division of Human Genetics  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
Cincinnati, Ohio

2016-  Professor, Adult Cardiovascular Diseases  
University of Cincinnati Medical Center  
Cincinnati, OH

2016-  Professor, Pediatric Cardiology  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
Cincinnati, OH

2016-  Professor, Division of Human Genetics  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
Cincinnati, OH

2016-  Cardiology Clinical Consultant  
Heart Institute Diagnostic Laboratory  
Cincinnati, OH
2016- Cardiology Consultant
Shriners Hospital
Cincinnati, OH

LICENSURE:
Texas – L6964
Ohio – 35096072
Kentucky – 33766

LICENSING AGENCY: National Board of Medical Examiners

ADDITIONAL TRAINING:
2012 Core Leadership, Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center
2012 Intermediate Improvement Science (I2S2)
2013 Advanced Improvement Methods

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIPS:
1992 Phi Beta Kappa
1992 Phil Kappa Phi
1995 American Medical Association
1997 American Academy of Pediatrics
1997 Kentucky Medical Association
2001 American Heart Association – Silver Heart Member
2001 American College of Cardiology
2001 Irish American Pediatric Society
2004 Adult Congenital Heart Association
2006 Heart Failure Society of America
2006 American Society of Echocardiography
2006 American College of Cardiology
Congenital Heart Disease and Pediatric Cardiology Section
2006 Texas Chapter, American College of Cardiology
2007  Texas Medical Association
2007  Harris County Medical Society
2007  Pediatric Cardiac Intensive Care Society
2007  International Society of Heart and Lung Transplantation
2008  Cambridge Who’s Who
2009  Marquis Who’s Who in America
2009  Fellow, American Academy of Pediatrics
2009  Fellow, American College of Cardiology
2011  International Cardi Oncology Society
2011  American College of Physicians, Internal Medicine
2011-present  America’s Top Cardiologists
2012  Cincinnati’s Top Doctors
2013-present  Best Doctors in America
2013  Cor Vitae, American Heart Association
2013  Fellow, American Heart Association
2013-present  Cincinnati’s Top Doctors
2013  Society for Pediatric Research (SPR)
2014-present  Children’s Oncology Group (COG)
2014  Cincy Magazine Top Doctors
2014  Heart Failure Society of America Mentoring Program
2015  Cardio Renal Society of America
2016  Fellow, Heart Failure Society of America
PRECEPTORSHIPS:

Preceptor, Student Advisory Program, Kinkaid High School, Houston, Texas.

Preceptor, Student Pre-Medical Association, Rice University, Houston, Texas.

HONORS AND AWARDS:


Outstanding Resident in Pediatric Cardiology Award, Department of Pediatrics, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky. June 1999.

Outstanding Resident in Pediatric Intensive Care Award, Department of Pediatrics, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky. June 1999.

Outstanding Resident in Pediatric Nephrology Award, Department of Pediatrics, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky. June 2000.

Outstanding Resident Research Award, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky. June 2000.

Outstanding Teacher Award, Internal Medicine and Pediatrics, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky. June 2000.


Winner, Sponsorship, Heart Failure University, Los Angeles, California. November 2005.


**PEER REVIEW/ JOURNAL REVIEWER:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Journal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-present</td>
<td>Reviewer, <em>Texas Heart Institute Journal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-present</td>
<td>Reviewer, <em>Circulation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-present</td>
<td>Reviewer, <em>Journal of the American College of Cardiology</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-present</td>
<td>Reviewer, <em>Journal of Heart and Lung Transplantation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-present</td>
<td>Reviewer, <em>Pediatrics</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-present</td>
<td>Reviewer, <em>Congenital Heart Disease</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-present</td>
<td>Reviewer, <em>Pediatric Transplantation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-present</td>
<td>Reviewer, <em>Cardiology</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-present</td>
<td>Reviewer, <em>International Journal of Cardiology</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-present</td>
<td>Reviewer, <em>Circulation Journal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-present</td>
<td>Reviewer, <em>Journal of Cardiac Failure</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-present</td>
<td>Reviewer, <em>Circulation Research</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-present</td>
<td>Reviewer, <em>Postgraduate Medicine</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-present</td>
<td>Reviewer, <em>American Journal of Cardiology</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-present</td>
<td>Reviewer, <em>Canadian Journal of Cardiology</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Reviewer, <em>The Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation (EME) Program, National Institute for Health Research (UK)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-present</td>
<td>Reviewer, <em>European Journal of Paediatric Neurology</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-present</td>
<td>Reviewer, <em>Molecular Genetics and Metabolism</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-present</td>
<td>Reviewer, <em>Health Research Board</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2014-present  Reviewer, *Italian Journal of Pediatrics*
2014-present  Reviewer, *The National Medical Research Council (NMRC)*
2014-present  Reviewer, *Pediatric Nephrology*
2014-present  Reviewer, *Journal of Inborn Errors of Metabolism and Screening*
2014-present  Reviewer, *The Journal of Steroid Biochemistry and Molecular Biology*
2014-present  Reviewer, *American Journal of Cardiovascular Drugs*
2014-present  Reviewer, *Catheter and Cardiovascular Interventions*
2014-present  Reviewer, *Journal of Pediatrics*
2015-present  Reviewer, *JACC Heart Failure*
2015-present  Reviewer, *Case Reports in Infectious Diseases*
2015-present  Reviewer, *Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare*
2015-present  Reviewer, *BMJ Case Reports*
2015  Reviewer, *Wellcome Trust, India Alliance System*
2015  Reviewer, *BioMed Research International*
2015-present  Reviewer, *American Heart Journal*
2016  Reviewer, *Pediatric Academic Societies Workshop*
2016-present  Reviewer, *Current Medicinal Chemistry*
2016  Reviewer, 2016 Heart, Lung, and Vascular Institute Study Section, University of Cincinnati
2016-present  Reviewer, *Case Reports in Obstetrics and Gynecology*
2016-present  Reviewer, *Kidney and Blood Pressure Research*
2016-present  Reviewer, *Circulation Heart Failure*
2016-present  Reviewer, *Clinical Science*
2016-present  Reviewer, *Expert Review of Cardiovascular Therapy*
2016-present  Reviewer, *Clinical Cardiology*

2017-present  Reviewer, *Gene*

2017-present  Reviewer, *Critical Care Medicine*

2017-present  Reviewer, JACC Cardiovascular Imaging

**SERVICE COMMITTEES:**

1997  Cardiology Section Review Committee  
Department of Internal Medicine  
University of Kentucky

2007-2010  Institutional Review Board  
Baylor College of Medicine

2009-2010  Committee on Scientific Integrity  
Baylor College of Medicine

2009-2010  Faculty Research and Fellowship Support Committee  
Baylor College of Medicine

2009-2010  International Activities Committee  
Baylor College of Medicine

2010-present  Scholarship Oversight Committee  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center

2011-present  Internal Advisory Committee  
Program Project Grant “Mechanisms and Clinical Phenotypes of Arrhythmogenic Cardiomyopathy”  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center

2012-present  Data Safety Monitoring Board  
Clinical Research Study “An Open-Label Trial to Determine the Effect of Losartan Potassium Tablets in Subjects with Eosinophilic Esophagitis (EoE)  
With or Without a Connective Tissue Disorder”  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center

2012-present  Research Advisory Committee  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center

2012-2017  Ohio-ACC Board of Trustees  
Ohio American College of Cardiology

2012-present  Chair, Pediatric Heart Failure Initiative
Healthcare Accreditation Colloquium

2013-2014 Committee Member, Thesis: Allyson Sommers

2013-present Member, Adult Care Steering Committee, Cincinnati Children’s Hospital

2013 International Greater Cincinnati World Affairs Council – US Department of State Visitor Leadership Program

2014-present ACHD Steering Committee – Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center

2014 American College of Cardiology Careers in Heart Failure and Transplant Work Group

2015-present Member, Heart Institute Tissue Biorepository Steering Committee

2015-present Member, HFSA Development Committee Heart Failure Society of America

2016-present Member, Careers in Heart Failure Work Group American College of Cardiology

JOURNAL EDITORIAL BOARDS:

2009-present Editorial Board Member Texas Heart Institute Journal

2015-present Editorial Board Member PLOS ONE

2015-present Editorial Board Member Journal of Cardiac Failure

GRANT APPLICATION REVIEWER:

2010-present Grant Application Reviewer Barth Syndrome Foundation

ADVISORY BOARDS:

2013-present Korey Stringer Institute Medical Advisory Board

2013-present The Dystrophic Epidermolysis Bullosa Research Association of America Medical Advisory Board
2015  Medtronic CRHF  
Heart Failure Advisory Board  

2015  Barth Syndrome Foundation  
International Scientific and Medical Advisory Board  

REGISTRY AND STUDY BOARDS:  

2009-present  Steering Committee  
Pediatric Cardiomyopathy Registry  
Funded by NHLBI  

2013-present  Chronic Kidney Disease in Children Prospective Cohort Study (CKiD)  
Cardiovascular Subcommittee  

MEDICAL MONITOR:  

2015-present  Syncardia 50cc Temporary Total Artificial Heart (TAH-T) as a Bridge to Transplant (BTT)  

GRANTS AWARDED:  

Active Grants:  

2012-present  **Investigator**  
Title of Project: Cardiac Biomarkers in Pediatric Cardiomyopathy  
1 R01 HL109090-01  
Principal Investigator: Steven Lipshultz, M.D.  
$7,235,569.00 Total  
July 2012-December 2017  

2013-present  **Principal Investigator**  
Continuous Arrhythmia Monitoring in Patients With Left Ventricular Noncompaction  
Sponsor: Medtronic  
Amount: $50,000  
February 1, 2013-December 31, 2017  

2013-present  **Investigator**  
NIH-NHLBI RO1 HL111459-01  
Principal Investigator, Carolyn Ho, M.D.  
HCMNet2: Using Genetics for Early Phenotyping and Prevention of HCM  
$11,304,199 (Total)  
September 2012-August 2016
2015-present  **Principal Investigator**  
Use of Handheld Technology to Enhance Patient Cardiac Care:  
Development and Assessment of Portable Device Applications to Improve  
Communication and Resource Utilization in Pediatric Cardiomyopathy  
Children’s Heart Association of Cincinnati  
$20,000  
October 1, 2015-November 1, 2017

2015-present  **Mentor and Senior Investigator**  
Primary Investigator: Samuel Wittekind, M.D.  
Cardiac Rehabilitation in Young Patients With Dilated Cardiomyopathy  
Sponsor: Children’s Heart Association of Cincinnati  
$20,000.00

2015-present  **Principal Investigator**  
A Randomized, Open-label Study of the Safety and Efficacy of Multi-  
Vessel Intracoronary Delivery of Allogeneic Cardiosphere-Derived Cells  
in Patients with Cardiomyopathy Secondary to Duchenne Muscular  
Dystrophy [HOPE-Duchenne (Halt cardiomyOPathyprogrEssion in  
Duchenne)]  
Sponsor: Capricor  
Amount: $510,000  
August 18, 2015-August 17, 2017

2015-present  **Principal Investigator**  
A Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled, Multicenter Study with an Open-  
Label Extension to Evaluate the Efficacy and Safety of SRP-4045 and  
SRP-4053 in Patients with Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy  
Sponsor: Sarepta  
Amount: $291,207.00  
October 14, 2015-October 13, 2017

2015-present  **Principal Investigator**  
SHaRe: The Sarcomeric Human Cardiomyopathies Registry Charter  
Sponsor: Myokardia  
Amount: $100,000  
December 1, 2015-November 30, 2018

2016-present  **Principal Investigator**  
Assessment of Quality of Life, Anxiety, and Depression in Barth  
Syndrome: Expanding the Scope of Comprehensive Care  
Sponsor: Barth Syndrome Foundation
2017-present  
**Principal Investigator**  
Multicenter, open-label, study to evaluate safety, tolerability, pharmacokinetics and, pharmacodynamics of LCZ696 followed by a 52-week randomized, double-blind, parallel group, active-controlled study to evaluate the efficacy and safety of LCZ696 compared with enalapril in pediatric patients from 1 month to < 18 years of age with heart failure due to systemic left ventricle systolic dysfunction.  
Sponsor: Novartis  
Amount: $189,951.00  
August 2017-September 2020

2017-present  
**Principal Investigator**  
Evaluation of Clinical Outcome Assessments for Pediatric Heart Failure: Patient Interviews  
Sponsor: Novartis  
Amount: $14,952  
January 25, 2017-March 18, 2018

2017-2020  
**Principal Investigator**  
An exploratory, open-label study to assess the effect of P-188 NF (Carmeseal-MDTM) on safety, on respiratory and cardiac dysfunction and on upper body strength in non-ambulatory patients with Duchenne muscular dystrophy (DMD)  
Sponsor: Phrixus Pharmaceuticals, Inc.  
Amount: $382,502  
September 2017-December 2018

**Previous Grants:**

2000-2001  
**Principal Investigator**  
Quality of Life and Social Outcomes of Adults with Congenital Heart Disease  
Sponsor: Crippled Children’s Network / Amount: $5,000

2003-2005  
**Principal Investigator**  
The Use of Nesiritide in the Pediatric Heart Failure Population  
Sponsor: Scios, Inc. / Amount: $35,000

2006-2008  
**Principal Investigator**  
A Case History, International, Multicenter Trial to Evaluate the Efficacy and Safety of Cardiolite Myocardial Perfusion Imaging in Pediatrics Patients with Kawasaki Disease  
Sponsor: Bristol-Myers Squibb
2006-2008  
**Investigator**  
Reduction of Events with Darbepoetin Alfa in Heart Failure Trial  
Sponsor: Amgen

2006-2010  
**Primary Site Investigator**  
Trial of Beta Blocker Therapy vs Angiotensin II Receptor Blocker Therapy in Individuals with Marfan Syndrome  
Sponsor: Pediatric Heart Network  
Amount: $50,000/year

2007-2010  
**Investigator**  
International Randomized Double Blind Clinical Study Evaluating the Efficacy and Safety of Clopidogrel 0.2 mg/kg Once Daily Versus Placebo in Neonates and Infants with Cyanotic Congenital Heart Disease Palliated with a Systemic-to-Pulmonary Artery Shunt (e.g. Modified Blalock Taussig Shunt)

2007-2010  
**Recipient**  
American College of Cardiology  
ACCF/Pfizer Research Award  
Amount: $65,000/year ($195,000 total)

2007-2008  
**Recipient**  
Thrasher New Researcher Award  
Amount: $26,750

2009-2010  
Pediatric Cardiomyopathy Registry Cohort Study; NIH/NHLBI; R01 HL53392-15  
Primary Institution: University of Miami  
**Principal Investigator:** Steven Lipshultz, MD  
**Subcontract Principal Investigator:** John Lynn Jefferies, MD, MPH  
$40,000 Direct/$61,400 Total  
June 1, 2009-May 31, 2010

2009-2010  
**Primary Investigator**  
Observational Pilot Study among children hospitalized for acute heart failure syndrome (AHFS) with volume overload secondary to cardiovascular etiology or due to post-operative volume-overload (POVO) following cardiopulmonary bypass (CPB) for surgical repair of a congenital heart defect.  
Sponsor: Merck, Inc.  
Amount: $57,635

2009-2010  
**Investigator**  
National Registry of genetically triggered thoracic aortic aneurysms and cardiovascular conditions (GENTAC)
2012-2013  **Recipient**  
Pediatric Heart Failure Fellowship Funding Support  
Funding in the amount of $15,000.00  
The Medtronic Grants and Donations Committee

2012-2016  **Investigator – 10% Support**  
Title of Project: Cardiac Biomarkers in Pediatric Cardiomyopathy  
1 R01 HL109090-01  
**Principal Investigator: Steven Lipshultz, M.D.**  
The major goal of this project is to identify clinically relevant biomarkers in children with Cardiomyopathies and determine the predictability of outcome.  
$7,235,569.00 Total  
July 2012-June 2016

2013-2016  **Primary Site Investigator**  
Otsuka 156-08-276 A Phase 3b, Multicenter, Open-label, Randomized Withdrawal Trial of the Effects of Titrated Oral SAMSCA® (Tolvaptan) on  
Serum Sodium, Pharmacokinetics, and Safety in Children and Adolescent Subjects Hospitalized With Euvolemic or Hypervolemic Hyponatremia

2013-2016  **Primary Site Investigator**  
Otsuka 156-11-294 A Phase 3b, Multicenter, Extension Follow-up Trial to Evaluate the Long-term Safety of Children and Adolescent Subjects With Euvolemic or Hypervolemic Hyponatremia Who Have Previously Participated in a Trial of Titrated Oral SAMSCA® (Tolvaptan)

2013-2014  **Recipient**  
Pediatric Heart Failure Fellowship Funding Support  
Funding in the amount of $15,000.00  
The Medtronic Grants and Donations Committee

2014-2016  **Investigator**  
Phase II randomized, placebo-controlled, double blind clinical trial of valsartan for attenuating disease evolution in early sarcomeric HCM

2014-2016  **Co-Investigator**  
Genzyme: A Phase 4, open, label, prospective study in patients with Pompe Disease to evaluate the efficacy and safety of Alglucosidase Alfa produced at the 4000 L Scale
2014-2016  **Co-Investigator**
GENZYME: A Phase 3/4, Prospective, Multinational, Open-label, Noninferiority Study of Alglucosidase Alfa Manufactured at the 160 L and 4000 L Scales in Treatment Naïve Patients with Infantile-Onset Pompe Disease

2014-2016  **Co-Investigator**
Genzyme: A Cross-sectional Study of Renal Function in Treatment-naïve, Young Male Patients with Fabry Disease

2014-2016  **Co-Investigator**
Genzyme: Characterization Of Coronary Artery Disease In Individuals With Mucopolysacharidoses

2013-present  **Site Investigator**
NIH-NHLBI RO1 HL111459-01
Principal Investigator, Carolyn Ho, M.D.
“HCMNet2: Using Genetics for Early Phenotyping and Prevention of HCM”
$11,304,199 (Total)
September 1, 2012-August 31, 2016

2014-present  **Site Investigator – 10% support**
NIH-NHLBI RO1 HL111459-01
Principal Investigator, Stephen E. Lipshultz, M.D.
“Genotype-Phenotype Associations in Pediatric Cardiomyopathies”.
$11,304,199 (Total)
September 1, 2012-August 31, 2016

2015-2017  **Principal Investigator**
“Use of Handheld Technology to Enhance Patient Cardiac Care: Development and Assessment of Portable Device Applications to Improve Communication and Resource Utilization in Pediatric Cardiomyopathy”
Children’s Heart Association of Cincinnati
$20,000.00
October 1, 2015-November 1, 2017

2014-2016  **Co-Investigator**
Novartis
Multicenter, open-label, dose escalation study to evaluate safety, tolerability, and pharmacokinetics of RLX030 in addition to standard of care in pediatric patients from birth to <18 years of age, hospitalized with acute heart failure.
2016-2017  
**Mentor and Senior Investigator**  
Primary Investigator: Hunter Wilson, M.D.  
Characterization of the Early Cardiac Phenotype in Anderson-Fabry Disease  
American Academy of Pediatrics  
$3,000.00  
December 1, 2016-June 30, 2017

2016-2017  
**Mentor and Senior Investigator**  
Primary Investigator: Hunter Wilson, M.D.  
Characterization of the Early Cardiac Phenotype in Anderson-Fabry Disease  
Cincinnati Children’s Research Fund  
$2,000.00  
December 1, 2016-June 30, 2017

2017  
**Senior Investigator**  
Treatment of non-ambulatory boys and young men with Duchenne muscular dystrophy (DMD) and with resultant respiratory and cardiac dysfunction and skeletal muscle weakness with 5 mg/kg of P-188 NF (Carmaseal-MD™)  
Sponsor: Phrixus  
$472,728  
August 1, 2017-Aug 1, 2019

**ADVANCED HEART FAILURE AND TRANSPLANT TRAINEES:**

2006-2007  
Joseph Rossano, M.D.  
Director, Heart Failure and Cardiac Transplantation  
Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

2008-2009  
Ivan Wilmot, M.D.  
Faculty, Heart Failure and Cardiac Transplantation  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital medical Center  
Cincinnati, Ohio

2009-2010  
Sabrina Law, M.D.  
Faculty, Heart Failure and Cardiac Transplantation  
Seattle Children’s Hospital  
Seattle, Washington

2012-2013  
Thomas Ryan, M.D., PhD.  
Faculty, Heart Failure and Cardiac Transplantation  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital medical Center  
Cincinnati, Ohio
2013-2014  
John Parent, M.D.  
Advanced Fellow, Heart Failure and Cardiac Transplantation  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
Cincinnati, Ohio

2013-2014  
Tamara Thomas, M.D.  
Advanced Fellow, Heart Failure and Cardiac Transplantation  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
Cincinnati, Ohio

2013-2014  
Chet Villa, M.D.  
Advanced Fellow, Heart Failure and Cardiac Transplantation  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
Cincinnati, Ohio

2015  
Jacob Mathew, M.D.  
Advanced Fellow, Heart Failure and Cardiac Transplantation  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
Cincinnati, Ohio

2015-2016  
Sairah Khan, M.D.  
Advanced Fellow, Heart Failure and Cardiac Transplantation  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
Cincinnati, OH

2016-2017  
Michelle Ploutz, M.D.  
Advanced Fellow, Heart Failure and Cardiac Transplantation  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
Cincinnati, OH

2016-2017  
Bethany Wisotzkey, M.D.  
Advanced Fellow, Heart Failure and Cardiac Transplantation  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
Cincinnati, OH

RESEARCH MENTORING:

2014  
John Shabosky  
Medical Student Scholars in Child and Adolescent Health Summer Research Scholarship  
$2,500

2011-2012  
Jaime Echartea-Gonzalez, M.D.  
Fellow, Pediatric Gastroenterology  
Fellow, Pediatric Hepatology  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center
2012-2014  Ahmad Kaddourah, M.D., M.S.  
Fellow, Pediatric Nephrology  
Fellow, Acute Care Nephrology  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center

2015-2016  Jaime Silva-Gburek, M.D.  
Resident, General Pediatrics  
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center

2016  Randa Newman  
Genetic Counselor Graduate Student  
University of Cincinnati

2016  Clifford J Chin  
Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowship  
Student, Washington University, St. Louis, MO  
Research Site: Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
Project: Sleep Disordered Breathing in Patients With Cardiomyopathy

2016  Hayley Jaeger  
Student Achievement in Research and Scholarship (STARS)  
University of Cincinnati  
Research Site: Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center

2016  Destini Thomas-Hayes  
Student Achievement in Research and Scholarship (STARS)  
University of Cincinnati  
Research Site: Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center

2016  Destini Thomas-Hayes  
Ronald E. McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement Program  
University of Cincinnati  
Research Site: Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
Project: Sleep Disordered Breathing in Patients With Cardiomyopathy

2017  Hunter Wilson, MD  
Resident, Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
Research Site, Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center  
Project: Characterization of the Early Cardiac Phenotype in Anderson-Fabry Disease

**INVITED PRESENTATIONS:**


40. “Neurodevelopmental Outcomes in Patients with Congenital Heart Disease.” Invited Lecture, Acute Care for the Primary Care Practitioner Conference. Hilton Head Island, South Carolina. June 2007.


69. “Infections in Heart Failure.” Division of Infectious Diseases Faculty Meeting, Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center. Cincinnati, Ohio. January 2011.

70. “Chemotherapy-Induced Cardiotoxicity: Existing and Future Diagnostic and Therapeutic Strategies.” Oncology Grand Rounds, Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center. Cincinnati, Ohio. February 2011.


75. “Heart Failure/VAD’s.” CICU Education Blitz 2011, Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center. Cincinnati, Ohio. April 2011.

77. “Genetically Triggered Aortopathies.” Emerging Topics in Clinical Genomics Lecture Series, University of Cincinnati Genetic Counseling Graduate Program, Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center. Cincinnati, Ohio. April 2011.


82. “The Heart & Genetics of the Heart.” Team Taught Course for Graduate Students in Molecular & Developmental Biology and Disease Course Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center. Cincinnati, Ohio. February 2012.


86. “Pediatric Heart Failure: Diagnosis and Management.” Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center, CICU Educational Blitz. Cincinnati, Ohio. April 2012.


88. “Transition of Congenital Heart Disease (CHD) Patients to Adulthood.” Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center, Pediatric Cardiology Grand Rounds. Cincinnati, Ohio. May 2012.


90. “Diagnosis and Management of Heart Failure in the Pediatric Population.” 2012 Cardiovascular Ultrasound Fall Conference, Cincinnati, Ohio, September 2012.


105. “Restrictive Cardiomyopathy – To Transplant or Manage Medically, the Great Debate.” Heart Failure/Transplant Educational Conference, Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center. Cincinnati, Ohio. June 2013.


110. “Cardio-Oncology: The Importance of the Heart in the Care of Cancer Patients.” Faculty Research CrossTalk, Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center. Cincinnati, Ohio. December 2013.


117. “Cardiac Rehabilitation in Patients with Coronary Disease and Heart Failure.” Cincinnati Clinical Exercise Testing and Therapeutics Symposium 2014, Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center. Cincinnati, Ohio. March 2014.

118. “Heart Health and Ongoing Cardiac Surveillance for Cancer Survivors.” CBDI Survivor Meeting, Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center. Cincinnati, Ohio. May 2014.

119. “Heart Disease Secondary to Treatment of Childhood Cancer.” CBDI Survivor Meeting, Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center. Cincinnati, Ohio. May 2014.


133. “Multidisciplinary Fabry Care: Challenges and Opportunities.” The Power of Registries in Rare Disease: Expanding knowledge from birth to adulthood. 15th National Rare Disease Registries Meeting. Chicago, Illinois. November 2015.


153. “Fabry Heart” FSIG Expert Fabry Conference, Cincinnati, OH. April 2017


158. “Cardiovascular Findings in Fabry Disease”. Sanofi Genzyme WebEx / Medical College of Wisconsin. June 2017


ABSTRACTS PRESENTED:


39. Erin M Miller, MS, Richard Czosek, MD, Amy Garrison, MS, Paula Goldenberg, MD, Michelle Grenier, MD, **John L. Jefferies, MD**, Angela Lorts, MD, Ashley Parrott, MS, Jeffrey Towbin, MD, Stephanie M. Ware, MD, PhD, *Toward Evidence-Based Guidelines for Cardiac Screening in Pediatric Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy*. The Heart Institute Retreat, Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center.

41. Tamara Thomas, MD, **John L. Jefferies, MS, MD**, Angela Lorts, MD, D. Woodrow Benson, MD, PhD, Jeffrey Anderson, MD, Kan Hor, MD, Zhiqian Gao, PhD, Linda Cripe, MD, Elaine Urbina, MS, MD. *Autonomic Dysfunction by Heart Rate Variability Analyses Correlates with Myocardial Fibrosis in Pediatric Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy*. ACC, San Francisco, California. March 2013.


82. Wittekind S, Jefferies JL. *Cardiac Rehabilitations in Young Patients with Nonschismic Dilated Cardiomyopathy.* Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center Heart Institute Research Retreat, Cincinnati, Ohio. September 2015.


Preliminary Results for Pediatric Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy. Pediatric Academic Societies Meeting, Baltimore, Maryland. May 2016.


ABSTRACTS PUBLISHED:


24. Tamara Thomas, MD; Elaine Urbina, MS, MD; Angela Lorts, MD; Kan Hor, MD; John L Jefferies, MS, MD; Jeffrey Anderson, MD; Zhiqian Gao, PhD. Autonomic Dysfunction Found in Pediatric DMD Patients by Heart Rate Variability Analyses. Midwest Pediatric Cardiology Society Conference, September 2012 Herma Heart Center at Children's Hospital of Wisconsin.


**PUBLICATIONS:**


87. Madueme PC, Mazur W, Hor KN, Germann JT, **Jefferies JL**, Taylor MD. Comparison of area-length method by echocardiography versus full-volume quantification by cardiac magnetic resonance imaging for the assessment of left atrial volumes in children, adolescents, and young adults. *Pediatr Cardiol* 2013; Nov 17 [Epub ahead of print].

89. Ryan TD, Jefferies JL, Sawnani H, Wong BL, Gardner A, Del Corral M, Lorts A, Morales DL. Implantation of the HeartMate II and HeartWare left ventricular assist devices in patients with Duchenne muscular dystrophy: Lessons learned from the first applications. Accepted by ASAIO.


92. Madueme PC, Grenier M, Taylor MD, Jefferies JL. Restrictive cardiomyopathy and left ventricular noncompaction associated with a Noonan syndrome phenotype in an 11-year old girl. Submitted to Tex Heart Inst J.


100. Towbin JA, Lorts A, Jefferies JL. Left ventricular noncompaction cardiomyopathy. Lancet 2015; Apr 9 [Epub ahead of print].

101. Rusconi P, Wilkinson JD, Sleeper LA, Lu M, Cox GF, Towbin JA, Colan SD, Webber SA, Canter CE, Ware SM, Hsu D, Chung WK, Jefferies JL, Cordero C, Lipshultz SE. Differences in presentation and outcomes between children with familial dilated cardiomyopathy and
children with non-familial idiopathic dilated cardiomyopathy: a report from the Pediatric Cardiomyopathy Registry Study Group. Submitted to *J Am Coll Cardiol*.


175. Cardiomyopathies due to left ventricular noncompaction, mitochondrial, and storage diseases, and inborn errors of metabolism. Towbin JA, Jefferies JL. Circ Res 2017. Sep 15;121(7);838-845.


BOOK CHAPTERS:


**TEXTBOOKS EDITED:**


**Jefferies JL**, Rossano JW, Shaddy RE, Chang AC, Towbin JA. *Heart Failure in the Child and Young Adult: From Bench to Bedside.*
Summary
On October 1, 2018, Scott Strome, M.D., began employment with the UT Health Science Center as Executive Dean of the College of Medicine, with a concurrent faculty appointment in the Department of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery. Chancellor Schwab has recommended to the President that tenure be granted to Dr. Strome in his faculty appointment without serving a probationary period. Dr. Strome was recruited from the University of Maryland, where he was a tenured Professor and Chair of the Department of Otorhinolaryngology in the School of Medicine.

Dr. Strome has an extensive publication history with 123 published peer-reviewed articles, one book and eight book chapters, 22 presented papers or abstracts, and seven patents. He is a reviewer for three journals in his discipline and has served on advisory and review committees for the National Cancer Institute. He has extensive current and completed external research funding, most as a principal investigator or co-investigator. He has mentored 12 post-doctoral fellows and four Ph.D. students.

The President has confirmed that Dr. Strome satisfies all requirements for tenure upon initial appointment, including (1) that he could not have been successfully recruited from his faculty appointment as Professor, with tenure, in the Department of Otorhinolaryngology in the School of Medicine at the University of Maryland; and (2) that all required tenure review and recommendation procedures were followed by the campus. Dr. Strome received the unanimous positive vote of both the departmental and college tenure committees, as well as the positive recommendation of the Chief Academic Officer and Chancellor Schwab.

After his independent review of the tenure dossier, the President recommends that the Board grant tenure to Dr. Strome in his faculty appointment in the Department of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery within the UTHSC College of Medicine. Dr. Strome’s curriculum vitae is included in the meeting materials.

[continued on next page]
Motion: I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend to the Board that tenure be granted to Scott Strome, M.D., in his faculty appointment in the Department of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery within the UTHSC College of Medicine by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

[Resolution follows]
Resolved: Upon the recommendation of the President, the Board of Trustees grants tenure to Scott Strome, M.D., in his faculty appointment in the Department of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery within the UTHSC College of Medicine.

Adopted this 2nd day of November, 2018.

* Number will be inserted after adoption.
October 2, 2018

MEMORANDUM

TO: Joe DiPietro, President
University of Tennessee

FR: Steve J. Schwab, Chancellor
University of Tennessee Health Science Center

RE: Recommendation for Expedited Tenure for Dr. Scott Strome

Dr. Scott Strome assumed the role of Executive Dean of the College of Medicine and Vice Chancellor of Health Affairs at the University of Tennessee Health Science Center (UTHSC). He will also hold the rank of Professor of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery. We are seeking your approval for an expedited tenure request for Dr. Strome, given his outstanding qualifications in leadership, teaching, research, patient care and service.

Dr. Strome received his terminal degree, MD, from Harvard Medical School. He did his residency in Otorhinolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery at the University of Michigan Medical Center and a Fellowship in the department of Otorhinolaryngology at the Allegany Health Education and Research Foundation. He was mentored by Dr. Lieping Chen at the Mayo Clinic. He is a Fellow in the American College of Surgeons, the Head and Neck Society, the Triological Society and the American Laryngological Association. Currently, he serves as Professor and Chair of the Department of Otorhinolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery at the University of Maryland School of Medicine. He began his academic career at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, MN.

As his attached CV reflects, Dr. Strome has an extensive publication history with 123 published peer-reviewed articles, 1 book and 8 book chapters, 22 presented papers or abstracts and 7 patents. He is the founder of Strome Steel Surgical and co-founder of Gliknik Inc., a company focused on developing novel therapeutics for the treatment of cancer and autoimmunity. He is a reviewer for three journals in his discipline and has served on advisory and review committees for the National Cancer Institute. He has extensive active and completed extramural funding in research, most as a Principal Investigator or Co-Investigator. Dr. Strome has a strong history of mentoring others. He has mentored 12 post-doctoral fellows and four Ph.D. students. He has also served as a research mentor for junior faculty.
His external letters of recommendation are from distinguished tenured professors at the University of California-San Francisco, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, LSU Health-Shreveport Feist-Weiller Cancer Center, University of Michigan and Stanford Health Care. They comment on his world-renowned expertise, his long-time success in leadership roles and his extremely productive scholarship. His collegiality and leadership received many comments in his letters of recommendation.

The academic appointment for Dr. Strome will be in the Department of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery in the College of Medicine. His future colleagues within that department unanimously supported awarding tenure to Dr. Strome (4 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions). The College of Medicine’s Collegiate Promotion and Tenure Committee gave their unanimous positive vote (11 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain) for his receipt of tenure, as did Dr. M. Boyd Gillespie, the chair of the Department of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery and Dr. Polly Hofmann, the Senior Executive Associate Dean in the College of Medicine.

I give my strongest support for the award of expedited tenure to Dr. Strome. He has a strong national and international reputation as an expert in the field of otolaryngology. He is well-poised to lead the College of Medicine in teaching, research, clinical care and service and I am confident he will make many positive contributions to the institution.

Sincerely,

Steve Schwab, MD
Chancellor
University of Tennessee Health Science Center

cc: Lori Gonzalez, PhD, Chief Academic Officer
    Polly Hofmann, PhD, Senior Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs
    M. Boyd Gillespie, MD, Chair, Department of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery
CURRICULUM VITAE
Scott E. Strome, M.D.
Professor and Chairman, Department of Otorhinolaryngology – Head & Neck Surgery
University of Maryland School of Medicine

Date: November 9, 2017

Personal Information

Business Address
Department of Otorhinolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery
University of Maryland School of Medicine
16 S. Eutaw Street, Suite 500
Baltimore, MD 21201

Phone Number (410) 328-6467
Fax Number (410) 328-6192
E-mail sstile@som.umaryland.edu

Education

Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH
B.A., Liberal Arts

Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA
M.D., Medicine

Post Graduate Education

Intern in General Surgery
University of Michigan Medical Center
Ann Arbor, MI

Resident in Department of Otorhinolaryngology- Head and Neck Surgery
University of Michigan Medical Center
Ann Arbor, MI

Fellowship in Department of Otorhinolaryngology
Allegheny Health Education and Research Foundation
Philadelphia, PA

Mentored with Dr. Lieping Chen
Mayo Clinic
Rochester, MN
Certifications

American Board of Otolaryngology 1998

Medical Licensures

State of Michigan (Inactive) 1995 – 1999
State of Minnesota (Inactive) 1998 – 2005
State of Maryland (Inactive) 2005 – Present

Employment History

Senior Associate Consultant, Otorhinolaryngology 1998 - 2000
Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota

Assistant Professor of Otolaryngology 1998 - 2002
Mayo Medical School
Rochester, Minnesota

Consultant, Otorhinolaryngology 2000 - 2004
Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota

Associate Professor of Otorhinolaryngology 2002 - 2004
Mayo Medical School
Rochester, Minnesota

Professor and Chairman 2005 - Present
Department of Otorhinolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery
University of Maryland School of Medicine

Professor of Immunology and Microbiology (Secondary) 2006 - Present
University of Maryland School of Medicine

Professor and Chairman with Tenure 2008 - Present
Department of Otorhinolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery
University of Maryland School of Medicine

Interim Chairman 2012 –2013
Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences
University of Maryland School of Medicine
Interim Chairman
Department of Dermatology
University of Maryland School of Medicine

Professional Memberships

  (Resident member)
- American Academy of Otorhinolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery 1997 – Present
- American Academy of Otorhinolaryngology, Research Committee 1994 –1997 (Resident member)
- Allegheny Health, Education and Research Foundation Research Committee 1997 – 1998
- Society of University Otolaryngologists (SUO) 1999 – Present
- Member, Radiation Therapy Oncology Group 1999 – 2002
- Sigma Xi Scientific Research Society, Mayo Clinic Chapter 2000 – 2004
- Minnesota Academy of Otolaryngology 2000 – 2004
- Fellow of the American College of Surgeons 2001 – Present
- Fellow of the Head and Neck Society 2002 – Present
- Fellow of the Triological Society 2005 – Present
- Fellow of the American Laryngological Association 2006 – Present

Honors and Awards

- Dr. Robert Baker Award, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 1984
- Magna Cum Laude, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 1987
- Phi Beta Kappa, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 1987
- American Academy of Otolaryngology, Resident Research Grant Award 1993
- American Cancer Society, Michigan Chapter New Investigator Research Award 1993
- Society of Surgical Oncology, James Ewing Resident Research Award 1994
- Head and Neck Tumor Immunobiology, Travel Grant Award 1994
- Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery 1996
  University of Michigan Medical Center John L. Kemink Award for Best Clinical Research Paper.
- Mildred Mindell Cancer Foundation Award, Baltimore, MD 2007
- The Daily Record Innovator of the Year Award, Baltimore, MD 2007
- American Laryngological Association, Presidential Citation 2008
- Baltimore Magazine, Top Doctors in Head and Neck Surgery 2010
- University of Maryland Baltimore -- Entrepreneur of the Year 2011
• Baltimore Magazine, Top Doctors in Head and Neck Surgery 2012
• University of Maryland -- Entrepreneur of the Year 2013
• University of Maryland Baltimore Champion of Excellence 2013
• Alpha Omega Alpha Honor Medical Society 2014
• University of Maryland, Department of OTO-HNS, Brian E. Emery, MD: Outstanding Teaching Award. 2014
• Elected by the students as 1/6 Faculty Hooders for the graduating Medical School Class of 2016 2016

Clinical Service

One day per week in clinical setting and one day per week in surgical setting during which time he is responsible for patient care and resident education.

Administrative Service

Institutional Service

• ORL Department Education Committee - Mayo Clinic 1998 – 2004
• ORL Research Committee - Mayo Clinic 1998 – 2004
• IACUC - Mayo Clinic 2002 – 2004
• Vice Chair, IACUC - Mayo Clinic 2003 – 2004
• Program Committee, Upper Midwest Head and Neck Oncology Symposium 2004 – 2005
• Clinical Affairs Advisory Committee 2005 – 2009
• IT Implementation Planning Committee 2005 – 2006
• Scientific Review Committee -University of Maryland SOM 2005 – Present
• Search Committee -Veterans Affairs of Maryland Health Care System 2005
• Associate Member, Graduate Faculty of the University of Maryland Graduate School 2006 – Present
• UPI (FPI), Board of Trustees – University of Maryland 2006 – Present
• Co-leader, Tumor Immunology Immunotherapy Program 2007 – 2012
  Marlene and Stewart Greenebaum Cancer Center University of Maryland
• Search Committee – Medicine Chairman, University of Maryland 2007
• Member, Cancer Biology Track - Molecular Medicine Program 2008 – Present
  University of Maryland
• Consultant Member of the Search Committee for the Chairman of the Department of Ophthalmology & Visual Sciences 2012
• Search Committee Member– Director of the Center for Vaccine Development 2014
• Founder and director of the Young Surgeons Group – The purpose of this group is to provide a forum for new academic surgeons from several different disciplines to gain exposure to key institutional leaders, discuss common problems, and learn about a diverse array of topics which impact their academic lives, but are not part of a traditional medical school/residency educational curriculum. 2014

• Chair of LCME Medical Student-Subcommittee for the UMSOM self-study. 2015

• Consultant Member of the Search Committee for the Chairman of the Department of Dermatology. 2016

• Leader of the Julius Friedenwald House 2016 - present
In 2016, the medical students at Maryland were assigned to one of four “houses.” The goal of this program is to improve student mentorship and to provide students with a relatively small “home” within a large institution. I direct one of the four houses.

• University of Maryland Medical Center Information Technology Advisory Committee. 2017- present

National Service

• Society of University Otolaryngologists 2002 – 2003
Long Range Planning Committee

• American Academy of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery Foundation Prizes and Awards Committee 2003 – 2004

• American Board of Otolaryngology Task Force on New Materials 2003 – 2006

• American Laryngological Association – Program Chair 2007 – 2008

• American Head and Neck Society – Finance Committee 2009 – 2011

• Triological Society Annual Program Committee 2009 – 2010

• Contemporary Reviews Committee of the Triologic Society 2010 – Present

• Daniel C. Baker Lectureship Committee (ALA) 2010 – 2012

• American Board of Otolaryngology Guest Oral Board Examiner 2011

• Triologic Best Practice Committee 2011 – Present

• American Board of Otolaryngology Guest Oral Board Examiner 2014

• University of Pittsburgh Head and Neck Cancer SPORE – External Advisory Board 2014 – Present

• Institute for Bioscience and Biotechnology Research (IBBR) – Medical advisory board. 2014 – Present

• American Head and Neck Society Program Committee 2014 – 2015

• Immunotherapy Clinical Trials Planning Meeting: Trial Design in Recurrent/Metastatic Disease. Section Co-chair. 2014

• University of Colorado SPORE Application– External Advisory Board 2015 – Present

Editorial Tasks:
• Reviewer for Head and Neck 2001 – Present
• Reviewer for Cancer 2001
• Reviewer for The Laryngoscope 2001 – Present
• Reviewer for Archives of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery 2002 – Present
• Editorial Board for Diseases of the Esophagus 2005 – 2007
• Editor for Head and Neck section of Ballenger’s 17th Edition 2006 – 2007
• Editor for Harvard Medical School Class of 1991 Reunion 2006 – 2007

Federal Review Committees

• Recombinant DNA Advisory Committee (AD Hoc Reviewer) 2005
• Recombinant DNA Advisory Committee member (RAC) 2006 - 2010
• Head & Neck SPORE grants (NCI) 2007
• Recombinant DNA Advisory Committee 2007
  (Single subject exemption working group)
• GI and Head & Neck SPORE grant (NCI) 2007
• Prostate, Breast & Skin Cancer SPORE grant (NCI) 2007
• Gene Therapy Serious Adverse Events Board (RAC) 2007 – 2010
• Head & Neck SPORE grants (NCI) 2007
• NCI's Cellular and Tissue Biology P01 Special Emphasis Review Panel 2009
  (Submitted reviews)
• NCI's Cellular and Tissue Biology P01 Special Emphasis Review Panel 2010
  (Chair)
• Gene-modified T cells: Challenges in clinical trial design with novel 2010
  Receptors, co-organizer of this RAC sponsored conference
• NCI's Cellular and Tissue Biology P01 Special Emphasis Review Panel 2010
  (Chair)
• Special Emphasis Panel/Scientific Review Group 2011/10 ZCA1 2011
  RPRB-B (O1) meeting.
• MD Anderson Cancer Center Site Visit Committee (Ad-Hoc member) 2013
• NCI’s National Clinical Trials Network (NCTN) Lead Academic 2013
  Participating Site Review Meeting
• NCI’s SPORE panel II/ Scientific Review Group ZCA1 RPRB-0 M1 P 2014

Teaching Responsibilities

The following individuals were mentored/trained in Dr. Strome’s laboratory for the time indicated:

Post-Doctoral Fellows

Primary Responsibility
Athanasia Savva, M.D. 2000 – 2001
Nissim Khabie, M.D. 2000 – 2001
Tamekia Wakefield, M.D. 2001 – 2002
Scott A. McLean, M.D., Ph.D. 2002 – 2004
Wei Lin, Ph.D. 2002 – 2010
Xiaoyu Zhang, M.D., Ph.D. 2004 – 2010
Chetan Nayak 2007 – 2009
Ronna Hertzano 2008 – 2011
Shaodong Cheng, MD 2013 – 2014
Zhou Hua, Ph.D. 2015 – present

Secondary Responsibility
Carolina Montes 2006 – 2008
Amudhan Maniar 2007 – 2009
Yue Zhang 2007 – 2009

Ph.D. Students
Caroline Voskens (Co-mentor with Dean Mann) (PhD 2012) 2006 – 2012
Michelle Sallin 2008 – 2013
Edward So 2013 – Present
Allana Murday (Thesis Committee only) 2014 – 2017

Students
Andleeb Khan 2005 – 2010
Sarah Hale 2005 – 2008
Elizabeth Martin 2005 – 2006
Alan Alexander 2006 – 2007
Elizabeth Le 2008 – 2009
    Alpha Omega Alpha
    Carolyn L. Kuckein Student Research Fellowship
Chioma Ihekweazu 2008 – 2009
    Howard Hughes Undergraduate Fellow

Residents
Spends significant time mentoring residents and helping choose career path

Junior Faculty Mentorship (Past and present)
Rodney Taylor, M.D. – American Cancer Society grant
Jeffrey Wolf, M.D. – Dendritic Cell Vaccine
Ajay Jain, M.D. – Enhancement of T-cell vaccines
Brian Gastman, M.D. – T-cell senescence
Duane Sewell, M.D. - Enhancing ADCC
Niharika Khanna, M.D. – BIRCWH Scholars Progam
Paul Antony, M.D. – Tumoricidal activity of CD4 T cells
Tonya Webb, PhD. – NKT cell functions in malignancy

Medical Students

Two lectures per year to the first year class.

Instruction Courses


**Grant Support – Past**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>American Academy of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Direct Costs Awarded: $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-principal Investigator</td>
<td>1995 – 1997</td>
<td>Adoptive immunotherapy of squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck (NIH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Direct Costs Awarded: $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>2001 – 2002</td>
<td>Characterization of the anti-tumor T-cell immune response to allogenic murine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dendritic cells primed with irradiated tumor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(American Academy of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Direct Costs Awarded: $9,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator (mentored) (75% effort)</td>
<td>1999-2004</td>
<td>Methods to enhance immunotherapy of head and neck cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K23DE 00459(NIH-NIDCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Direct Costs Awarded: $555,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>Faculty Pilot Research Grant (University of Maryland) under the Other Tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Related Diseases (OTRD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Development of a Serum/Tissue Bank for the Identification of Biomarkers in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Squamous Cell Carcinoma of the Head and Neck”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Direct Costs Awarded: $50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Indirect Costs Awarded: $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Direct Costs Awarded: 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Indirect Costs Awarded: $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor (Rodney Taylor, PI)</td>
<td>2006 - 2007</td>
<td>Relationships Between Ethnic Differences in EGFR Over-Expression and NK Cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FcyR Polymorphisms and Clinical Outcomes for Patients with Squamous Cell Cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Of the Head and Neck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(American Cancer Society)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Direct Costs Awarded: $20,000

Subcontract with GTC Biotherapeutics, Inc
(University of Maryland)
Dan Schindler (PI)
CD137 as a Target for the Immunotherapy of Cancer
NIH/SBIR R44CA 107608-1 (GTC Biotherapeutics, Inc.)
Total Direct Costs Awarded: $87,164

Principal Investigator
Maryland Industrial Partnership (MIPS) / Gliknik
Recombinant FC dimer treatment of autoimmunity
Total Direct Costs Awarded: $87,251

Subcontract with GTC Biotherapeutics, Inc
(University of Maryland)
Dan Schindler (PI)
CD137 as a Target for the Immunotherapy of Cancer
5R44CA107608-04
Total Direct Costs Awarded: $151,923

Mentor (Ronna Hertzano, PI)
American Academy of Otolaryngology
Characterization of cluster of differentiation proteins in the
mouse inner ear
Total Direct Cost: $10,000

Principal Investigator (10% effort)
MAGE-A3/HPV 16 Peptide Vaccines for Head and Neck Cancer
R01 DE15324-01(NIH-NIDCR)
Total Direct Costs Awarded: $580,000

(Ronna Hertzano, PI)
Deafness Research Foundation
A new protocol for selective and efficient sorting of the
auditory sensory epithelium.
Total Direct Cost: $24,805

Deafness Research Foundation (Ronna Hertzano, PI)
A New Protocol for Selective and Efficient Sorting of the
Auditory Sensory Epithelium.
Role: Co-PI

Career Development Award ((Hertzano (PI))
AAO-HNS
Cell type specific genome wide mapping of protein-DNA
interactions in the ear.
Role: Mentor

R01 (Strome (PI)) 11/1/12- 04/30/13
LIGHT Co-Stimulatory therapy on GVHD and GVL
#5R01HL088954-05
Dr. Strome assumed the role of PI when Dr. Tamada, the original PI, returned to Japan

**Grant Support – Present**

Gliknik, Inc. (Zhang (PI)) 7/1/2014-6/30/2018
Functional evaluation of Gliknik Stradomers™ and Gliknik Stradobodies™

Pfizer (Strome (PI)) 5/1/2015-Present
Studies on the mechanisms of action of PF-06755347

**Clinical Trials**

Principal Investigator for the initial study. 4/1/2004-2012
MAGE/HPV 16 Peptide Vaccines for Head and Neck Cancer.
Initially sponsored by NIDCR

Mentor to Jeffrey Wolf, MD 9/1/2007 – 8/22/2012
Intra-tumoral injection of Dendritic Cells as Adjuvant Therapy for Squamous Cell Carcinoma of the Head and Neck.

**Patents**

6-015-419 Retractable surgical scalpel
6-591-140 Apparatus and system for stimulating mouth muscles
8-163-550 Enhancement of immune responses by 4-1BB-binding agents
7-892-540 B7-H1 and methods of diagnosis, prognosis, and treatment of cancer
7-794-710 Methods of enhancing T cell responsiveness
7-651-686 Enhancement of immune responses by 4-1BB-binding agents
7-449-300 Detection of antibodies specific for B7-H1 in subjects with diseases or pathological conditions mediated by activated T cells
8,263,560 HPV 16 peptide vaccine for head and neck cancer

**Companies Founded**

Strome Steel Surgical was founded as a holding company for intellectual property for a retractable surgical scalpel.
Gliknik Inc., is a biotechnology company of which Dr. Strome is a cofounder and a major stockholder. The company aims to develop novel therapeutics for the treatment of cancer and autoimmunity.

Publications

Journal Articles (Peer Reviewed)


68. Wood AHD, Zhang X, Farber DL, Strome SE. CD8+ memory T lymphocytes from bone marrow – immune function and therapeutic potential. Critical Reviews in Immunology. 27(6), 2007. PMID:18245489


100. Lubeck JE, Hancock MK, **Strome SE**. What is the value of hyperbaric oxygen therapy in management of osteoradionecrosis of the head and neck? *The Laryngoscope*. 123(3):555-556, 2013. PMID: 23444188


Journal Articles (Non-Peer Reviewed)


Journal Articles – submitted/ in preparation


Books


Chapters in Books


Multimedia

Spinner RJ, Strome SE. Peripheral Nerve Case from Mayo Clinic August 30, 2002.

Major Invited Speeches or Talks


25. Characterization of Antigenic Targets for the Immunotherapy Of Head And Neck Cancer. 7th World Congress on Advances in Oncology and 5th International Symposium on Molecular Medicine. Hersonissos, Crete, Greece, October 2002.


49. Advances in Immunotherapy for the Treatment of Head and Neck Cancer. Department of Otolaryngology Grand Rounds, National Naval Medical Center, October 2006.
50. Panel Discussion. Alternative Funding Opportunities for your Education Program. Society of University Otolaryngologists, Chicago, IL, October 2006.


61. Surgical Management of Laryngeal Carcinoma. Department of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, Louisiana State University, Visiting Professor, Shreveport, LA, November 2009.


65. Visiting Professor: Targeted mAb Therapy for SCCHN: Current Challenges and Future Directions. Mayo Clinic College of Medicine, Rochester, April 2010.


68. A Friendship, a Foot and the Development of “Recombinant IVIG.” University of Maryland Baltimore Entrepreneur of the Year Lecture, Baltimore, MD, October 2011.

69. FcR Polymorphisms as Predictors of Outcome to Targeted mAb Based Therapies for Head and Neck Cancer. VIIIth National Cancer Congress, Sofia, Bulgaria, November 2011.

70. Visiting Professor: Targeted mAb Therapy for SCCHN: Current Challenges and Future Directions. Penn State University, Division of OTO-HNS, Hershey, Pennsylvania, February 2012.

71. Visiting Professor: Surgical Management of Laryngeal Carcinoma. Penn State University, Division of OTO-HNS, Hershey, Pennsylvania, February 2012.


73. Invited Speaker, University of Maryland Ventures Symposia. University of Maryland, Baltimore, MD, May 2012.
75. Visiting Professor, Groningen Medical Center, Netherlands, September 2012.
77. Corporate Funding for Academic Research: A Starter Course. University of Maryland Corporate Funding Seminar, Baltimore, MD, September 2013.
86. Peptide Vaccines for the treatment of Head and Neck Cancer. Amritha Institute of Medical Sciences, Kochi, India, October 2014.
97. IgG Fc multimers have potent anti-inflammatory activity: A new perspective on aggregated IVIG. FDA seminar, Silver Spring, Maryland, March 2016.
98. Manipulation of the B7-H1 (PD-L1)-PD-1 Axis for the Treatment of Head and Neck Cancer: A Personal Perspective. Visiting Professor at the University of Maryland, College Park, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, November 2016.

Presented Papers /Abstracts/Posters


the head & neck following concurrent chemoradiation therapy. ASTRO Meeting, Los Angeles, CA, October 2007.


ORNL is managed by UT-Battelle, LLC for the US Department of Energy
Oak Ridge National Laboratory evolved from the Manhattan Project

The Clinton Pile was the world’s first continuously operated nuclear reactor

Chemical processing techniques were developed to separate plutonium from irradiated fuel
ORNL has a distinguished history of making groundbreaking discoveries and meeting national needs.
ORNL innovations have had billion-dollar impacts

- Big-area additive manufacturing: US investment >$1B
- Fueleconomy.gov: $1B in cost savings $1B
- Ceramic matrix composites for gas turbines $150B
- Lab-on-a-chip: Caliper acquired by PerkinElmer $0.6B
- Cesium extraction: Basis for waste processing plant $1.3B
- Reactor life extension: $20B cost avoidance $20B
- Advanced alloys: Chrome-moly steel in widespread use
- Ion implantation: Integrated circuits and medical implants
- Cryopreservation (mouse embryos): Livestock reproduction
- Centrifuge technology: Basis for vaccine purification and US enrichment industry
- Instrumentation: Products and spinoffs from ORTEC and TENNELEC >$1B
- Reactor technology: Concepts for light water, high temperature, and molten salt reactors
- PUREX: Basis for nuclear fuel reprocessing techniques used worldwide
- Radioisotopes: Multibillion dollar industry (>100 million procedures per year) >$5B/year

1940s

Today
Today, ORNL is a leading science and energy laboratory

- Nation’s largest materials research portfolio
- World’s most diverse energy portfolio
- World-class research reactor
- Forefront scientific computing facilities
- Managing major DOE projects: US ITER, exascale computing
- 2,261 journal articles published in CY17
- 258 invention disclosures in FY18
- 60 patents issued in FY18

- 3,200 research guests annually
- Nation’s most intense neutron source
- World’s class research reactor
- 2,261 journal articles published in CY17
- 258 invention disclosures in FY18
- 60 patents issued in FY18

- 4,400 employees
- $1.63B FY18 expenditures
- $750M modernization investment

- 2,261 journal articles published in CY17
- 258 invention disclosures in FY18
- 60 patents issued in FY18

- 4,400 employees
- $1.63B FY18 expenditures
- $750M modernization investment
ORNL is managed by UT-Battelle, LLC

- ORNL partner since 1946
- State-funded Science Alliance started in 1982, to build programs with ORNL
- Shared research, education, and joint appointments
- Joint institutes:
  - Advanced materials
  - Biological sciences
  - Computational sciences
  - Neutron sciences
  - Nuclear physics
- 75-year relationship with DOE
- Develops and deploys technology worldwide
- Manages or co-manages 7 DOE national labs:
  - ORNL (with UT)
  - Brookhaven (with SUNY-Stony Brook)
  - Idaho
  - Lawrence Livermore (with UC and Bechtel)
  - Los Alamos (with UC and Texas A&M)
  - NREL (with MRI)
  - Pacific Northwest
ORNL’s mission

Deliver scientific discoveries and technical breakthroughs needed to realize solutions in energy and national security and provide economic benefit to the nation

Signature strengths

Computational science and engineering
Materials science and engineering
Neutron science and technology
Nuclear science and engineering
ORNL’s major science and technology initiatives

Advance ORNL’s science and innovation culture

Accelerate the discovery and design of new materials for energy

Advance the science and impact of neutrons

Scale computing and data analytics to exascale and beyond

Advance scientific basis for breakthrough nuclear technologies and systems

Advance understanding of complexity in biological and environmental systems

Enhance strategic capabilities in isotopes

Accelerate deployment of DOE IP and engagement with universities and industry

Accelerate R&D and manufacturing of integrated energy systems

Deliver S&T to address complex security challenges

Deliver S&T to address complex security challenges
ORNL’s distinctive facilities bring thousands of R&D partners to Tennessee each year
We are committed to strengthening the regional innovation ecosystem

- Technology licenses
- Small business vouchers
- Strategic Partnership Projects
- Cooperative R&D agreements

Contributing to state and local economic development initiatives

Deploying an industry cluster strategy to build regional competitive advantage

Carbon fiber
Automotive
Additive manufacturing

SkyNano LLC

Making our resources available to industry partners
## ORNL’s partnership with UT is a major asset

**Building strength in strategic research areas**
- Neutrons
- Computing
- Nuclear science and technology
- Materials and manufacturing
- Energy
- National security
- Biology and health

**Attracting world-class staff and students in key fields**
- UT-ORNL Governor’s Chairs and joint faculty
- Bredesen Center Graduate Program
  - 40+ PhDs granted
  - Data Science and Engineering Program initiated in 2017
- Graduate Program in Genome Science and Technology
- Enriching research opportunities for undergraduates

**Leveraging resources to serve shared goals**
- Institute for Advanced Composite Materials Innovation (IACMI)
- Center for Bioenergy Innovation
- Joint research institutes
- Advanced manufacturing
- Fuel cells
Innovation ecosystem

Vanderbilt University Health Care Industry

University of Tennessee Health Science Center
St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital

Electric Power Board (EPB)

Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL)

Tennessee Valley of Authority (TVA)
University of Tennessee, Knoxville (UT)
UT-Battelle contract competition timeline

The decision on any competition or extension of an M&O FFRDC must and shall be made by the Secretary of Energy.

“We don’t live in Knoxville. We live in a new generation Silicon Valley. We just don’t know it yet.”

- Dr. Lonnie Love
A comprehensive report on enrollment and other indicators is provided to the Board each year at the Fall Meeting.

The summary report, which appears first in the materials, includes the following data for a 5-year period (Fall 2014 to Fall 2018):

- headcount enrollment of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students by campus
- 6-year graduation rates for new full-time, first-time freshmen
- first-year retention rates for new full-time, first-time freshmen
- number of baccalaureate degrees conferred
- number of graduate and professional degrees conferred
- number of new freshmen
- ACT comprehensive scores for new freshmen
- average weighted high school gpa for new freshmen
- number of freshmen applications
- new freshmen admit rates
- new freshmen yield rates
- new transfer enrollments
- number of transfer applications
- number of new graduate and professional students

Following the summary report are detailed data for the indicators listed above.
University of Tennessee
Enrollment
And Other Indicators
Board of Trustees
November 2, 2018
How has UT performed in the past year?
Total Enrollment:
Enrollment Exceeds 50,000 Across all UT Campuses

UT Total Headcount by Campus

UTK
UTC
UTM
UTHSC
UT System
Undergraduate Enrollment: Increase at all Campuses

UT Undergraduate Headcount 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>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>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>22,317</td>
<td>10,176</td>
<td>6,330</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>22,815</td>
<td>10,195</td>
<td>6,674</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate and Professional Enrollment:
Increase at UTK and UTHSC; Decrease at UTC and UTM

UT Graduate and Professional Student Headcount 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>2014</td>
<td>5,959</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5,982</td>
<td>1,304</td>
<td>392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5,913</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>6,004</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>6,079</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2014 2015 2016 2017 2018

UTK
UTC
UTM
UTHSC
6-Year Graduation Rates: Exceeds 60% across UT System; Increase at UTK and UTC; Decrease at UTM

6-Yr Graduation Rates for New Full-Time, First-Time Freshmen for UTK, UTM, UTC, and UT System

- 69.3% 70.3% 68.8% 70.2% 72.5%
- 57.3% 57.6% 59.2% 59.6% 61.1%
- 47.0% 45.7% 50.2% 50.2% 47.7%
- 39.8% 43.6% 44.2% 44.9% 47.7%

2014 2015 2016 2017 2018
First-year Retention:
Increase at UTK; Slight Decline at UTC; Decrease at UTM

First-Year Retention Rates for New Full-Time, First-Time Freshmen at UTK, UTM and UTC
Bachelor’s Degrees:
Increase at UTK and UTHSC; Decreased at UTC and UTM

UT Baccalaureate Degrees Conferred

- 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>2014</td>
<td>4,561</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4,634</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4,675</td>
<td>2,069</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4,837</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4,907</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UT Surpassing State Master Plan Goal in Baccalaureate Degree Production

UT Unduplicated Baccalaureate Degrees Compared to State Master Plan
Graduate and Professional Degrees:
Increase at UTK, UTC, and UTM; Slight Decrease at UTHSC

UT Graduate and Professional Degrees Conferred

- UTK
- UTC
- UTM
- UTHSC
Freshman Enrollment: Increase at all Campuses; UTK up 6.5%; UTM up 8.7%; UTC up 5.0%

UTK: Exceeded 5,000 new freshmen, an increase of 6.5% from 2017
Entering Freshmen ACT Scores: Increase at all Campuses

Average ACT Comprehensive Score for UT New Freshmen
Entering Freshmen GPA:
Increase at UTK and UTC

Average Weighted High School GPA for UT New Freshmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UTK</th>
<th>UTC</th>
<th>UTM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Freshmen Applicants:
Increase at all UT Campuses; UTM 64% Increase

Freshmen Applications to UT Campuses

UTK: Eclipsed 20,000 applications for first time
New Freshmen Admit Rates:
Increase at UTM and UTK; Decrease at UTC

New Freshmen Admit Rates (Percent of Applicants Admitted) for UT Campuses

UTC: Becoming more selective with 7.3% decrease in admit rate
Percentage of Freshmen Applicants Admitted who Enrolled: Yield Rates have Steadily Decreased at all UT Campuses

New Freshmen Yield Rates for UT Campuses

Yield Rates have Steadily Decreased at all UT Campuses at UT Campuses.
New Transfer Enrollment:
Increase at UTC and UTHSC; Decrease at UTK and UTM

UT New Transfers by Campus
Total Transfer Applications:
Increase at UTK and UTC; Decrease at UTM

UTC: 19.3% increase in transfer applications from 2017
New Graduate and Professional Enrollment: Slight Increase at UTK; Stable at UTM and UTHSC; Decrease at UTC

UT New Graduate and Professional Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UTK</th>
<th>UTC</th>
<th>UTM</th>
<th>UTHSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,914</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1,942</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### University of Tennessee

#### Fall Student Enrollments

##### Headcount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad / Professional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>38,656</td>
<td>10,442</td>
<td>49,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>38,646</td>
<td>10,489</td>
<td>49,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>38,875</td>
<td>10,512</td>
<td>49,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>39,162</td>
<td>10,717</td>
<td>49,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>40,043</td>
<td>10,767</td>
<td>50,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1-Yr Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad / Professional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>38,656</td>
<td>10,442</td>
<td>49,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>38,646</td>
<td>10,489</td>
<td>49,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>38,875</td>
<td>10,512</td>
<td>49,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>39,162</td>
<td>10,717</td>
<td>49,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>40,043</td>
<td>10,767</td>
<td>50,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### % 5-Yr Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad / Professional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>38,656</td>
<td>10,442</td>
<td>49,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>38,646</td>
<td>10,489</td>
<td>49,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>38,875</td>
<td>10,512</td>
<td>49,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>39,162</td>
<td>10,717</td>
<td>49,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>40,043</td>
<td>10,767</td>
<td>50,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5-Yr Trend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad / Professional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>38,656</td>
<td>10,442</td>
<td>49,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>38,646</td>
<td>10,489</td>
<td>49,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>38,875</td>
<td>10,512</td>
<td>49,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>39,162</td>
<td>10,717</td>
<td>49,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>40,043</td>
<td>10,767</td>
<td>50,810</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>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</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>35,951</td>
<td>35,940</td>
<td>35,965</td>
<td>36,458</td>
<td>36,990</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>8,312</td>
<td>8,873</td>
<td>8,893</td>
<td>9,073</td>
<td>9,136</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44,263</td>
<td>44,813</td>
<td>44,858</td>
<td>45,531</td>
<td>46,126</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</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>20,440</td>
<td>20,837</td>
<td>21,092</td>
<td>21,295</td>
<td>21,812</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>4,365</td>
<td>4,890</td>
<td>4,815</td>
<td>4,890</td>
<td>4,910</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24,805</td>
<td>25,727</td>
<td>25,907</td>
<td>26,185</td>
<td>26,722</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</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>9,177</td>
<td>9,029</td>
<td>9,122</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>9,395</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,080</td>
<td>9,917</td>
<td>10,055</td>
<td>10,310</td>
<td>10,393</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</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>6,099</td>
<td>5,802</td>
<td>5,453</td>
<td>5,502</td>
<td>5,398</td>
<td>(104)</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td>-11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>-16.6%</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,276</td>
<td>5,994</td>
<td>5,664</td>
<td>5,711</td>
<td>5,573</td>
<td>(139)</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td>-11.2%</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>235</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad-Academic</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad-Professional</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grad</td>
<td>2,867</td>
<td>2,903</td>
<td>2,934</td>
<td>2,964</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,102</td>
<td>3,175</td>
<td>3,232</td>
<td>3,325</td>
<td>3,438</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>10.8%</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: PHARMD
# University of Tennessee
## DEGREES AWARDED
### (Summer, Fall, Spring)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>1-Yr Change N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>% 5-Yr Change</th>
<th>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>7,688</td>
<td>7,808</td>
<td>8,141</td>
<td>8,314</td>
<td>8,301</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,152</td>
<td>11,288</td>
<td>11,565</td>
<td>11,741</td>
<td>11,805</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</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>4,561</td>
<td>4,634</td>
<td>4,675</td>
<td>4,837</td>
<td>4,907</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>-12.5%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1,571</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1,529</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>-13.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,689</td>
<td>6,758</td>
<td>6,741</td>
<td>6,944</td>
<td>7,055</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</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>1,847</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>2,069</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>-13.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>2,494</td>
<td>2,529</td>
<td>2,511</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>6.9%</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>1,242</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
<td>-6.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>(62)</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
<td>-5.5%</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>38</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>431.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
<td>-12.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>26.1%</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>Entering Cohort</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Indian</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>-6.4%</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MultiRacial</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>-</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>39.8%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>-11.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Indian</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MultiRacial</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</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>47.0%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>-17.6%</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>-21.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Indian</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MultiRacial</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Retention Rate (Freshmen to Sophomore)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entering Cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Indian</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>11.3%</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>70.0%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Indian</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>-6.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>-12.6%</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>15.9%</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>70.8%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>-10.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Indian</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
<td>-28.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### University of Tennessee

#### Fall New Student Enrollments

**Applications, Admits, Enrolled**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Freshmen</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>1-Yr Change</th>
<th>% 5-Yr change</th>
<th>5-Yr Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Applications</td>
<td>15,442</td>
<td>17,101</td>
<td>17,583</td>
<td>18,872</td>
<td>20,457</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>11,555</td>
<td>13,035</td>
<td>13,578</td>
<td>14,526</td>
<td>15,912</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>4,701</td>
<td>4,719</td>
<td>4,851</td>
<td>4,895</td>
<td>5,215</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>-7.9%</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>7,399</td>
<td>6,752</td>
<td>7,628</td>
<td>7,235</td>
<td>8,858</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>5,718</td>
<td>5,349</td>
<td>5,970</td>
<td>5,990</td>
<td>6,691</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>-4.1%</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>3,530</td>
<td>3,485</td>
<td>3,547</td>
<td>4,917</td>
<td>8,059</td>
<td>3,142</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>128.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>2,587</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td>2,366</td>
<td>3,012</td>
<td>5,549</td>
<td>2,537</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>114.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>-4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>-14.3%</td>
<td>-25.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Transfers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>3,226</td>
<td>3,515</td>
<td>3,007</td>
<td>2,921</td>
<td>2,969</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>-8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>2,092</td>
<td>2,313</td>
<td>2,103</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>2,121</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>1,647</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>1,739</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>-9.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>(112)</td>
<td>-8.7%</td>
<td>-14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>(107)</td>
<td>-12.8%</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>-10.6%</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
<td>163.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>-25.4%</td>
<td>-30.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University of Tennessee
Fall New Student Enrollments
Applications, Admits, Enrolled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>% 5-Yr change</th>
<th>5-Yr Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Graduate / Professional Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Knoxville Grad Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>6,162</td>
<td>7,080</td>
<td>6,646</td>
<td>6,125</td>
<td>5,806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
<td>-5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>2,521</td>
<td>3,367</td>
<td>2,887</td>
<td>2,913</td>
<td>2,947</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>1,703</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| UT Knoxville Grad-Professional |      |      |      |      |      |   |   |               |            |
| Applications            | 1,492| 1,765| 1,802| 1,941| 2,023| 82| 4.2%| 35.6%         |            |
| Admits                  | 472  | 557  | 547  | 571  | 545  | 26| -4.6%| 15.5%         |            |
| Enrolled                | 177  | 202  | 204  | 211  | 210  |   | -0.5%| 18.6%         |            |
| Admit Rate              | 32%  | 32%  | 30%  | 29%  | 27%  |   | -2.5%| -4.7%         |            |
| Yield Rate              | 38%  | 36%  | 37%  | 37%  | 39%  |   | 1.6% | 1.0%          |            |

| UT Chattanooga         |      |      |      |      |      |   |   |               |            |
| Applications           | 940  | 798  | 779  | 783  | 760  | (23)| -2.9%| -19.1%        |            |
| Admits                 | 581  | 518  | 596  | 631  | 600  | (31)| -4.9%| 3.3%          |            |
| Enrolled               | 333  | 290  | 431  | 490  | 365  | (125)| -25.5%| 9.6%         |            |
| Admit Rate             | 62%  | 65%  | 77%  | 81%  | 79%  |   | -1.6%| 17.1%         |            |
| Yield Rate             | 57%  | 56%  | 72%  | 78%  | 61%  |   | -16.8%| 3.5%         |            |

| UT Martin              |      |      |      |      |      |   |   |               |            |
| Applications           | 400  | 388  | 458  | 367  | 360  | (7 )| -1.9%| -10.0%        |            |
| Admits                 | 217  | 236  | 274  | 225  | 200  | (25)| -11.1%| -7.8%        |            |
| Enrolled               | 100  | 116  | 123  | 129  | 129  |   | 0.0% | 29.0%         |            |
| Admit Rate             | 54%  | 61%  | 60%  | 61%  | 56%  |   | -5.8%| 1.3%          |            |
| Yield Rate             | 46%  | 49%  | 45%  | 57%  | 65%  |   | 7.2% | 18.4%         |            |

| UT Health Science Grad-Academic |      |      |      |      |      |   |   |               |            |
| Applications             | 1,528| 1,456| 2,006| 1,988| 1,889| (99)| -5.0%| 23.6%         |            |
| Admits                  | 533  | 509  | 603  | 622  | 610  | (12)| -1.9%| 14.4%         |            |
| Enrolled                | 324  | 314  | 320  | 340  | 324  | (16)| 4.7% | 0.0%          |            |
| Admit Rate              | 35%  | 38%  | 30%  | 31%  | 32%  |   | 1.0% | -2.6%         |            |
| Yield Rate              | 61%  | 62%  | 53%  | 55%  | 53%  |   | -1.5%| -7.7%         |            |

| UT Health Science Grad-Professional |      |      |      |      |      |   |   |               |            |
| Applications            | 3,675| 3,947| 4,470| 4,321| 4,276| (45)| -1.0%| 16.4%         |            |
| Admits                 | 643  | 694  | 681  | 657  | 752  | 95 | 14.5%| 17.0%         |            |
| Enrolled               | 432  | 457  | 440  | 444  | 461  | 17 | 3.8% | 6.7%          |            |
| Admit Rate             | 17%  | 18%  | 15%  | 15%  | 18%  |   | 2.4% | 0.1%          |            |
| Yield Rate             | 67%  | 66%  | 65%  | 68%  | 61%  |   | -6.3%| -5.9%         |            |
## University of Tennessee
### Fall New Student Enrollments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UT System</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>1-Yr Change N</th>
<th>% 5-Yr change</th>
<th>5-Yr Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Freshmen</strong></td>
<td>8,060</td>
<td>7,607</td>
<td>7,877</td>
<td>8,094</td>
<td>8,613</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Transfers</strong></td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>2,964</td>
<td>2,836</td>
<td>3,029</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Graduate</strong></td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>3,085</td>
<td>3,151</td>
<td>3,317</td>
<td>3,221</td>
<td>(96)</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Graduate</strong></td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>1,914</td>
<td>1,942</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UT Knoxville</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>1-Yr Change N</th>
<th>% 5-Yr change</th>
<th>5-Yr Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Freshmen</strong></td>
<td>4,701</td>
<td>4,719</td>
<td>4,851</td>
<td>4,895</td>
<td>5,215</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Transfers</strong></td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Graduate Acad.</strong></td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>1,703</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Professional</strong></td>
<td>177</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Graduate</strong></td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>1,914</td>
<td>1,942</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UT Chattanooga</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>1-Yr Change N</th>
<th>% 5-Yr change</th>
<th>5-Yr Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Freshmen</strong></td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Transfers</strong></td>
<td>804</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Graduate</strong></td>
<td>333</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>(125)</td>
<td>-25.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Graduate</strong></td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>1,914</td>
<td>1,942</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UT Martin</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>1-Yr Change N</th>
<th>% 5-Yr change</th>
<th>5-Yr Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Freshmen</strong></td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Transfers</strong></td>
<td>493</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>-10.6%</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Graduate</strong></td>
<td>333</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>(125)</td>
<td>-25.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Graduate</strong></td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>1,914</td>
<td>1,942</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UT Health Science</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>1-Yr Change N</th>
<th>% 5-Yr change</th>
<th>5-Yr Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Freshmen</strong></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Transfers</strong></td>
<td>324</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Graduate Acad.</strong></td>
<td>432</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Professional</strong></td>
<td>432</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Graduate</strong></td>
<td>756</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### University of Tennessee

**Indicators of Academic Quality of New Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</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>New Freshmen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACT Equivalent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACT State Avg.</strong></td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACT National Avg.</strong></td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted H.S GPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Transfers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer GPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>-9.2%</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>