

**CBA Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty: Annual Evaluations,
Promotion and Tenure**

Accepted: May 12, 1997

Revisions approved May 13, 2005; November 16, 2007; April 29, 2008; April 20, 2009; April 1, 2011; October 3, 2013; November 2015; December 2016

These Guidelines supplement the current versions of the Bylaws of the Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska ; the Bylaws of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln ; and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty.

I. INTRODUCTION

These guidelines apply to all academic units within the College of Business Administration (CBA), University of Nebraska-Lincoln.¹ They are intended to be a supplement to the UNL guidelines on faculty evaluation and should be read and interpreted within the framework of those guidelines. The CBA guidelines provide further interpretation and guidance for the process, criteria, and standards applied to faculty evaluation with respect to tenure and promotion as well as ongoing assessment.

II. FACULTY ROLE IN THE COLLEGE

Consistent with the overall mission of the University, the College of Business Administration's educational mission focuses on three interdependent parts: instruction, research, and public service. Faculty members are expected to contribute to these roles and are evaluated in accordance with their assignment of duties.

III. GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF FACULTY EVALUATION: PROCESS, CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

The UNL guidelines set forth general principles applying to the faculty evaluation process, criteria, and standards. These principles are the foundation on which evaluation of faculty within the College of Business Administration takes place. It is worth reiterating here the UNL guidelines on standards:

"Qualitative evaluation of faculty, while highly subjective, is the essence of the faculty evaluation process. The single common standard by which to judge the extent of achievement is that of excellence -- excellence in creativity and in significance of contribution. Although specifics as to what constitutes excellence in particular cases are necessarily a matter of judgment that varies from discipline to discipline, faculty members must be given reasonable assistance to understand the components of that judgment."

This evaluation process, like most at the University, involves subjective decisions about quality and performance, as well it should. The professional evaluation of a faculty member by his or her peers remains an integral and very important part of the academic world. Clearly the individual faculty member being evaluated plays a major role in the collection and preparation of supporting information.

¹For purposes of simplification in this document, the term "Department" shall include "School" and the term "Chair" shall include "Director". Hence, the Director of the School of Accountancy would be referred to as a Department Chair.

Consequently, it is extremely important that the process, criteria, and standards be well understood by each faculty member. It is also important that for any consideration of promotion or tenure, that the faculty member involved completes high-quality documentation (see Appendix).

In recognition that faculty activities and responsibilities may vary somewhat from department to department, the UNL Guidelines on Faculty Evaluation permit individual departments to establish their own promotion and tenure standards and criteria. These standards must be at least as rigorous as those established for the College as a whole. Departmental procedures, criteria, and standards are considered to be a supplement to the College Guidelines and must be consistent with the process established herein. In the absence of a document specifying higher departmental standards, the College of Business Administration's standards will apply.

Emeritus faculty do not participate in evaluations of faculty, nor promotion or tenure decisions.

IV. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

The UNL guidelines, consistent with Regents Bylaws, 4.6, call for the annual evaluation of the following categories of faculty members:

1. Probationary Faculty
2. Tenured, Not Fully Promoted
3. Tenured, Fully Promoted
4. Not Tenurable, Not Fully Promoted
5. Not Tenurable, Fully Promoted
6. Professor of Practice, Not Fully Promoted
7. Professor of Practice, Fully Promoted

Of these, categories 4 and 5 are not currently relevant to the College of Business Administration. However, should such positions be created in the future, the process described in the UNL guidelines shall apply.

A. Probationary Faculty

While the UNL guidelines call for the annual evaluation of all faculty regardless of status, the annual evaluation of probationary faculty is particularly significant in that it provides guidance to the faculty member toward achieving both promotion and tenure.

The process for the annual evaluation of probationary faculty (those on tenure track but not yet tenured) consists of the following steps:

1. The responsibility for communicating to probationary faculty what constitutes creative, scholarly, or professional activity in their discipline shall rest with the Department Chair.
2. In the first year of employment, each probationary faculty member shall acknowledge in writing to the Department Chair the fact that he or she has received the UNL Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty, the College of Business Administration's Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty and, if appropriate, any Departmental Guidelines.
3. At an appropriate time annually, each faculty member is to prepare annual performance records and supporting documents. These are then submitted to the Department Chair.
4. After receiving and reviewing the documents submitted by probationary faculty members, the Department Chair will consult with an appropriate Committee to discuss the performance of each faculty member being evaluated. This Committee will consist of all tenured faculty within the Department or a sub-set of such tenured faculty as elected by the Department. This committee shall exclude the Department Chair. The Committee will have access to the aforementioned documents. This information may be supplemented with other evidence of performance for the current and previous years.

5. Upon completion of this review, the Department Committee will provide written statements to the Chair concerning progress of a particular faculty member or members. The Department Chair shall not take part in these deliberations.
6. The Department Chair will give the probationary faculty member a written analysis of his or her progress and meet with him or her to discuss his or her situation each year. The document should let the faculty member know exactly where he or she stands and what must be done to make progress toward a favorable tenure recommendation from the Department.
7. Copies of the written analysis will be forwarded by the Department Chair to the Senior Associate Dean. The Senior Associate Dean will verify that probationary faculty members have indeed been informed in writing of their progress toward tenure. In the event that the process has not been carried out, the Senior Associate Dean will so inform the Department Chair so that appropriate corrective action may be taken.
8. In the year of tenure notification, the Candidate will be asked to prepare a file for examination. The process to be followed for tenure recommendation is set forth in the "Evaluation for Continuous Appointment (Tenure)" section of these guidelines.

B. Tenured, Not Fully Promoted

The annual review of faculty members who are tenured but not yet fully promoted generally is geared toward evaluating progress toward the rank of Full Professor in that, in most instances, those who have achieved tenure have also achieved the rank of Associate Professor.

1. As with probationary faculty, this category of faculty members is expected to complete the annual faculty performance records, prepare supporting documents, and present these to the Department Chair for review.
2. Annually, after reviewing the materials submitted by the faculty member, the Department Chair will evaluate the performance of that faculty member based on the criteria and standards appropriate to the faculty member's rank. Progress toward the attainment of the rank of Full Professor will also be considered in this review.
3. The Department Chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the results of the evaluation and to offer suggestions for further growth.
4. Every third year, prior to making the evaluation of any not-fully-promoted faculty member (either tenured or non-tenured), the Department Chair will meet with a Committee consisting of all tenured members who have attained the rank of Professor or a sub-set of such faculty members elected by the Department to discuss the performance of the faculty member being evaluated.. This committee shall exclude the Department Chair. The Department Chair is expected to consider the advice offered by that Committee before preparing a final evaluation and discussing it with the faculty member.

C. Tenured, Fully Promoted

Faculty members who are both tenured and fully promoted will also be evaluated by the Department Chair on an annual basis. The purpose of this evaluation is to indicate how the faculty member is performing in relation to proper expectations and to encourage the faculty member to continue to perform at exemplary levels. The steps are essentially identical to the steps followed for the annual evaluation of tenured, not-fully-promoted faculty.

1. The faculty member is expected to complete the annual faculty performance records, prepare supporting documents, and present these to the Department Chair for review.
2. Annually, after reviewing the materials submitted by the faculty member, the Department Chair will evaluate the performance of that faculty member based on the criteria and standards for the rank of Full Professor.
3. The Department Chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the results of the evaluation and to offer suggestions for further growth.

D. Professor of Practice, Not Fully Promoted

The annual review of Professor of Practice faculty members who are not yet fully promoted generally is geared toward evaluating progress toward the rank of Full Professor of Practice.

1. This category of faculty member is expected to complete the annual faculty performance records, prepare supporting documents, and present these to the Department Personnel Committee and Department Chair for review.
2. After receiving and reviewing the documents submitted by the Professor of Practice, the Department Chair will consult with an appropriate Committee to discuss the performance of each faculty member being evaluated. This Committee will consist of all tenured faculty within the Department or a sub-set of such tenured faculty as elected by the Department. This committee shall exclude the Department Chair. The Committee will have access to the aforementioned documents. This information may be supplemented with other evidence of performance for the current and previous years.
3. Upon completion of this review, the Department Committee will provide written statements to the Chair concerning progress of a particular faculty member or members. The Department Chair shall not take part in these deliberations.
4. The Department Chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the results of the evaluation and to offer suggestions for further growth.
5. An evaluation for the purposes of deciding on contract renewal shall be made for each not-fully-promoted Professor of Practice prior to a decision regarding contract renewal, in a timing consistent with deadlines for notification of contract renewals in section 4.4.8 of the Board of Regents By-Laws. This evaluation may be a regular annual evaluation or an evaluation made especially for deciding on contract renewal, at the discretion of the Department Chair, or at the request of the faculty member being evaluated. The Department Chair will meet with a Committee consisting of all tenured members who have attained a rank above that of the Professor of Practice being evaluated or a sub-set of such faculty members elected by the Department to discuss the performance of the faculty member being evaluated. The Department Chair is expected to consider the advice offered by that Committee before preparing a final evaluation and discussing it with the faculty member.

E. Professor of Practice, Fully Promoted

Professors of Practice who are fully promoted will also be evaluated by the Department Chair on an annual basis. The purpose of this evaluation is to indicate how the faculty member is performing in relation to proper expectations and to encourage the faculty member to continue to perform at exemplary levels. The steps are essentially identical to the steps followed for the annual evaluation of Professors of Practice, not fully promoted.

1. The faculty member is expected to complete the annual faculty performance records, prepare supporting documents, and present these to the Department Chair for review.
2. Annually, after reviewing the materials submitted by the faculty member, the Department Chair will evaluate the performance of that faculty member based on the criteria and standards for the rank of Professor of Practice.
3. The Department Chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the results of the evaluation and to offer suggestions for further growth.
4. An evaluation for the purposes of deciding on contract renewal shall be made for each fully-promoted Professor of Practice prior to a decision regarding contract renewal, in a timing consistent with deadlines for notification of contract renewals in section 4.4.8 of the Board of Regents By-Laws. This evaluation may be a regular annual evaluation or an evaluation made especially for deciding on contract renewal, at the discretion of the Department Chair, or at the request of the faculty member being evaluated. The Department Chair will consult with a committee consisting of the tenured professors and higher ranking

PoPs in the department about whether to renew contracts of PoPs. This committee shall exclude the Department Chair.

5. Upon completion of this review, the Department Committee will provide written statements to the Chair concerning progress of a particular faculty member or members. The Department Chair shall not take part in these deliberations. The Department Chair is expected to consider the advice offered by that Committee before preparing a final evaluation and discussing it with the faculty member.

V. PROMOTION IN RANK FOR TENURED AND TENURE TRACK FACULTY

The process, criteria, and standards for promotion in faculty rank within the College of Business Administration are consistent with those set forth in the UNL guidelines. However, some clarification is necessary for the steps mandated for the promotion procedures and for the standards used for promotion to Associate Professor and to Full Professor on tenure-track lines.

A. Process

1. Consideration for promotion can be initiated by the faculty member in question, or with the candidate's consent, the Department Chair and/or another faculty member of the College. The College process must provide adequate opportunity for due process in the consideration of an applicant's nomination, for Candidate response, and time for reconsideration of adverse decisions.²
2. When promotion is to be considered, the Candidate will prepare a file for examination by a committee of all tenured Department faculty above the candidate's rank. The department chair shall not be a part of this committee. Three external letters from faculty of professorial rank at other universities evaluating the Candidate's work as a scholar and his or her contributions to the field should be provided. These letters should be solicited by the Department Chair in accordance with the procedures suggested in the UNL Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty and placed in the Candidate's file along with (a) an indication of whether the Candidate has waived his or her right to read the letters, (b) an indication of whether the Candidate has waived his or her right to know the identity of the outside reviewers, (c) an explanation of why these persons were selected to do the external review, and (d) an explanation of the process followed to secure these letters. Once the final identification of reviewers has been made, if the Candidate has not waived his or her right to know the identity of the outside reviewers, the Candidate shall have the right to enter formal, written objections to any reviewer in the file. (These letters may also be used as part of the tenure review process.)
3. Prior to making any recommendations to the Dean, a Departmental Promotion & Tenure Committee composed of all tenured Associate Professors and Full Professors of the Department will vote by secret ballot on promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, and a Departmental Promotion & Tenure Committee composed of all tenured Full Professors will vote by secret ballot on promotion to the rank of Full Professor. In an instance where a department does not have sufficient Full Professors to meet the requirement of three (3) Full Professors (to include departmental faculty currently serving in Assistant or Associate Dean roles), the department shall hold an election to select a qualified member(s) from eligible faculty from other departments within the college. A letter of recommendation with the recorded vote and reasons for and against promotion is provided to the Department Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee and placed in the Candidate's promotion file. Promotion to Assistant Professor will, in most cases, be made when a faculty member is appointed -- perhaps contingent upon completion of the Ph.D. degree -- and will thus be covered under procedures for hiring new faculty.
4. After receiving notification from the Department, the Department Chair shall make his or her recommendation and shall forward it within one week to the Dean and the Promotion and Tenure Committee with reasons for and against promotion.
5. The College Promotion and Tenure Committee shall follow the procedures detailed in the College by-laws and make a recommendation to the Dean for or against promotion.

² The Candidate may stop the College process at any time. No person, may be nominated without his or her consent.

As described in the UNL guidelines, the Dean reviews the entire record of each nominee and submits an independent recommendation on each that is transmitted in writing to the Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, to the Candidate, and to the Department Chair. Further steps in the promotion process are set forth in the UNL Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty.

B. Standards

The following standards apply to promotion decisions for tenure-track positions:

1. Promotion to Associate Professor
 - a. Standards equal to those required for tenure in teaching, research, and service.
 - b. Completion of a period of quality performance at the Assistant Professor level (usually 6 years).
2. Promotion to Professor
 - a. Attainment of all standards for promotion to Associate Professor.
 - b. Completion of a period of quality performance at the Associate Professor level. (It is highly unusual for faculty to move from Associate Professor to Professor in less than 7 years).
 - c. Continual progress in performance in teaching, research, and service.
 - d. Significant involvement in the graduate program. Involvement with Ph.D. students is highly desirable.
 - e. Strong likelihood of continuing progress in performance.
 - f. National recognition in the Candidate's specialization area.

VI. PROMOTION IN RANK FOR PROFESSORS OF PRACTICE

The process, criteria, and standards for promotion in faculty rank within the College of Business Administration are consistent with those set forth in the UNL guidelines. However, some clarification may be necessary for the steps mandated for the promotion procedures and for the standards used for promotion to Associate Professor of Practice and Professor of Practice.

A. Process

1. Consideration for promotion can be initiated by the faculty member in question, or with the candidate's consent, the Department Chair or another faculty member of the College. The College process must provide adequate opportunity for due process in the consideration of an applicant's nomination, for Candidate response, and time for reconsideration of adverse decisions.
2. When promotion is to be considered, the Candidate will prepare a file for examination by the appropriate Committee of the Department. This committee shall exclude the Department Chair. Three external letters from faculty of higher rank (tenure-track or not) at other universities and/or leading practitioners evaluating the Candidate's work as a Professor of Practice and her/his contributions to the field should be provided. These letters should be solicited by the Department Chair in accordance with the procedures suggested in the procedures for promotion in the UNL Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty and placed in the Candidate's file along with (a) an indication of whether the Candidate has waived her/his right to read the letters, (b) an indication of whether the Candidate has waived his or her right to know the identity of the outside reviewers, (c) an explanation of why these persons were selected to do the external review, and (d) an explanation of the process followed to secure these letters. Once the final identification of reviewers has been made, if the Candidate has not waived his or her right to know the identity of the outside reviewers, the Candidate shall have the right to enter formal, written objections to any reviewer in the file.
3. Prior to making any recommendations to the Dean, Department Chairs will consult with a committee consisting of the tenured professors and higher ranking PoPs in the department regarding promotion of PoPs. This committee shall exclude the Department Chair. The Department Chair shall not take part in these deliberations. The vote and reasons for and against promotion are provided to the Department

Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee and placed in the Candidate's promotion file. Promotion to Assistant Professor of Practice will, in most cases, be made when a faculty member is appointed, and will thus be covered under procedures for hiring new faculty.

4. After receiving notification from the Department, the Department Chair shall make his or her recommendation and forward it within one week to the Dean and the Promotion and Tenure Committee with reasons for and against promotion.
5. The College Promotion and Tenure Committee shall follow the procedures detailed in the College by-laws and make a recommendation to the Dean for or against promotion.

As described in the UNL guidelines, the Dean reviews the entire record of each nominee and submits an independent recommendation on each that is transmitted in writing to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, to the Candidate, and to the Department Chair. Further steps in the promotion process are set forth in the UNL Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty.

B. Standards

The following standards apply to appointment and promotion decisions for Professors of Practice: Appointment and promotion for Professors of Practice shall be consistent with the standards established by the Board of Regents, November 3, 2006.

1. Promotion to Associate Professor of Practice
 - a. Meets requirements for Assistant Professor of Practice.
 - b. Evidence of contributions to advancing learning in the field
 - c. Satisfactory completion of other responsibilities as assigned at the discretion of the department/college, to include apportionment in service and/or professional development, and/or minimal requirements to meet academic qualification for accreditation.
 - d. Excellence in academic or professional instruction, evidenced e.g. by student evaluations, portfolio, peer review, student learning outcomes.
 - e. Evidence of leadership in instructional activity that has had significant impact on the Department, College, or University.
 - f. Completion of a period of quality performance at the Assistant Professor level (usually 6 years).
2. Promotion to Full Professor of Practice
 - a. Attainment of all standards for promotion to Associate Professor of Practice.
 - b. Completion of a period of quality performance at the Associate Professor of Practice level. (It should be highly unusual for faculty to move from Associate Professor of Practice to Professor of Practice in less than 7 years).
 - c. Continual progress in performance in teaching and other assigned duties.
 - d. Strong likelihood of continuing progress in performance.
 - e. Minimum expectation is for national visibility for Candidate's instructional activities and/or practice, achievable through, for example:
 - leadership in professional organizations
 - instructional methods and/or materials disseminated nationally
 - grant funding for instructional activities/innovation

VII. EVALUATION FOR CONTINUOUS APPOINTMENT (TENURE)

One of the most important decisions in academic life is the granting of tenure. Certainly it is true that the most important commitment the University can make to an individual faculty member is the awarding of continuous appointment. Each year the University of Nebraska-Lincoln initiates the process by which faculty members are selected for the awarding of tenure. Within the College of Business Administration this process involves review of tenure-eligible faculty members at three levels: (1) Department, (2) College Promotion and Tenure

Committee, and (3) Dean of the College. The purpose of this section of the College Guidelines is to outline the procedural steps and standards which are common to all departments in the College.

A. Process

1. In the year of tenure notification, the Candidate, with the aid of his or her Department Chair and Department support staff, shall prepare a file for examination. Timelines are below. As indicated in the UNL Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty, the College deadlines must provide adequate opportunity for due process in the consideration of an applicant's nomination, for Candidate response, and time for reconsideration of adverse decisions. (For a new faculty member without credit for prior experience, the tenure review process would normally begin in the fall term of the sixth year of appointment.) Much of the documentary evidence on which tenure evaluations are based will already have been collected in Departmental files, and material from this source as well as other information to be used in the tenure decision should be assembled by the Department Chair and/or the Candidate for study by the tenured faculty of the department.

Three external letters from faculty of professorial rank (associate or full) at other universities, who are qualified to assess the scholarly impact of the Candidate's work, should be provided. These letters should go beyond a count of articles or evaluation of the quality of the publication outlets. The letters should reflect a detailed assessment of the current and longer-term scholarly impact of the work that the Candidate has put forward for evaluation. These letters should be solicited by the Department Chair in accordance with the procedures suggested in the UNL Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty, and placed in the Candidate's file along with (a) an indication of whether the Candidate has waived her/his right to read the letters, (b) an indication of whether the Candidate has waived his or her right to know the identity of the outside reviewers, (c) an explanation of why these persons were selected to do the external review, and (d) an explanation of the process followed to secure these letters. Once the final identification of reviewers has been made, the Candidate shall have the right to enter formal, written objections to any reviewer in the file. (These letters may also be used as part of the promotion process.)

It is the responsibility of the individual being considered to examine these materials and to see to it that they are accurate and complete. The faculty member considered may want to seek advice of the Department Chair or other faculty to make sure that no important information has been overlooked.

2. The individual being considered for tenure is guaranteed access to all materials submitted for his or her evaluation and the opportunity to respond in writing. A possible exception to this "right of access" is outside evaluations which, with the faculty member's consent, will be kept confidential. The only anonymous materials that can be included in the file are student evaluations. It is important that each faculty member understands that it is his or her responsibility to present evidence of his or her accomplishments in the areas of research, teaching, and service. The Department Chair and/or the Candidate may ask other faculty members to verify that the material is accurate and complete, while preserving the confidentiality of the external reviews. UNL provides a "Document Request Form" and a "Transmittal Form" for preparing the recommendation from the Department (See Appendix). Additional information can be submitted. ("and usually is" deleted)

Materials presented in support of a recommendation for tenure will be reviewed by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, Dean, and the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Since these people may not be cognizant of the record of the individual whose tenure is being proposed, it is incumbent upon the Department and the Candidate to present documentary material supporting the case in a clear and readily understood format and to be explicit about the factors that provide positive support for the recommendation. Guidance for the preparation of the tenure Candidate's file is provided in the Appendix (See "Documents Request Form").

3. After the file has been compiled, the Department Promotion & Tenure Committee, consisting of all tenured members of the Department shall meet to evaluate the tenure Candidate and to make a tenure recommendation. This committee shall exclude the Department Chair. At the end of the deliberations, the Committee will vote by secret ballot on whether to recommend tenure or not. The Department Chair shall not take part in these deliberations. A letter of recommendation from the Department's Promotion & Tenure Committee, which includes the recorded vote and reasons in favor and against shall be forwarded to the Department Chair and the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, and be placed in the Candidate's tenure file. Any member(s) of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee may write and sign one or more minority reports to be placed in the candidate's file. If the Department Committee recommends against granting tenure, the Candidate must be informed of the right to request reasons for adverse recommendation and of the right to request reconsideration as described in the UNL Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty.
4. Following completion of deliberations by the Department Committee, the Department Chair reviews the entire record and makes an independent recommendation that is transmitted in writing to the Dean, to the Candidate and to the Department Committee. Transmittal of this recommendation shall include reasons for and against recommendation of tenure. If the Department Chair recommends against tenure, the Candidate must be informed of the right to request his or her reasons for adverse recommendation and of the right to request reconsideration as described in the UNL Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty.
5. The Dean will make each tenure file available to tenured members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. The tenured members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee then meet as a whole to discuss the pros and cons of the recommendation. Only the tenured members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be present for their deliberations before their vote. Minutes of the deliberations shall be kept and reasons for or against awarding tenure shall be recorded. A secret ballot vote is then taken with each tenured member having one vote. The result of this vote and the reasons for and against awarding tenure shall be forwarded to the Dean with copies to the Department Chair and to the Candidate. The Chair of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee shall ensure that the results and reasons are placed in the Candidate's tenure file. If the Promotion and Tenure Committee recommends against tenure, the Candidate must be informed of the right to request reasons for adverse recommendation and of the right to request reconsideration as described in the UNL Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty.
6. In the event the tenured members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee do not concur with the recommendation made by the Department, there is an opportunity for the Department to request reconsideration of the decision. The request for reconsideration is normally made by the Department Chair to the tenured members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. The faculty member involved may be consulted by the Department Chair to seek his or her input into the request for reconsideration, and may personally join in the request for reconsideration.
7. Upon receiving the recommendation of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Dean is required to transmit a personal recommendation to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs with copies to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, Department Chair, and the Candidate. Should a positive tenure recommendation by the majority of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee be unwarranted in the Dean's judgment, the Dean shall provide reasons in writing to the tenured members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and to the Department, with a copy of the letter to Candidate. Whenever the tenured members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee or the Dean disagree with the recommendation of the Department, the reasoning underlying the decision is transmitted to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. If the Dean recommends against tenure, the Candidate must be informed of the right to request reasons for the adverse recommendation and of the right to request reconsideration as described in the UNL Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty.

B. Standards

The following standards apply to the granting of tenure within the departments:

1. Teaching: The Candidate should submit evidence of consistently effective teaching. Teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate level is recommended. The Candidate should present evidence of the following:
 - a. Ability to provide leadership in the learning process -- proper preparation and organization, development of instructional materials, classroom presentation and management, and intellectual stimulation of students.
 - b. The application of high standards in the feedback process to students, including grading.
 - c. Effective teaching, as indicated by student evaluations, awards, recognition, peer comments, and Chair's comments.
 - d. Improvements and innovations in teaching materials and techniques.
 - e. Other appropriate evidence, such as effective advising, counseling of students, and directing independent studies or internships.
2. Research and Scholarly Activity
 - a. The Candidate should have a record that includes presentations of research to a national scholarly audience.
 - b. As a guideline, the expectation is that the successful applicant must have a sufficient number of high quality publications to receive a favorable vote for tenure. Faculty are expected to publish in the top journals in their broadly defined field of study (accounting, actuarial science, economics, finance, marketing, and management). Field specific journals (e.g. labor economics, corporate finance, etc.) may also qualify as top-tier. It is expected that probationary faculty starting before Fall 2012 will have published in top journals as well. However, these probationary faculty will not likely be held to the same standard faculty starting in Fall 2012 and since. In particular, the standard for probationary faculty should be based on the applicant's date of hire. Although other research output, along with teaching and service, should be considered when evaluating a faculty member's portfolio, in all cases publication in top-tier journals is a necessary condition for receiving tenure. The candidate is responsible for providing evidence of research activity, the quality and impact of which demonstrates to both the faculty and the administration a case for the granting of tenure.
3. Service: The Candidate for tenure should submit evidence of:
 - a. Contributions of service to the Department, College, or University.
 - b. Service contributions to organizations external to the University which benefit the University.
 - c. Membership and/or chairing of University, College, and/or Departmental committees, including task forces and special activities.
 - d. Involvement in local, state, regional, national, and international activities related to his or her professional area.
 - e. Membership and/or offices in pertinent professional organizations or associations.

VIII. NEW APPOINTMENT TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE

Standards:

A person appointed as a new Assistant Professor on tenure track must have a terminal degree. A person appointed as a new Assistant Professor of Practice must have a terminal degree or be professionally qualified according to AACSB standards.

IX. NEW APPOINTMENT TO ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSORS OR ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSORS OF PRACTICE, INCLUDING AWARDING OF TENURE

Standards:

Persons not currently holding an academic appointment within the College may be appointed to Associate or Full Professor or Associate or Full Professor of Practice, subject to the processes and standards below.

A. Process

1. All procedures required by the University shall be followed. All persons in the College involved in the process shall be obligated to proceed with deliberate speed if required by the circumstances of the appointment.
2. A Departmental Promotion & Tenure Committee consisting of all Department faculty of equal or greater rank than the proposed rank of the Candidate, shall evaluate the Candidate for appointment and vote by secret ballot whether to appoint or not. This committee shall exclude the Department Chair. Professors of Practice shall not vote on tenure-track appointments, but shall vote on Professor of Practice appointments. Untenured Professors shall not vote on the awarding of tenure. Minutes shall be taken and reasons for and against appointment shall be recorded. A letter of recommendation from the Departmental Promotion & Tenure Committee, which includes the recorded vote and reasons for and against the awarding of tenure shall be forwarded to the Department Chair and the Dean, and the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.
3. The College Promotion and Tenure Committee shall vote on awarding tenure (if appropriate) and Associate or Full status (tenured, untenured, or professor of practice, as appropriate) to the candidate. Voting eligibility on the College Promotion and Tenure Committee shall follow the guidelines for the rank and type of appointment as in normal promotion and tenure cases within the College. A letter including the recorded vote and the reasons for and against the appointment and granting of tenure (if appropriate) shall be forwarded to the Department Chair and the Dean.
4. The Department Chair will make a separate evaluation and recommendation for or against appointment. The Chair's recommendation and reasons for or against shall be forwarded to the Dean. The recommendation of the Department Committee and the Department Chair on an appointment shall be considered advisory to the Dean of the College. Results of the vote are included on the transmittal form submitted to the Senior Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
5. The Dean reviews the entire record of each nominee and submits an independent recommendation on each, which is transmitted in writing to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and to the Department Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

B. Standards

The standards for new appointment to a faculty rank or the awarding of tenure are the same as those for promotion to that rank or awarding of tenure for a Candidate who already holds an academic appointment in the College.

X. CHANGES TO THIS DOCUMENT.

As of 1/21/13, UNL Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty states that "Each major administrative unit of the University shall prepare written standards that shall be used in making all decisions on promotions, awarding Continuous Appointments, and merit salary adjustments. ... The Chancellor of each major administrative unit is empowered to approve the content of the written standards and the scope of their applicability..." Changes to CBA faculty evaluation standards requires both a majority vote by secret ballot of CBA faculty and subsequent approval by the dean.

APPENDIX
(Promotion and Evaluation for Continuous Appointment [Tenure])
Supporting Materials

The initial preparation of supporting material by the faculty member being considered is an extremely important part of the promotion and tenure processes. The faculty member should be certain that all relevant material is included in appropriate folders when departmental colleagues begin their review. A major cause of controversy and conflict stems from incomplete folders. Preparation of the folder requires forethought and planning.

UNL has developed a "Document Request" form that specifies the materials that should be included in the various folders to support a Candidate's consideration for promotion and tenure. The current version of that form is included as part of this Appendix, together with a copy of the Tenure/Promotion Transmittal Form and a "Suggested Letter for Obtaining External Letters of Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion." These documents can be found at: <http://svcaa.unl.edu/faculty/promotion-tenure#forms>

ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEWS
Procedures/implementation of campus post-tenure
Review policy

March 9, 1998

To: Deans and Department Chairs/Heads

From: Richard Edwards, Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Subject: Procedures for annual faculty reviews and implementation of a campus post-tenure review policy

The Role of Annual Faculty Reviews

For a variety of reasons, we need to ensure that annual faculty evaluations are performed in all departments in a rigorous and equitable manner.¹ Annual reviews are mandated by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty: Annual Evaluations, Promotion, and Tenure (accepted 5/89; revised 9/90), which supplement the Bylaws of the Board of Regents. The Board of Regents, in recently passing the post-tenure review policy, reaffirmed the importance of the annual reviews. And the Academic Senate representatives, in our consultations to produce a campus post-tenure review plan, insisted upon having language in the preamble that emphasizes the importance of having annual reviews "conducted in all departments in a rigorous and equitable manner."

As per the Guidelines, the annual evaluation should, for every faculty member, provide an opportunity to judge that faculty member's contribution to the University's missions, offer useful feedback to the faculty member on his or her contribution, and create the context in which the faculty member and his or her chair or head can develop goals and objectives for future achievement. The specific nature and form of a review will vary in accord with the individual's type of appointment, rank, tenure status, and assignment. But for all situations, the review should form the basis for annual merit salary raises and other rewards, including promotion

and tenure.³ Additionally, if the faculty member has a substantial and continuing deficiency in performance, the annual review is the mechanism within which to identify such deficiency for purposes of post-tenure review.

Ensuring Rigorous and Equitable Reviews

The Dean has the central role in ensuring that Department Chairs and heads conduct annual evaluations in a rigorous and equitable manner.⁴ I ask each dean to undertake the following steps to carry out this responsibility:

1. The Dean should meet with each Department Chair or head before the review process to review existing annual evaluation procedures, both to ensure that the procedures are appropriate and that the chair or head fully understands his or her responsibility. The Dean should ensure that each unit has developed criteria for evaluation that are consistent with the objectives of the unit.
2. The Dean, upon receiving from the unit as mandated the reviews from the chair, should ensure that the evaluation has the following elements:
 - A. A clear statement of what is expected of the individual faculty member in terms of teaching, creative activity or research, and service/outreach in the context of his or her particular role in the university.
 - B. A listing or description of what the faculty member did during the year. (This may be accomplished by appending the faculty member's report of activities).
 - C. An assessment or critique, that is, a judgment of how well the faculty member performed each of his or her major assignments during the year.
 - D. A clear statement, in those cases where there is a substantial and continuing deficiency in the performance of a faculty member beyond the third year of continuous appointment, that a deficiency has been identified and unless corrected, will result in a post-tenure review.

Evaluations that do not contain all of these elements should be returned by the Dean to the department for completion.

3. The Dean should annually provide to the Senior Vice chancellor or the Vice Chancellor for IANR the names of any faculty members beyond the third year of continuous appointment found to have substantial and continuing deficiencies, and the disposition of such cases (including where in the prescribed procedure the case is, whether alternate arrangements such as reassignment have been made, and whether a post-tenure review panel has been appointed).

³ Faculty are encouraged to collect information for "Document Folder 2 "(Teaching) in a "Teaching Portfolio."

⁴ The reasons: (1) Annual faculty evaluations play a very important role in tenure decisions and other promotion decisions; poorly-done evaluations frequently compromise or even conflict with these decisions, creating the potential for substantial problems. (2) The new post-tenure review policy of the University (attached) depends critically upon the validity and fairness of annual evaluations. And (3) annual merit pay and other rewards need to be tied more effectively to the annual review.