

College of Business and Technology Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

Revised Fall 1994, Fall 1996, and Spring 2010; Approved May 5, 2010



College of Business and Technology Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

*Based on UNK Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure Approved October 2008-
Revised Fall 1994, Fall 1996, and Spring 2010; Approved May 5, 2010.*

*These Guidelines replace and supersede all previous policies of the College of Business and
Technology addressing evaluation, promotion, and tenure.*

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	1
II. Letters of Appointment and Reappointment	2
III. Faculty Academic Records	3
IV. Annual Review of Faculty Performance.....	5
V. Promotion and Tenure Process	12
VI. The Criteria for Promotion and Tenure	15
VII. Promotion of Lecturers (Special Appointments - non-tenure track) to Senior Lecturer	18
VIII. Post-Tenure Review	20
IX. The Portfolio	20
X. Grievance and Appeal Process.....	20



CBT Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Approved May 5, 2010)

Based on UNK Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure Approved October 2008- Revised Fall 1994, Fall 1996, Spring 2010; Approved May 5, 2010.

These Guidelines replace and supersede all previous policies of the College of Business and Technology addressing evaluation, promotion, and continuous appointment (tenure).

I. Introduction

These guidelines are based on the campus-wide guidelines for Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure¹. The term "tenure," as used in these guidelines, is synonymous with the term "continuous appointment" in *Regent Bylaws*. These guidelines are subject to the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Board of Regents and the University of Nebraska at Kearney Education Association.

Just as these University of Nebraska at Kearney Guidelines incorporate and complement the *Bylaws of the Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska*, these guidelines complement the University of Nebraska-Kearney guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure and therefore shall be read and implemented in conjunction with UNK Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure. These guidelines are more detailed and specific, where necessary, than UNK guidelines. These College Guidelines conform to Regent Policy, and are approved by the College faculty, the College Dean, the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, and the Chancellor. These guidelines are subject to the Collective Bargaining Agreement. These approved CBT Guidelines are distributed to all College faculty and to new faculty as they are appointed.

In like manner, individual departments will develop appropriate and complementary documents or addenda to these College Guidelines to accommodate discipline specific professional practices and expectations. All Department Guidelines must conform to these College Guidelines, and must be approved by the affected faculty, the College Academic Affairs committee², the College Dean, the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, and the Chancellor. The departmental guidelines are subject to the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Department Guidelines must be distributed to faculty when the guidelines are approved and to new faculty as they are appointed.

- A. The purpose of evaluating, promoting, and granting tenure to faculty in the College of Business and Technology of the University of Nebraska at Kearney is the continuous development of university-level faculty members involved in teaching, scholarship, and service.
- B. Teaching includes preparation, instruction, mentoring, and assessment. Teaching excellence is the primary responsibility of teaching faculty members. Non-teaching faculty are evaluated for excellence in their primary area of responsibility.

¹ UNK Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure of the University of Nebraska-Kearney (Approved October 2008)

² The role of the committee is to ensure that all promotion and tenure guidelines are followed, and to make professional judgments on the overall contribution of the faculty member to the College, the University, and the community.



CBT Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Approved May 5, 2010)

- C. All faculty members are expected to demonstrate activities that maintain the currency and relevancy of their instruction. Faculty members can maintain currency and relevancy through a variety of efforts including scholarship, professional development, and current professional experience.
- D. Scholarship, consisting of research and creativity activity, is expected of all faculty. Scholarship includes the advancement, integration, application, and representation of knowledge (refer to [Appendix A of UNK Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure³](#)), and is inherent in excellent teaching.
 - 1. Research is expected to lead to the advancement of knowledge and result in peer-reviewed publications or equivalent demonstrations.
 - 2. Juried creative activity is recognized as the equivalent of peer-reviewed publications.
- E. Service to the University and the larger communities encompassing the University is expected of the faculty.
- F. Evaluation of faculty members will take into consideration workload allocations among teaching, scholarship, and service.
- G. Nothing in this document is intended to contradict "[UNK Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure](#)" established for the campus and approved by the campus-wide faculty in October 2008.

II. Letters of Appointment and Reappointment

- A. Letters of Appointment and Reappointment must conform to UNK Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure.
- B. Faculty holding an "Appointment for a Specific Term" will be considered for reappointment as described below.
 - Regent Bylaws, Section 4.4.2, sets standards for notification of probationary faculty of possible nonreappointment. First-year faculty who hold an "Appointment for a Specific Term" (tenure-track faculty in the probationary period) must be notified of the University's reappointment decision not later than March 1 of the first year of service, or three months before contract expiration. For such faculty in their second year, notification must be made by December 15, or six months before contract expiration. For probationary faculty reappointed as of December 15 in their second year or such faculty in their third or subsequent

3



CBT Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Approved May 5, 2010)

year, notification of the reappointment decision must be made one year before contract expiration (June 1). In the event of failure to meet a notification deadline, the College obliges itself to contract with the faculty member for an additional academic year of service as an "Appointment for a Specific Term."

- The Dean of the College of the faculty member must make a reappointment recommendation in writing to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs (SVCASA) by February 15 of the first year of service, by December 1 of the second year, and by May 1 for a reappointed second year or longer-serving probationary faculty member. The Dean's recommendation should note positive and/or negative aspects of the appraisal of the person's performance as a faculty member, as the Dean has learned them from the documentation available to him or her, and should be copied to the faculty member.
- The appraisal will include the Annual Review of Faculty Performance, which must include a summary of both student and peer evaluations, as outlined below. Because the Dean relies on the Annual Review of Faculty Performance to be the primary means of assessing the faculty member for reappointment, this review would have to be completed by February 1 of the first year, November 15 of the second year, and April 15 of a reappointed second year or longer-serving faculty member. The documentation to the Dean and to the SVCASA by the Dean must include an updated curriculum vitae prepared by the faculty member. The Dean must convey in person to the faculty member the substance of his or her recommendation to the SVCASA not later than one month after transmittal of the recommendation, and the Dean shall make a note of this conversation in the Cumulative Faculty Academic Record and the Department Faculty Academic Record (refer to Section III of UNK Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure: Faculty Records) of the faculty member.
 - a. Faculty holding "Special Appointment" are considered for reappointment as described below. All appointments to faculty positions that are not "Appointments for a Specific Term", or "Continuous Appointment" are "Special Appointments," as outlined in *Regent Bylaws, Section 4.4.1*. Deans of Colleges should *notify the SVCASA with reappointment recommendations for all faculty* for special appointment of 0.5 FTE or greater by May 1 of each year. Recommendations will include any relevant plans to continue or discontinue the position, redefine it, or convert it to a tenure line. When circumstances require, the services of Special Appointment faculty may be arranged for after May 1 if a Dean so recommends and the SVCASA approves.

III. Faculty Academic Records

The College will follow UNK Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure in maintenance of Faculty Academic Records.



CBT Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Approved May 5, 2010)

Faculty members are encouraged to provide relevant materials in digital format for the Department, College, and Cumulative Faculty Academic Records using an approved online information management system used by the College. Faculty members shall have access to these Records and may add written responses to anything included in these Records. Written responses to Annual Reviews should be copied to both Department and College (Cumulative) Records.

Documents of an evaluative nature addressing the Faculty Member's performance, employment status, or academic assignment must be copied to the Faculty Member prior to being placed in a Faculty Academic Record.

- A. **Department Faculty Academic Record** is kept for each faculty member and includes any information relative to teaching assignment/area of expertise, student evaluation, peer review, annual evaluation, temporary absence/sick leave, and copies of Chair correspondence relative to the faculty member. The Record may have copies of pertinent materials from the Cumulative Faculty Record. The Department Record may include evidence of scholarship, service in and out of the institution, and teaching effectiveness. Written annual reviews are included in this Record and other pertinent materials may be added to this Record by the Department Chair or Dean with the faculty member's knowledge. The Department Faculty Academic Record is generally more comprehensive than the Records at either the Dean or SVCASA levels. For this reason, materials accrued in the Department Record will be used in determining reappointment, promotion and tenure, and will be used in the post-tenure review process. In cases where, because of organizational structure, a Department Record is not kept, the Record will be the Cumulative Faculty Academic Record in the Dean's Office.

- B. The **Cumulative Faculty Academic Record** is maintained in the Dean's Office and is the official Academic Record for a Faculty Member. This Record includes the following:
 1. Copies of transcripts (baccalaureate through terminal degree)
 2. Correspondence relating to initial hiring (cover letter, resume/c.v., reference letters, departmental recommendations)
 3. Initial appointment letter or other documentation of hiring date
 4. Special conditions/agreements entered at time of initial appointment (tenure, early tenure, chair/director, other special conditions of employment)
 5. Tenure Notify Date/Date of Tenure Award
 6. Date of promotions
 7. Contract copies or salary notations
 8. Annual Reviews of Faculty Performance
 9. Scholarly/Service Activities Records
 10. Honors and Awards/grants/fellowships
 11. Letters of recognition/reprimand/memoranda to the file related to performance



CBT Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Approved May 5, 2010)

12. Copies of correspondence from the Dean relative to the faculty member
 13. Curriculum Vitae
 14. Current Year sick leave/absence forms
 15. Other relevant information
 16. Faculty response to any of the above
- C. The Office of the **Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs** has Faculty Academic Records to meet the requirements of academic audit/accreditation. Included in this Record are official transcripts, copies of contracts or other salary notations, date of appointment, tenure notification date, tenure award, and promotion.
- D. Access to the Faculty Academic Records is restricted to the faculty member, his or her agent, and authorized administrators. Faculty members have access to their Record during normal business hours and may request copies of materials therein. Faculty members may not remove their Record from the room in which it is kept.
- E. Faculty members may enter a statement to their Official Academic Record (or any other Record) which they believe clarifies, corrects, or refutes material therein. Such a statement will be attached to relevant documents in the Record. They may also place in their Records materials documenting academic qualifications, teaching, research, scholarship, and service.
- F. Faculty Academic Records may be purged of obsolete, unfounded, or inappropriate materials: (1) on written request from the faculty member and agreed to by the administration, or (2) by periodic administrative purge of files, in which case the materials are returned to the faculty member.

IV. Annual Review of Faculty Performance

The primary purpose of the annual review is to provide faculty members with a written record of accomplishments and expectations, an ongoing critique of strengths and weaknesses, and direction for the faculty member in his or her development as a contributing member of the academic community.

For probationary faculty (those on tenure track, but not yet tenured), the annual evaluation communicates areas of progress and strength, and alerts the faculty member to performance deficiencies at the earliest possible time. Any concerns held by the Department Chair or Dean regarding the faculty member's performance should be clearly stated in the written evaluation. The review will make specific recommendations for self-improvement and professional development which will enhance the faculty member's chances of eventually achieving tenure and promotion. Annual evaluations should apprise probationary faculty members of performance deficiencies in time for them to take corrective actions. To this end, Annual Reviews for all faculty must be completed by May 1.



CBT Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Approved May 5, 2010)

The annual evaluation will generally emphasize progress toward the next rank.

For tenured, fully promoted faculty the annual evaluation will generally emphasize meeting the expectations as if progressing toward the rank of Professor.

For faculty with Special Appointments (such as non-tenure track Senior Lecturers, Lecturers and Instructors) the annual review will focus primarily on strengths and weaknesses, and on specific recommendations for improvement and professional development.

A. General Procedures

1. Each full-time faculty member shall be reviewed annually in compliance with Regent Bylaws, Section 4.5 and Section 4.6., which requires “relevant information from all sources, including student evaluations and peer judgments.” The annual review of faculty performance will primarily address these three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty whose assignments do not include these three areas will be reviewed in a manner appropriate to their assigned duties. Other professional matters may be included.
2. *Each department shall have a written set of procedures and guidelines for the annual review of faculty performance as additions to this policy.* Such procedures and guidelines shall conform to *Regent Bylaws*, UNK Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure, these guidelines, and are subject to the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Departmental procedures and guidelines must be approved by the College Academic Affairs Committee, the Dean of the college and the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs (SVCASA).
3. The Department Chair or equivalent supervisor will normally conduct the annual review of the faculty member. This review will incorporate student and peer evaluations as laid out below in sections B, C, and D.
4. Faculty holding appointments in more than one department or college will be jointly reviewed using procedures consistent with both areas. Only one official Departmental File and Cumulative Faculty Record will exist for such faculty members. Review procedures and the location of the files must be agreed upon at the time of the joint appointment.
5. The review of Department Chairs as faculty will be conducted by the Dean as outlined in UNK Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure IV.A. The review of the Chair as administrator will be carried out by the Dean at the same time.
6. The annual review shall provide, in writing, a description of the faculty member’s activities throughout the year, and suggestions regarding courses of action the faculty member might follow to best contribute to the mission and goals of his or her department, the College, and the larger University of Nebraska at Kearney academic community. If post-tenure review (refer to UNK Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure Section VIII) is suggested, it must be clearly stated in the Department Chair’s written annual review.



CBT Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Approved May 5, 2010)

7. There shall be a meeting of the Department Chair and faculty member to discuss the written annual review. The faculty member and Department Chair shall sign and date the written review, indicating only that the faculty member has read and discussed the review with the Chair.
8. After the meeting, the written annual review shall be added to the Departmental File. The accrued annual reviews of faculty performance, included with other materials in the Departmental File, will provide an evidentiary basis for the judgments involved in matters of retention, promotion, and tenure. A copy of the review shall, at the same time, be provided to the Dean for the Cumulative Faculty Record, and to the faculty member. The faculty member may respond in writing for inclusion in both files.
9. The Dean will review the Annual Performance Review and may review the Departmental File annually. The Dean will add a written review of annual performance in the case of probationary faculty. The Dean's review will be copied to the Cumulative Faculty Record and a copy shall be provided to the faculty member. The faculty member may respond in writing for inclusion in both files.

B. Annual Review of Faculty Performance: Teaching

1. The annual review of faculty teaching performance shall conform to the following in the use of student assessment of teaching:
 - a. There shall be student evaluation of every course every semester, excepting independent studies and reading courses, thesis direction, and other faculty directed individual activities.
 - b. Each faculty member shall utilize the evaluation form developed and approved by CBT, with the inclusion of any additional core or global discipline-specific questions developed and approved by the department. The course evaluation form must call for response to the following four dimensions:
 - i. The instructor's daily handling and organization of the class.
 - ii. The instructor's skill in communicating the course material.
 - iii. The student's perception of the learning experience.
 - iv. The degree to which the student feels his or her interest and/or thinking has been stimulated.
 - c. Evaluations shall be distributed and collected in a manner consistent with college and departmental procedures and guidelines. These procedures must protect the integrity of the data, and must also "protect members of the faculty from capricious and uninformed judgments" (*Board of Regents Bylaws*, 5.3). Students shall always be given the opportunity to sign or not sign the evaluation forms, as well as to include additional written comments. Online and distance education courses shall utilize a course evaluation form appropriate to this mode of instruction. The faculty member shall not review evaluation forms until after the final course grades have been submitted and should so assure the students.



CBT Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Approved May 5, 2010)

- d. The individual faculty member shall have the right to review the evaluations and append any explanations or additional information desired before the student evaluations are reviewed by the Department Chair. Departmental procedures to allow a faculty response must also protect the integrity and privacy of the data. The faculty member's response should be included with the raw data for consideration by the Chair.
 - e. The Department Chair shall review and summarize in writing pertinent raw data from all classes, and comment on any faculty response included with those data. The review may include consideration of variables other than quality of teaching that may have influenced student evaluations. These variables include matters specific to online and distance education courses.
 - f. Once student evaluations have been used for the annual review of the faculty member, those evaluations become the property of the individual faculty member. The original and all copies of raw data will be returned to the faculty member. The department shall retain summary data sheets and transcripts of student comments in a permanent file.
2. Departmental procedures and guidelines shall provide for peer review of teaching in the annual evaluation process, and include criteria for the use of peer judgments in annual reviews. Examples of peer judgment criteria include:
- a. The quality of student work in later courses in sequentially organized disciplines.
 - b. Growth and development of students in regard to course objectives as measured by pre- and post-testing or as demonstrated by student portfolios and other projects produced in the course.
 - c. Curriculum development and innovation.
 - d. Grading standards.
 - e. Review of teaching materials in terms of the currency, academic soundness, relationship with course objectives, and level.
 - f. Assessment of special incidents provided the contents and nature of any complaint is known to the individual faculty member, and that he or she be given the opportunity to respond in writing, with the response retained as a part of his or her departmental file.
 - g. Classroom visitation. If a program of classroom visitation is adopted, the following procedures must be followed:
 - i. The Department Chair shall assign a visitor from the appropriate faculty group, as determined by department policy. This group must be generally defined, e.g., full professors in history or associate and full professors in social science, and may include faculty from outside the department, especially in small departments.
 - ii. The individual faculty member may invite a second visitor from the appropriate faculty group.



CBT Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Approved May 5, 2010)

- iii. Departmental procedures and guidelines must include a written checklist of the dimensions to be appraised by the visitor(s). The visitor(s) will report in writing.
 - iv. The faculty member shall have the right to see the report(s) of the visitor(s) before submission to the Department Chair or the Department Chair and the appropriate faculty committee and to respond in writing, with such response to be attached to the report.
 - h. The Department Chair shall review and summarize in writing all peer judgments of teaching.
 - i. When there is disagreement about the quality of the faculty member's performance at any level of review, it is incumbent on both parties to make their case regarding the faculty member's performance.
3. CBT Criteria for evaluation of teaching are:

Does Not Meet Expectations: The faculty member's performance in teaching is generally unsatisfactory and the quality of teaching is minimal. Teaching deficiencies exist that influence overall teaching effectiveness. These teaching deficiencies may include lack of content expertise, unsatisfactory instructional effectiveness and creativity, and poor course management. Evaluations are below the expectations within the college.

Meets Expectations: The faculty member's performance in teaching is excellent and does not indicate any deficiencies influencing overall teaching effectiveness. There is evidence of quality teaching demonstrated through content expertise, instructional effectiveness and creativity, and course management. Evaluations are positive and meet the expectations within the college.

Exceeds Expectations: The faculty member's performance in teaching is very high. There is evidence that the faculty member is providing high quality teaching demonstrated through content expertise, instructional effectiveness and creativity, and course management. Evaluations are positive and exceed the expectations within the college.

C. Annual Review of Faculty Performance: Scholarship

- 1. The annual review of faculty scholarship performance shall be based on the following expectations:
 - a. Tenured and tenure track faculty

CBT Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Approved May 5, 2010)

- i. Typically, all tenured and tenure track faculty in the college shall have maintained scholarly release-time obligations⁴ during the year (refer to CBT's Scholarly Productivity Guidelines for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty).
 - ii. Tenured and tenure-track faculty in the divisions or departments of the college teaching masters' level courses shall have maintained Graduate Faculty status.
 - iii. Tenured and tenure-track faculty in the business division shall have maintained Academically Qualified status (refer to Guidelines for CBT Academically Qualified and Professionally Qualified Faculty).
 - b. Non-tenure track faculty (Senior Lecturers and Lecturers)
 - i. Senior Lecturers and Lecturers in the business division shall have maintained Professionally Qualified or Academically Qualified status (refer to CBT Guidelines for Academically Qualified and Professionally Qualified Faculty)
 - 2. Departmental procedures and guidelines shall provide for peer review of scholarship in the annual evaluation process, and include criteria for the use of peer judgments in annual reviews.
 - 3. The Department Chair shall review peer evaluation(s) and the materials provided by the faculty member relative to scholarship, and summarize them in writing, as a part of the annual review of faculty performance.
 - 4. When there is disagreement about the quality of the faculty member's performance at any level of review, it is incumbent on both parties to make their case regarding the faculty member's performance.
5. CBT Criteria for evaluation of scholarship are:

Does Not Meet Expectations: The faculty member's scholarly activity and/or research is unsatisfactory. There is minimal evidence of research activity resulting in either peer-reviewed publications or equivalent demonstrations, or juried creative activity that is recognized as the equivalent of peer-reviewed publications (See section C.1.a.i above). The scholarly engagement and output is minimal and does not meet the expectations within the college.

Meets Expectations: The faculty member's scholarly activity and/or research is satisfactory. There is evidence of research activity resulting in either peer-reviewed

⁴ In rare cases, a tenured faculty member may be allowed to pursue a non-scholarship release work-load option with the approval of the Department Chair and Dean.



CBT Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Approved May 5, 2010)

publications or equivalent demonstrations, or juried creative activity that is recognized as the equivalent of peer-reviewed publications (See section C.1.a.i above). The scholarly engagement and output meets the expectations within the college.

Exceeds Expectations: The faculty member's scholarly activity and/or research is very high. There is evidence of consistent and continued research activity that shows a history of peer-reviewed publications or equivalent demonstrations, or juried creative activity that is recognized as the equivalent of peer-reviewed publications (See section C.1.a.i above). The scholarly engagement and output exceeds the expectations within the college.

D. Annual Review of Faculty Performance: Service

1. Departmental procedures and guidelines shall provide for peer review of service in the annual evaluation process, and include criteria for the use of peer judgments in annual reviews.
2. The Department Chair shall review peer evaluation(s) and the materials provided by the faculty member relative to service, and summarize them in writing, as a part of the annual review of faculty performance.
3. When there is disagreement about the quality of the faculty member's performance at any level of review, it is incumbent on both parties to make their case regarding the faculty member's performance.
4. CBT Criteria for evaluation of service are:

Does Not Meet Expectations: The faculty member's service activity is unsatisfactory. There is marginal involvement in service work to the university and profession. While they may be members of university/campus/college/department committees participation is minimal and below the expectations within the college. Service outside the university to the profession/ community/region is minimal and below expectations within the college.

Meets Expectations: The faculty member's professional service to the university and profession is satisfactory and does not indicate any deficiency. There is evidence of quality service to the university/campus/college/department. There is evidence of service to the profession/ community/region that is discipline related. The level of professional service meets the expectations within the college.

Exceeds Expectations: The faculty member's professional service to the university is very high. There is evidence of high quality professional service and leadership to the university/ campus/college/department. There is evidence of high quality service to the profession/ community/region that is discipline related. There is evidence of professional service that exceeds the expectations within the college.



CBT Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Approved May 5, 2010)

Service to the university/campus/college/department may include contributions made individually, or may include work on committees, administrative positions held, student organizations sponsored, service on university unit boards and advisory bodies, consulting with or conducting studies for university units/agencies or other specific assignments. Service to the profession may include membership and offices held in professional organizations as well as involvement in activities sponsored by state, regional and national organizations related to the field of study or discipline. Service outside the university to the community/region or beyond is appropriate if it is related to the field of study or discipline related.

V. Promotion and Tenure Process

The promotion and tenure of university faculty is based on a commitment to appoint and retain the highest level of academic professionals. Through the practice of mentorship and annual assessment of faculty performance in teaching or librarianship, scholarship, and service, the university aspires to uphold a level of excellence in its faculty that corresponds to its mission and sustains an intellectual environment supporting academic freedom and scholarly pursuit.

The awarding of promotion in rank is a tangible method of acknowledging measurable distinction of faculty achievement in teaching or librarianship, scholarship, and service. It is the right of each faculty member seeking promotion to expect an equitable and unencumbered process in this pursuit; and it is the responsibility of his or her colleagues and the University to establish clear and consistent criteria for assessment.

The granting of tenure symbolizes a collegial and administrative acceptance of a faculty member into the university's scholarly community. It represents not only an evaluation of past performance, but an evaluation of potential for continued growth. The tenure decision, therefore, must involve consideration of a faculty member's ability to work effectively in, and contribute significantly to, the department, college, university, and the professional communities.

- A. The process for the promotion recommendation is as follows:
 1. The Faculty Member submits his or her portfolio to the Department Chair or equivalent supervisor by November 1. The portfolio should address elements detailed in Section IX, The Portfolio.
 2. The Department Chair will implement the departmental procedures for review, which have been approved by the department, the Dean of the college, and the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs (SVCASA).

In the absence of approved departmental procedures that specifically allow for a different committee configuration, the Chair will convene a committee of all the department's faculty ranked senior lecturers and above to review the materials and make recommendation for those applying to the senior lecturer rank, assistant professor and above to review the materials and make recommendation for those applying to the assistant rank, a committee of the department's faculty ranked associate professor and above to review the materials and make recommendation for those applying for



CBT Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Approved May 5, 2010)

associate, and a committee of the department's faculty ranked full professor to review the materials and make recommendation for those applying for full professor. In each case, should there be fewer than five members at the appropriate rank on any committee, faculty from inside or outside the institution meeting the above rank criteria will be appointed to the committee by the Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair and the faculty member, to reach a minimum of five.

The committee will make recommendations in writing, generally addressing strengths and/or weaknesses of the application. The vote count must be a part of the letter. If a departmental committee includes appropriately ranked faculty from outside the department or the institution, the committee composition should be addressed in the committee's letter. In the case of joint appointments, the committee composition should be addressed in the committee's letter, and provisions for such committee appointments must be included in written departmental procedures and guidelines, or in written agreements with jointly appointed faculty. The committee's letter becomes part of the portfolio. On receipt of the portfolio, the Chair will write a separate letter that also becomes part of the portfolio.

Letters from the committee and Chair must be copied to the faculty member by December 20. The faculty member may attach a response with compelling supporting material not available at the time of the original submission, may ask for reconsideration of the portfolio in light of that response, or may withdraw from consideration before the application is put forward to the Dean by January 15.

3. The Dean of the College of Business and Technology requests the appropriate college faculty committee to review the materials and make a recommendation. The college committee will make recommendations in writing, generally addressing strengths and/or weaknesses of the application. The vote count must be a part of the committee's letter. The committee's letter becomes part of the portfolio. On receipt of the portfolio, the Dean will write a separate letter that also becomes part of the portfolio.

Letters from the Dean and the committee must be copied to the faculty member by February 15. The faculty member may attach a response, may ask for reconsideration of the portfolio in light of that response, or may withdraw from consideration before the application is put forward to the SVCASA and Chancellor by February 22.

4. Faculty members who sit on both departmental and college committees may participate in discussion and voting on either committee, but not both. For example, faculty who voted on a candidate at the department level must recuse themselves from the discussion and vote on that candidate at the college level. Faculty members who are Department Chairs and members of the college committee must write the Chair's letter and recuse themselves from the discussion and vote on that faculty member candidate at the college level.

- B. The process for the tenure recommendation is as follows:



CBT Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Approved May 5, 2010)

1. The Faculty Member submits his or her portfolio to the Department Chair or equivalent supervisor by November 1.
2. The Department Chair will implement the departmental procedures for review, which have been approved by the department, the college, the SVCASA, and the Chancellor.

In the absence of approved departmental procedures that specifically allow for a different committee configuration, the Department Chair will convene a committee of all tenured faculty in the department to review the materials and make a recommendation. In this case (absence of approved department procedure), should there be fewer than five tenured department members, tenured faculty from inside or outside the institution will be appointed to the committee by the Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair and the faculty member, to reach a minimum of five.

The committee will make its recommendations in writing, generally addressing strengths and/or weaknesses of the application. The vote count must be a part of the letter. If a department's committee includes faculty from outside the department or the institution, the committee composition should be addressed in the committee's letter. In the case of joint appointments, the committee composition should be addressed in the committee's letter, and provisions for such committee appointments must be included in written departmental procedures and guidelines, or in written agreements with jointly appointed faculty. The committee's letter becomes part of the portfolio.

On receipt of the portfolio, the Chair will write a separate letter that also becomes part of the portfolio. Letters from the committee and Chair must be copied to the faculty member by December 20. The faculty member may attach a response with compelling supporting material not available at the time of the original submission, may ask for a reconsideration of the portfolio in light of that response, or may withdraw from consideration before the application is put forward to the Dean by January 15.

3. In the undergraduate colleges, the Dean requests the appropriate college faculty committee to review the materials and make a recommendation. The college committee will make recommendations in writing, generally addressing strengths and/or weaknesses of the application. The vote count must be a part of the committee's letter. The committee's letter becomes part of the portfolio. On receipt of the portfolio, the Dean will write a separate letter that also becomes part of the portfolio. Letters from the Dean and the committee must be copied to the applicant by February 15. The faculty member may attach a response, may ask for a reconsideration of the portfolio in light of that response, or may withdraw before the application is put forward to the SVCASA and Chancellor by February 22.
4. Faculty members on both departmental and college committees may participate in discussion and voting on either committee, but not both. For example, faculty who voted on a candidate at the department level must recuse themselves from the discussion and vote on that candidate at the college level. Faculty members who



CBT Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Approved May 5, 2010)

are Department Chairs and members of the college committee must write the Chair's letter and recuse themselves from the discussion and vote on that faculty member candidate at the college level.

- C. The recommended process for the distribution of copies of tenure and promotion letters by those writing to the record is as follows:

Original Letter from:	Addressed to:	Copied to:
Department Committee	Chair	Faculty Member
Department Chair	Dean	Faculty Member; Department Committee Chair
College Committee	Dean	Faculty Member; Department Committee Chair; Department Chair
Dean	SVCASA	Faculty Member; Department Committee Chair; Department Chair; College Committee Chair

- D. Copies of all original letters are placed in the faculty member's personal file. If the faculty member withdraws, letters which are not sent forward will not be copied or placed in the personal file.

VI. The Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

This document provides the general framework for making promotion and tenure decisions in the College of Business and Technology. Teaching, scholarship, and service are the general areas to be used by reviewers in determining faculty performance. Each department, with the approval of its faculty, will elaborate on the specific criteria for granting of promotion and tenure, and the departmental criteria will become part of this document. Departmental standards will be no less stringent than those contained in this document and UNK Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure of the University of Nebraska-Kearney approved in October 2008.

The decision to award promotion is very important for the institution as well as to individual faculty members, and must be based on evidence of strong performance in teaching, scholarship, and service, and should not be determined solely on length of service to the institution.

The decision to award tenure is a critical one for the department and the college as well as for individual faculty members, and therefore must be based on evidence of strong performance in teaching, scholarship, and service, and should not be determined solely on length of service to the institution.



CBT Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Approved May 5, 2010)

Post-tenure performance reviews will be similar to reviewing of faculty performance to grant tenure and therefore must be based on evidence of strong performance in teaching, scholarship, and service, and should not be determined solely on length of service to the institution.

Each department in the College shall formulate specific quality standards, aligned with their accrediting agencies, for promotion and tenure. Departmental standards will be no less stringent than those contained in the College Guidelines for promotion and tenure.

Consistent with the UNK mission, performance in **teaching** is paramount. Therefore, all teaching faculty applying for promotion or tenure must provide, as a minimum, evidence of excellence in teaching. Teaching excellence will be judged by evidence of content expertise, instructional effectiveness and creativity, and course management. This evidence will include student evaluations and may include, but is not limited to, other means such as teaching portfolios and peer observation. Faculty whose primary assignment is not teaching will be reviewed in a manner consistent with their assignment.

Scholarship, which includes the advancement, integration, application, and representation of knowledge, is inherent in effective teaching. Expectations of scholarship for promotion and tenure shall follow the requirements outlined in CBT's Scholarly Productivity Guidelines for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty. Research leading to the advancement of knowledge resulting in publication in peer-reviewed publications is an expectation of faculty. As referenced in section I.C.2., juried creative activity (or other departmentally-approved activities) is recognized as the equivalent of peer-reviewed publication. Such publications (and departmentally-approved equivalents) may be associated with teaching and/or service. (Refer to both Introduction and Appendix A of UNK Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure.) Additional evidence of scholarship may include (but is not limited to) presentations at scholarly meetings, external research funding received, grant proposals submitted, intellectual properties developed, and awards and other recognitions.

Service to the University at all levels, community, and profession involves the use of a faculty member's professional expertise and leadership ability to serve various constituencies. Evidence of service may include (but is not limited to) membership on and leadership of department, college, campus, and University committees and task forces; sponsorship of student organizations; participation in or direction of professional conferences, workshops, and clinics; use of professional expertise in the service of community or governmental entities; institutional grant writing; editing or refereeing for professional or scholarly publications; and officership or other service in professional or scholarly societies.

A. Promotion

1. For promotion or appointment to **Assistant Professor**, the faculty member should have at least 30 hours beyond the master's in an active terminal degree program (or an appropriate equivalent) in his or her field. The faculty member must show promise of making a contribution to the department and the University. In addition, promotion to Assistant Professor normally requires three years of full-time college



CBT Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Approved May 5, 2010)

level teaching or its equivalent. The year of the promotion review process counts in meeting this requirement.

2. Promotion or appointment to **Associate Professor** normally requires the terminal degree (or its appropriate equivalent) and the faculty member must present clear evidence of significant sustained contributions in teaching, scholarship, and professional service beyond the level of accomplishment for promotion to Assistant Professor. In addition, promotion to Associate Professor requires five years of experience in the rank of Assistant Professor and three years in the rank of Assistant Professor at UNK. Any exception to this requirement must be agreed upon and incorporated into the faculty member's initial letter of appointment. The year of the promotion review process counts in meeting these requirements. Promotion to Associate Professor shall be based upon history of consistent demonstrated performance that meets or exceeds CBT expectations in teaching, scholarship, and service.
3. For promotion or appointment to **Professor**, there should be clear evidence of sustained and recognized contributions in teaching, scholarship, and professional service significantly beyond the level of accomplishment expected for promotion to Associate Professor. In addition, promotion to Professor normally requires ten years of full-time experience in college-level teaching or its equivalent and five years in the rank of Associate Professor at UNK. The year of the promotion review process counts in meeting these requirements. Promotion to Professor shall be based upon consistently high quality performance, subsequent to promotion to Associate Professor, which meets or exceeds CBT expectations in teaching, scholarship, and service.

B. Tenure

1. Because of its impact on the future of the institution, tenure is the most significant recognition the University can give a faculty member. Therefore, promise of future performance must be supported by clear evidence of sustained contribution, consistent with the teaching, scholarship and service criteria above, over the period of time at UNK. All candidates for tenure must hold the terminal degree or its appropriate equivalent.
2. Individuals and committees who make recommendations on the granting of tenure should specifically address their expectation that the candidate's future performance will contribute to the effectiveness of the department and the college. The collegial model of shared authority requires responsible participation in the pursuit of department, college, and university objectives.
3. The granting of tenure shall be based upon history of consistent demonstrated performance that meets or exceeds CBT expectations in teaching, scholarship, and service.
4. The granting of tenure must conform to Regent Bylaw 4.10 and Regent Policy 4.3.1. To gain tenure, the candidate without credit for prior experience will normally be considered in the sixth year at UNK. The truly exceptional candidate may be



CBT Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Approved May 5, 2010)

considered for and awarded tenure at an earlier time. The date that will be considered as the candidate's sixth year in the tenure process, as per *Regent Bylaw 4.10*, must be specified in the initial letter of appointment. In accordance with Executive Memorandum No. 18 of the President of the University of Nebraska, the period of service before consideration for tenure may be extended in some cases due to maternity, disability, or family and medical leave.

VII. Promotion of Lecturers (Special Appointments - non-tenure track) to Senior Lecturer

A. The process for the promotion recommendation is as follows:

1. The **Faculty Member** submits his or her portfolio to the Department Chair or equivalent supervisor by November 1. The portfolio should address elements detailed in Section IX, The Portfolio, as appropriate.
2. The **Department Chair** will implement the departmental procedures for review, which have been approved by the department, the college, the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs (SVCASA), and Chancellor.

In the absence of approved departmental procedures specifying a different committee configuration, the Chair will convene a committee composed of two colleagues (tenure-track, tenured, or senior lecturer) named by the faculty member and three (same pool) named by the chair, all to be from the department, if possible. Both the faculty member and the chair may name committee members outside the department if there are not five who are available to serve within the department.

The committee will make recommendations in writing, generally addressing strengths and/or weaknesses of the application. The vote count should be a part of the letter. If a department's committee includes appropriately ranked faculty from outside the department or the institution, the committee composition should be addressed in the committee's letter. In the case of joint appointments, the committee composition should be addressed in the committee's letter, and provisions for such committee appointments must be included in written departmental procedures and guidelines, or in written agreements with jointly-appointed faculty. The committee's letter becomes part of the portfolio.

On receipt of the portfolio, the Chair will write a separate letter that also becomes part of the portfolio. Letters from the committee and Chair must be copied to the faculty member by December 20. The faculty member may attach a response, may ask for



CBT Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Approved May 5, 2010)

reconsideration of the original portfolio in light of that response, or may withdraw from consideration before the application is put forward to the Dean by January 15. For Library faculty, there will be only one committee, which will follow the processes of the departmental committee.

3. In the undergraduate colleges, the **Dean** requests the appropriate college faculty committee to review the materials and make a recommendation. The college committee will make recommendations in writing, generally addressing strengths and/or weaknesses of the application. The vote count must be a part of the committee's letter. The committee's letter becomes part of the portfolio.

On receipt of the portfolio, the Dean will write a separate letter that also becomes part of the portfolio. Letters from the Dean and the committee must be copied to the faculty member by February 15. The faculty member may attach a response, may ask for reconsideration of the original portfolio in light of that response, or may withdraw from consideration before the application is put forward to the SVCASA and Chancellor by February 22. For Library faculty, the Dean follows the deadlines for the colleges.

4. Faculty members who sit on both departmental and college committees may participate in discussion and may vote on either committee, but not both. For example, faculty who voted on a candidate at the department level must excuse themselves from deliberations on that candidate at the college level. Faculty members who are Department Chairs and members of the college committee must write the Chair's letter and excuse themselves from discussion and vote on that faculty member candidate at the college level.

B. Criteria for appointment or promotion to Senior Lecturer

1. Consistent with the UNK mission, performance in teaching is paramount. Normally, promotion to Senior Lecturer recognizes a sustained record of excellent performance to the University in the capacity of Lecturer. Faculty initially appointed as Senior Lecturer must bring to the University a record of accomplishment which meets or exceeds the promotion criteria.
2. Senior Lecturers have at least five years of teaching or other relevant academic or professional experience.
3. Senior Lecturers demonstrate excellence in teaching and other closely related academic and professional activities as assigned by their department.
4. As an alternative to the above criteria, the title of Senior Lecturer may also recognize advanced academic preparation, including the doctorate or other terminal degree. Teaching excellence is paramount in all cases.



VIII. Post-Tenure Review

Post tenure review processes will follow the guidelines established in the UNK Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Section VIII).

IX. The Portfolio

The portfolio shall consist of items outlined in the UNK Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (2008).

Additionally, faculty members applying for promotion and/or tenure and/or post-tenure shall append the following documents to their portfolio, in original/copy:

- a. Appointment letter
- b. Creative works that cannot be digitized
- c. Letter from the Department Committee
- d. Letter from the College Committee

X. Grievance and Appeal Process

Throughout the evaluation, promotion, and tenure process, faculty have the opportunity to provide written responses to the input of persons and groups. In addition, formal grievance procedures are available to faculty in accordance to UNK Guidelines: Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Section X).