

Procedures for Faculty Evaluation
Department of Chemistry, University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Adopted 10/09/2013 by the Faculty of the Department of Chemistry
(earlier versions adopted within departmental Bylaws 1979; amended 2004)

Table of Contents:

<u>OVERVIEW:</u>	<u>3</u>
Relationship to College and University policies	
Modification or Suspension of Procedures	
<u>ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE (“MERIT” EVALUATION)</u>	<u>3</u>
Overview	
Apportionment of Duties	
Changes in Apportionment	
Mechanism of Annual Evaluation	
Relationship of Annual Evaluations and Recommended Changes in Salary	
<u>EVALUATIONS RELATED TO REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, and/or TENURE</u>	<u>5</u>
Overview	
Appointment of Review Subcommittee for Tenured and Tenure track Faculty	
Appointment of Review Subcommittees for non-tenure track faculty	
Role of Review Subcommittee in Preparing the Report for Review Committee	
Classes of Evaluations	
Reappointment of an untenured faculty member for reappointment	
Evaluation of continuous appointment (tenure)	
Evaluation of tenured faculty member for promotion	
Reappointment of non-tenure track faculty to a specific term	
Evaluation of non-tenure track faculty for promotion	
Timetable for Review Process	
Materials to be used for reviews	
Evaluations of tenure track faculty not involving promotion and/or tenure	
Evaluations of non-tenure track faculty for reappointment	
Evaluations related to continuous appointment (tenure) and/or promotion	
Outside Evaluations	
Review File: Insertion of Material and Right of Access	
Evaluations related to promotion and/or tenure	
Review and Recommendation by the Faculty Review Committee	
Overview of procedures	
Request for additional materials	
Evaluations for reappointment to a specific term	
Evaluations for promotion and/or tenure	
Review and Recommendation by Chair	

Request for Reconsideration

POLICIES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW

10

APPENDICES:

- I. Examples of Materials to be Submitted in Preparation for Promotion and/or Tenure
- II. Overview of Materials to be Submitted as Part of Evaluations for Promotion of Non-tenure Track Faculty
- III. Timeline for Departmental Review of Promotion and/or Tenure Files
- IV. Templates for Correspondence with External Reviewers

OVERVIEW:

This document describes two classes of evaluations: (1) Performance evaluations (often termed “merit” evaluations) shall be conducted annually for all faculty members. (2) Evaluations for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure shall be conducted at defined intervals, described below, for faculty members who are untenured, tenured but not fully promoted, or who are on term appointments.

Relationship to College and University Guidelines

This document describes Departmental policies and procedures for faculty evaluation, including evaluation for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The Department of Chemistry is subject to the By-Laws and published policies of both the Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.¹ As of October 2013, the departmental procedures described were consistent with policies and procedures for faculty evaluation issued by the office of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (hereafter, “SVCAA”) and the College of Arts and Sciences (hereafter, “CAS”) at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL).^{2,3} In the event of changes in policy from one or both of these two offices, those portions of this document in conflict with the new policies will be suspended until the departmental policies can be revised.

Modification or Suspension:

These policies may be amended or suspended with approval of two-thirds of the tenured or tenure-line faculty members with appointments of at least 0.51 FTE in Chemistry so long as such suspension does not result in conflict with the guidelines for faculty evaluation promulgated by the College of Arts and Sciences or Academic Affairs as described later in this document.

ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE (“MERIT” EVALUATION)

Overview:

The annual evaluation provides an opportunity to judge a faculty member's performance during the past year and to develop goals for future achievement. The annual evaluation also forms the basis for merit salary raises and other rewards. Cumulatively, the annual evaluations establish a continuous written record of expectations and performance that encourage professional growth, optimize the match of faculty expertise with the institutional mission, and provide support for promotion, tenure and other recognition.⁴

Apportionment of Duties:

The progress and achievements of each faculty member will be reviewed within the context of an assigned apportionment of duties, which is intended to broadly match the faculty member's expected contributions among research, teaching, service, administration, and/or extension.

¹ a) <http://nebraska.edu/board/bylaws-policies-and-rules.html>

b) <http://www.unl.edu/ucomm/chancellor/bylaws/>

² <http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/resources/promotion>

³ <http://cas.unl.edu/adminresources/index.html>

⁴ Adapted from: “Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty: Annual Evaluations, Promotion, and Tenure”(UNL Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, 1989; Approved by the Academic Senate on December 4, 2001).

Changes in apportionment: An initial apportionment of duties is negotiated as part of a letter of offer and/or appointment. This apportionment may be adjusted over the course of a career to reflect changes in the direction or extent of faculty effort, or to accommodate fellowships or leaves. The Department Chair is responsible for setting faculty apportionments with input from the Executive Committee, which will review assigned apportionments on at least an annual basis. The Chair will provide written notice of any change in apportionment to the affected faculty member, who will have the opportunity to respond and/or appeal.

Evaluation for faculty members with either full or partial year absence:

There are numerous scenarios whereby a faculty member might want or need leave from his/her assigned appointment. These include, but are not limited to, faculty development leave, family or personal leave, and administrative leave both within and external to the University. For an evaluation period that includes a leave of one semester or less in time, evaluation of research, teaching, service, outreach and/or administration will be based upon a proration of efforts for the other semester. For a year-long leave, evaluation of research, teaching, service, outreach and/or administration will depend upon the nature of the leave, and should be negotiated with the Chair in advance, if possible.

Mechanism of Annual Evaluation:

The Chair, with input from the Executive Committee, will evaluate the performance of each faculty member within each area (research, teaching, service, administration, and/or outreach) of non-zero apportionment. The evaluation process may be based upon multiple data, but shall include the opportunity for the faculty member to submit an annual update describing effort and achievement within the evaluated period. To facilitate this, each faculty member will be provided by the Chair's office with an Annual Review of Activity form (Appendix A). This document will contain a summary of activity that includes but is not limited to the department's records regarding the faculty member's apportionment of duties; departmental committee assignments; teaching activities, including student evaluation scores and the student comments for each course students supervised and supervisory committee memberships; and publications and grant activities for the reporting period. The Chair, with the input from the Executive Committee, may update the form in Appendix A to reflect more accurately the information required for evaluation of faculty performance. The Annual Review of Activity summary form will be provided by the Chair's office to each faculty member undergoing evaluation at least two weeks prior to the due date to allow for corrections and/or additions to be made prior to review. In addition to the Annual Review of Activity form, each faculty member will submit a current curriculum vitae and syllabi for all courses taught within the review period.

The evaluation of the faculty member's progress will be documented in writing and may include a numerical score or ranking but shall describe performance within each evaluated category using an adjective or a combination of adjectives from among the following: inadequate; adequate; good; superior; outstanding. The faculty member will be given a copy of the evaluation and will have an opportunity to respond.⁵

Relationship between Annual Evaluation and Changes in Recommended Salary:

The results of the annual evaluations, either directly or as part of a multi-year rolling average, will form a major consideration in recommendations for salary changes. In addition, annual evaluations may be used in reappointment decisions, and must be included in documentation for tenure and promotion reviews (see below). In the event of post-tenure

⁵ See "Guidelines for Annual Evaluations, Promotion, and Tenure " at <http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/faculty/policies/>

review, the three previous annual evaluation letters must be included in the review documentation.⁶

EVALUATIONS RELATED TO REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND/OR TENURE

Procedures for evaluations related to reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure are summarized here. The overall process will be based upon policies and guidelines from the CAS and the office of the SVCAA.^{6,7}

Appointment of Review Subcommittee for Tenured and Tenure track Faculty

A faculty Review Subcommittee, hereafter termed "Subcommittee", of at least three tenured faculty members shall be established for every tenure track faculty member, hereafter "candidate", not yet tenured or fully promoted. The Department Chair, with the approval of the Executive Committee, shall select the members of the Subcommittee from faculty members who are fully promoted or at least one rank above that of the candidate. One or more members of the Subcommittee, but not the Subcommittee chair, may come from other departments.

The formal role of the Subcommittee is gathering information to advise the Faculty Review Committee on the progress of the candidate toward promotion and/or tenure, and to set the timelines for review. As part of this process, the candidate and the department are each responsible for the timely assembly and submission of specific materials, as described in more detail later in this document.⁸ The Subcommittee may be consulted as to the format/choice of submitted materials, and may request additional information beyond that required by published procedures. The Subcommittee should meet periodically with the candidate to discuss the candidate's progress toward promotion and/or tenure.

Appointment of Review Subcommittee for non-tenure track faculty: The Review Subcommittee for Assistant or Associate Professors of Practice, or Research Associate Professors may include tenured, tenure track and non-tenure track faculty, but must be chaired by a tenured faculty member. Any non-tenure track members must hold rank greater or equal to that held by the candidate. The charge to these Review Subcommittees is similar to that described in the previous paragraph except that the emphasis is on promotion and not tenure.

Role of Subcommittee in Preparing the Report for Review Committee:

In preparation for each reappointment evaluation, the Subcommittee shall prepare a fact-finding summary of the candidate's file. The Subcommittee's report, which shall take the form of a draft letter to the Chair on behalf of the Faculty Review Committee, will consist of a summary of the candidate's performance in *research, teaching, service*, and, if appropriate, *outreach, administration, and extension*. The draft letter will be placed in the file and will be made available to the candidate, who has the right to make a written response to the Subcommittee within five working days.^{9b} The draft letter, together with the response from the candidate, will inform the discussion of the full Faculty Review Committee.

Classes of Evaluations

⁶ http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/policies/posttenure_review.shtml

⁷ <http://cas.unl.edu/adminresources/promotiontenure/guidelines.html>

⁸ See Appendix II http://ascweb.unl.edu/adminresources/reappoint_schedule.html

Evaluations of an untenured faculty member for reappointment to a specific term are typically required annually beginning in the second year of appointment,⁸ and shall be conducted in accordance with college and university guidelines.^{6,9}

Evaluation for continuous appointment (tenure) shall occur at the time stated in the accepted letter of offer; earlier consideration may occur only upon written request by the candidate.

Evaluation of a tenured faculty member for promotion shall be initiated at the request of that faculty member. To assist the candidate, the assigned Review Subcommittee will periodically discuss progress toward promotion with the tenured, not-fully-promoted member of the faculty.^{9a}

Reappointment of non-tenure track faculty to a specific term shall normally be considered in the final year of the previous appointment or by negotiation between the Chair and the faculty member.

Evaluation of non-tenure track faculty for promotion shall be initiated at the request of the candidate. The Department Chair and/or Subcommittee chair shall regularly discuss the promotion process with tenured, not-fully-promoted members of the faculty.

Timetable for Review Process

The Subcommittee, in consultation with the candidate and with the department Chair, shall establish a timeline for review compliant with College and University Deadlines.¹⁰ The Subcommittee will work with the candidate and department Chair's office to collect data relevant to evaluation; the nature of the data required will vary depending upon the class of evaluation (see following section). The candidate and the department each have responsibility for the timely assembly and submission of selected materials for the review; details on required materials are included in the following section.

Materials to be used for reviews:

For evaluations of tenure track faculty for reappointment not involving promotion and/or tenure, the file must include an updated vita and a copy of each letter of reappointment. It should include all pertinent information about teaching, research/creative activity, service, and, if relevant, outreach and/or administration. Publications should be listed in chronological order, giving specific bibliographic information (including all authors, publication titles, and volume numbers/page numbers for articles), as well as the identity of the corresponding author, the impact factor of the journal, information as whether the publication or creative activity was refereed, and the role of the faculty member in the research leading to that publication, including an explanation of their contribution while at UNL. Guidelines from the College of Arts and

⁹ <http://ascweb.unl.edu/adminresources/promotiontenure/guidelines.html>

^{9a} General guidelines for promotion and the promotion timeline can be obtained from the SVCAA and CAS websites.

^{9b} UNL guidelines state that a candidate has five working days to respond to changes or additions to their file. We interpret this to mean that the candidate can take up to five days but may choose to finish sooner.

¹⁰ The candidate and Subcommittee should take particular note that the departmental review process will have to substantially precede the published deadlines from CAS (see, for example, Appendix III and http://cas.unl.edu/adminresources/reappoint_schedule.html)

Sciences should be consulted for full details.⁹ While annual evaluations for reappointment will pay close attention to achievements during the previous year, the overall evaluation shall provide input regarding overall progress towards promotion and/or tenure.

The reappointment evaluation in the fourth year must include the same materials and be in the same format as for a tenure file, with the exception that outside letters are not required. The reader is directed to Appendix I and the Arts and Sciences Web site for additional details.⁹ To assess research and creative activity, the department faculty should place considerations of quality foremost.¹¹

Evaluations of non-tenure track faculty for reappointment will follow the same procedures in the previous section but should focus on achievements in the most recent appointment term. For details, see <http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/resources/promotion/>.

Evaluations related to continuous appointment (tenure) and/or promotion

Appendix I contains an overview of the materials required for evaluation of promotion and/or tenure as of October 2013; the candidate and the Subcommittee should review current guidelines from the College of Arts and Sciences and Academic Affairs each year.¹⁰ The candidate is not constrained by these lists for submission of materials for departmental review. In addition, evaluations related to promotion and/or tenure requires external evaluations as described in the following section.

Outside evaluations: Reviews for tenure or for promotion of tenure-line faculty normally require letters from outside referees. Responsibility and authority for solicitation of external letters rests exclusively with the chair of the Subcommittee. The candidate and Subcommittee shall each independently suggest at least ten potential reviewers, along with their home institution/contact information^{11a} and a brief description of each reviewer's research interests as related to the candidate's work. The Subcommittee shall provide to the candidate the names of potential referees in order to provide the candidate with an opportunity to state objections and identify any potential conflicts of interest; however, the candidate shall not have veto power.

External reviewers should be fully promoted except in exceptional cases (for example, industrial or government scientists who have national or international standing in the research field of the candidate; these will require special justification in the file). Regardless, reviewers must occupy a rank equivalent to or greater than that under consideration for the candidate. As the purpose of external reviews is to provide an objective evaluation of the candidate, the list of reviewers should normally exclude those with any special relationship to the candidate, including former advisors, current or former collaborators, current or former colleagues, close relatives, or personal friends. Current preference in the CAS and the Office of the SVCAA is given to institutions listed by the Carnegie Foundation as Research Universities with very high activity (Carnegie RU/VH institutions), with additional justification being required for reviewers from other types of institutions. The Dean of College of Arts and Sciences must approve the final list. The dossier submitted to the college shall describe the authors of external letters in terms of area of expertise and standing in the field, whether they were chosen by the department or the candidate, and the relationship, if any, of the reviewer to the candidate.

Prior to solicitation of external reviews, the candidate must complete and sign a clear and specific statement indicating to what extent he or she agrees to waive the right of access to the external reviews and the right to know the identity of the reviewers. A standard waiver form can be found on the Web site for Academic Affairs. The signed waiver will be kept in the confidential evaluation file. Correspondence with potential reviewers shall follow closely upon

¹¹ (April 2003 memo from AVC Jacobson).

the templates provided in Appendix IV. The letters of evaluation received from external reviewers shall be available to all faculty members participating in the review process and to the candidate if he or she has not waived the right of access.

Outside letters are not typically required for reappointment evaluations not involving promotion and/or tenure. External references are not required for promotion to Associate Professor of Practice or Research Associate Professor unless requested by the Faculty Review Committee. External references shall be required for promotion to the ranks of Full Professor of Practice or Research Professor; procedures for selecting external reviewers and obtaining external letters will be the same as outlined earlier.

Review File: Insertion of Material and Right of Access

The rights of a faculty member to access materials used for an evaluation as well as the resulting evaluation are overviewed here and described in detail on the web site for UNL Academic Affairs.¹² Except for materials to which the candidate has formally waived access, the candidate is entitled to access any and all materials in the file and to know the identity of everyone who reviews the file. Anyone with relevant information for inclusion into the file may proffer that information at any level of consideration to the chair of the Review Subcommittee, who shall determine, after consultation with the candidate, whether to include the material. The candidate must be informed of the content and source of any substantive new evidence to be added to the existing file. Such insertions shall be dated and shall include the identity of the person requesting the inclusion. The candidate has a right to review, object to, and respond in writing to any such added material with the response becoming a part of the documentation file prior to any further consideration.

The file shall be closed to further insertions by the Subcommittee or department one week before the meeting of the Faculty Review Committee. The candidate will have five working days to examine the file and insert statements in response to any added materials, after which the file will be made available to members of the Faculty Review Committee.

For evaluations related to promotion and/or tenure: The file shall be closed to further insertions by the Subcommittee or department one week before the initial meeting of the Faculty Review Committee; any materials to which the candidate has not waived access must be added by this time.¹³ The candidate will have five working days to examine the file and insert statements in response to any added materials. Immediately thereafter, the chair of the Review Subcommittee shall place in the file all material to which the candidate has waived the right to access. The file shall then be available to all members of the Faculty Review Committee.

The Department Chair will include notice of the availability of the file in the announcement of the meeting of the Faculty Review Committee, which is to be made not less than five days in advance of the meeting.

Review and Recommendation by the Faculty Review Committee ("Committee")

Overview of procedures:

The Faculty Review Committee for tenure track faculty includes all tenured faculty members of greater rank than the candidate. The Faculty Review Committee for promotion to Associate or Full Professor of Practice includes all tenured and tenure track faculty and

¹² "Guidelines for Annual Evaluations, Promotion, and Tenure", at <http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/faculty/policies>

¹³ Materials added at this time could include, for example, external reviews in original or redacted form, depending upon the nature of the waiver provided by the candidate.

Professors of Practice of rank equal or greater to that being considered. The Faculty Review Committee for promotion to Research (Full) Professor includes all tenured and tenure track faculty as well as Research (Full) Professors.

The Subcommittee shall provide, in the form of a letter from the faculty Review Committee to the Chair, a summary of the candidate's activities in terms of research, teaching, service, and, if appropriate, outreach and administration. This summary is not a formal recommendation but a presentation of information to facilitate assessment of a candidate's record, and, in particular, the quality and impact of the candidate's research, teaching, service, and, where appropriate, outreach and administration. At the faculty meeting, the chair of the Subcommittee will lead an impartial discussion of the candidate's progress before the faculty Review Committee (hereafter "Committee"), which includes all tenured faculty members at or above the rank under considerations. All eligible faculty members should participate. The Chair may participate in discussion but is not a voting member of the Review Committee.

Request for additional materials: At the meeting of the Review Committee, additional information for the review file can be requested based upon motion(s) made, seconded, and adopted. If additional information is added to the file in response to an adopted motion, the candidate will have five working days to respond to the additional information before the Faculty Review Committee can take up discussion of the newly included material.

For reappointment to a specific-term, discussion, review, and evaluation should be based predominantly upon the materials presented by the Subcommittee. Action shall be taken on the basis of motion(s) made, seconded, and adopted. Eligible voters who cannot be present at the meeting may send their vote by proxy to be counted at the meeting. Discussion during this meeting shall be strictly confidential. Two voters and the Chair shall count the votes immediately after the ballot and announce the results without delay. The eligible faculty shall, on the basis of motions made, seconded, and adopted, provide a recommendation on the question of reappointment. The eligible faculty shall, on the basis of motions made, seconded, and adopted, amend the information letter prepared by the Subcommittee to describe the candidate's progress in research, teaching, service, and, if appropriate, outreach and administration, using the following adjectives or some combination: *outstanding, superior, good, adequate, and inadequate*. The eligible faculty may, on the same basis, amend the information letter in any other manner desired. The fourth year review shall be in greater depth than for other preceding years and the faculty shall provide an evaluation of the candidate's progress towards promotion and/or tenure.

Evaluations for promotion and/or tenure must be based solely on the material in the file. (Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, April 14, 2003 memo) and will take place at two meetings separated by five working days. At the first meeting, the members of the Faculty Review Committee will receive a presentation from the Subcommittee and conduct a confidential discussion of the candidate's progress. At the second meeting, the Faculty Review Committee shall consider, as individual questions on the basis of motions made, seconded, and adopted, recommendations for continuous appointment (tenure) and for promotion. Eligible voters who cannot be present at the meeting may send their vote by proxy. Two voters and the Chair shall count the votes immediately after the ballot and the results announced to the Review Committee without delay. The eligible faculty will, on the basis of motions made and seconded, approve an edited version of the Subcommittee letter as the formal recommendation of the faculty Review Committee. The Chair will inform the candidate of the result of the faculty vote as soon as possible after the meeting and within two working days.

Review and Recommendation by the Chair

After the candidate has been informed of the Review Committee's recommendation, the Chair shall prepare an independent recommendation. This recommendation shall include a summary of the substantive discussions and recommendations of the Faculty Review Committee. For reviews not involving a question of tenure, the Chair will provide an evaluation of progress towards tenure. This recommendation, which will be prepared as a draft letter to the Dean, shall be sent to the candidate and the chair of the Review Subcommittee. The Chair will discuss the recommendation with the candidate.

If the candidate does not request a reconsideration within five working days of receiving the Chair's recommendation, the Chair shall forward the recommendation to the Dean, along with other required review materials (see Appendix I), any response by the candidate to the review, and any other forms required by the Dean. Copies of the Chair's letter shall be sent to the candidate and the chair of the Review Subcommittee.

Request for Reconsideration

(Adapted from: "Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty: Annual Evaluations, Promotion, and Tenure"⁷ and <http://cas.unl.edu/adminresources.shtml>⁶)

For any recommendation from the Review Committee, or the Chair, the candidate shall have the right to request the reasons for the recommendation in writing. The candidate may then request reconsideration by the person or group that made the recommendation and may produce evidence to support the request. If the recommendation was negative, the candidate must be informed of the right to request reconsideration of the decision. No negative recommendation shall be forwarded until the reconsideration is complete. If the candidate requests a statement of reasons or requests reconsideration of the decision, such request shall be granted as expeditiously as possible. The candidate shall have five working days from the time they receive notice and a statement of the reasons for the negative recommendation to seek a reconsideration of the recommendation and to submit a rebuttal argument to the committee or official who made the negative recommendation. A candidate's request for reconsideration must specify whether it is for tenure and/or promotion. The reconsideration process must be completed so as to comply with submission deadlines to the next level of consideration (see Appendix III). The committee or official must reconsider the candidate's file and, after deciding whether to change the initial recommendation, inform the candidate in writing of the decision. The candidate's request for reconsideration, the rebuttal argument, and the second recommendation become part of the candidate's file.

POLICIES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW

(Abridged from <http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/faculty/policies>)

Post-tenure review is triggered by the determination of substantial and continuing deficiency in the performance of a faculty member beyond the third year of continuous appointment (tenure).¹⁴ Substantial and continuing deficiency is defined in this context as two successive annual evaluations of "inadequate".¹⁵ The following is presented as a brief description and overview; the process is described in detail on the web site for the SVCAA: <http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/faculty/policies>.

¹⁴ Review may also be requested by a faculty member seeking constructive evaluation and assistance. See <http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/faculty/policies>.

¹⁵ Upon recommendation of the Chair and approval of the Dean, a faculty member may be exempted or deferred from post-tenure review if there are clearly extenuating circumstances (for example, health problems) and if an alternate plan for addressing the problems is adopted.

Following the determination of the need for post-tenure review, the Chair will consult with the faculty member and then establish a schedule for the review. The Chair will appoint a Review Committee (herein in this section also referred to as the "Committee") comprised of three or more tenured faculty holding academic rank equal or greater than the faculty member to be reviewed. The Chair and the faculty member shall meet and attempt to agree on the composition of this committee.

The Chair will prepare a special peer review file.¹⁶ Where research productivity is an issue, evaluation by peers external to the university shall be included.¹⁷ The faculty member will be able to add materials to the file and will have general access to the file. The exception is for external reviews and the identity of external reviewers, where access will be governed by the same policies as for external evaluations related to promotion and tenure (*vida infra*). The Review Committee, after reviewing the file, may meet with the unit administrator and the faculty member, either together or separately. The Committee may consult other sources of information not included in the file with the approval of the unit administrator and the faculty member.

The Review Committee role is advisory. The Review Committee will make a written report of its findings to the Chair, the faculty member, and the Dean of Arts and Sciences.¹⁸ The report should evaluate the performance of the reviewed faculty member, with specific emphasis on whether the faculty member has one or more substantial and chronic deficiencies. If the Committee finds no evidence of such deficiencies, the faculty member and the Chair will be notified and the review considered completed. The Committee should also indicate if it believes inappropriate criteria have been used to evaluate the faculty member. If the Committee finds deficiencies as described above, these shall be described in the report, which should also evaluate any plan submitted by the Chair or the faculty member to remedy the deficiencies. The report should also provide recommendations to maximize the faculty member's contributions to the unit and the University, and may also recommend sanctions for performance characterized by substantial and chronic deficiency. The Committee will provide a copy of the report to the faculty member and the unit administrator.

The faculty member under review will have the opportunity to provide a written response to the report from the Review Committee. Except when the review was conducted at the faculty member's request, the Report and any response from the faculty member shall become a part of the faculty member's permanent personnel record. If the report finds evidence of substantial and chronic deficiency, the Chair shall meet with the faculty member to consider the report and any recommendations therein. The Chair shall then provide the faculty member and the dean with a written appraisal of the faculty member's performance, together with all documentation pertaining to the faculty member's review, including the file constructed for the review, the Review Committee's Report, and the faculty member's written response to the review. The faculty member, the Chair, and the Dean shall work together to implement those recommendations on which they mutually agree. Details regarding requirements for the Chair's appraisal, along with a description of subsequent procedures beyond the level of the department, are available from the SVCAA.⁷

¹⁶ See <http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/faculty/policies>.

¹⁷ Even if not required, external evaluations may be obtained at the recommendation of the Review Committee.

¹⁸ If the request for post-tenure review comes only from the faculty member and not the Chair, then the Committee report is shared only with the faculty member.

APPENDIX I.

Example of Materials to be Submitted in Preparation for Evaluation for Promotion and/or Tenure (October 2013).

Candidates are directed to the Web sites of Academic Affairs and/or the College of Arts and Sciences for more specific guidelines.¹⁹

Administrative Section (to be prepared by department)

- Copy of any current departmental promotion and tenure guidelines
- Transmittal form for Tenured or Tenure/Track Faculty
- Letters of appointment or position descriptions, reappointment and record of any changes including in apportionment
- Annual evaluations and/or reappointment letters by Department Chair/Head
- Promotion and tenure evaluations (as applicable) in this order: 1) Letter from Department Review Committee; 2) Letter from College or Institute Committee; 3) Letter from Chair; 4) Letter from Dean(s)
- Peer evaluations of teaching
- External reviews, to be preceded by Sample letter soliciting evaluation
- Candidate's waiver form
- Brief statement of how external reviewers were chosen, their qualifications, and their relationship to candidate
- Teaching information; List of courses taught with summary of quantitative data from student teaching evaluations, if available; or summary of extension education

Candidate Section (to be prepared by candidate)

- Curriculum Vitae (clearly note refereed or juried work; extent of contributions, such as publications and proposals or grants, if collaborative work)^{22a}
- Candidate Statement identifying that portion of the candidate's work that in the candidate's judgment represents his or her most significant work, explains why he or she thinks this work is significant, and points out what its impact has been or will be. This statement should reference supporting materials in the Appendices. Candidate must also include as appropriate to his/her assignment (1-5 pages)
- Teaching philosophy, goals, and summary of evidence that documents teaching achievements and local and broader impact (1-5 pages)
- Research/Creative Activity philosophy, goals, achievements, significance and impact (1-5 pages)
- Outreach/Service philosophy, goals, achievements, significance, impact at the department, college, university, professional and community levels (1-5 pages)
- Extension Education philosophy (if applicable), goals, achievements, significance and impact (1-5 pages)

Appendices (to be prepared by candidate) Candidates should only include significant and relevant information referred to in the Candidate Section or required by Arts and Sciences.

¹⁹<http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/faculty/policies;>

<http://cas.unl.edu/adminresources/promotiontenure/guidelines.html>

^{22a}The CAS required percent contributions in Fall 2012 for files submitted for tenure and promotion.

Supporting evidence for the quality and effectiveness of teaching include:

Student evaluations; Course portfolio; Number of undergraduate advisees; Curriculum/course development; Student achievement/outcomes; Number of graduate students mentored and degrees awarded; international activities, and activities related to Scholarship of Teaching and Learning)

Supporting evidence of the quality of scholarly, professional, and creative activity include:

Publications (including electronic); Citation data; Presentations; Awards and honors; Funded or non-funded grant proposals and associated reviews may also be included at the candidate's discretion.

Supporting evidence of the quality and significance of professional and institutional service and outreach activities include: Editorships; Committee service (Department, College, University); Leadership in professional organizations; Community service related to assignment

Appendix II. Overview of Materials to be Submitted as Part of Evaluation for Promotion of Non-tenure Track Faculty

Documentation Format for Promotion for Research Faculty

<http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/resources/policies/>

The material contained in this file will be similar in content to the items that are listed under Appendix I. This material will include both Administrative sections and Candidate sections, as itemized under Appendix I, but may not include a teaching section if this latter section does not apply to the nature of the Candidate's appointment.

Supporting evidence of the quality of scholarly, professional, and creative activity include:

Publications (including electronic); Performances/exhibitions; Reviews; Citations; Funded grant proposals, with the relative contribution of the Candidate to items such as publications and funded proposals being clearly indicated. (see Appendix I for further details)

Supporting evidence of the quality and significance of professional and institutional service and outreach activities include:

Editorships; Committee service (Department, College, University); Leadership in professional organizations; Community service related to assignment

http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/documents/research_transmittal.pdf

<http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/faculty/policies>

Documentation Format for Promotion for Associate Professor or Professor of Practice Faculty

Supporting evidence for the quality and effectiveness of teaching include:

Student evaluations; Course portfolio; Number of undergraduate advisees; Curriculum/course development; Student achievement/outcomes; international activities, and activities related to Scholarship of Teaching and Learning)

Supporting evidence of the quality of scholarly, professional, and creative activity include:

Publications (including electronic); Performances/exhibitions; Reviews; Citations; Funded grant proposals.

Supporting evidence of the quality and significance of professional and institutional service and outreach activities include:

Editorships; Committee service (Department, College, University); Leadership in professional organizations; Community service related to assignment

In the case of promotion to Professor of Practice, external letters are required. The promotion to Associate Professor of Practice is based largely on an overall evaluation within the department and at UNL and does not require external letters.

Appendix III. Timeline for Departmental Review of Promotion and/or Tenure Files²⁰

Timetable from the date the [Review Subcommittee completes collection of the material from the department and the candidate for the file.²¹ The Faculty Review Committee timeline must accommodate College deadlines (see CAS and SVCAA websites cited earlier).

Day	Actions
1	Review Subcommittee completes collection of material from the department and the candidate; the candidate is informed by the Review Subcommittee that this part of the file is complete.
2-6 (WD)	Candidate reviews file materials to which access has not been waived and inserts any new material.
7-9	Subcommittee meets and drafts a report to the Review Committee summarizing the file adding it to the file with a copy to the candidate
10-14 (WD)	Candidate may add to the file comments on the report of the Subcommittee and any material added subsequent to the review.
15-17 (WD)	Completed file open to faculty for review
18	Faculty Review Committee discussion of materials in the file
19-23 (WD)	Insertion of additional material requested by Faculty Review Committee; review of this new material and response by Candidate
24	Faculty Review Committee votes on the question(s) and votes to approve the Letter from the Review Committee to the Chair. The approved letter is added to the file with a copy sent to the candidate ²²
25-29 (WD)	Candidate may add to the file comments on the Letter of the Review Committee. ^{25a}
30-32	Department Chair reviews file and adds an independent recommendation to the file with a copy sent to the candidate and the chair of the Review Subcommittee
33-37 (WD)	Candidate may add to the file comments on the Letter of the Chair ^{25a}
38	Material forwarded to the A&S Dean ^{25b}
	Additional time to be inserted into the timeline if an appeal is made of the Faculty Review Committee and/or Chair's adverse decision

²⁰ For the purposes of this timeline, "departmental" refers to the Review Subcommittee, the Review Committee, and the Department Chair.

²¹ [Day" does not imply working day (WD) unless specifically indicated].

²² At the initial review meeting, or within 24 hours after this meeting, any member of the review committee may request that additional materials be added to the file. However, once such materials have been added to the file (which may require more than 24 hours in cases requiring gathering of information), the candidate will have an additional five WD days to respond. The review timetable will be extended by a proportionate period of time

^{25a}A request by the candidate for reconsideration may also occur during this time period.

^{25b}After the file leaves the department, the file will be reviewed by the A&S Executive Committee and Dean.

Appendix IV: Templates for Correspondence with External Reviewers

1. E-mail request soliciting external review for promotion to full professor.
2. Follow-up letter soliciting external review for promotion to full professor.
3. E-mail request soliciting external review for tenure and promotion.
4. Follow-up letter request soliciting external review for tenure and promotion.

EMAIL REQUEST SOLICITING EXTERNAL REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR (to be followed by letter)

REVISED: Model Letter Soliciting External Reviews

(fill-in capitalized text and correct references to his/her and s/he)

DATE

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY, STATE, ZIP

Dear NAME:

On behalf of my colleagues, I write to ask you for a professional favor: to assess the work of {NAME OF FACULTY}, a candidate for {PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSOR AND/OR TENURE}. {NAME OF FACULTY} holds a joint appointment in the {FIRST UNIT} (%FTE) and the {SECOND UNIT} (%FTE) with their tenure home residing in the {APPROPRIATE UNIT}.

Enclosed you will find a copy of {NAME OF FACULTY} current vitae and a statement that s/he wrote identifying his/her most significant work and indicating why s/he thinks it is significant and what its impact is or will be. I have also enclosed a copy of the waiver form signed by {NAME OF FACULTY} indicating whether s/he has waived his/her rights to read the external reviews in his/her file, to write comments on them to be included in the file, and to know the identity of those who submit reviews. {NAME OF FACULTY} signature indicates that s/he {DESCRIBE THE WAIVERS, IF ANY, THAT THE CANDIDATE HAS SIGNED}. {IF THE CANDIDATE HAS WAIVED ANY OR ALL OF THE RIGHTS INCLUDE THIS STATEMENT} We will keep the described material and/or information confidential to the extent permitted by law if {NAME OF FACULTY} has signed the relevant waiver.

We seek an objective assessment of the quality and significance of {NAME OF FACULTY} work, especially the work s/he discusses in his/her statement. In your professional judgment, what is the nature and extent of {NAME OF FACULTY} contributions? Based on your assessment, how do you rate his/her potential for sustaining and exceeding what s/he has done thus far? Your letter will become part of {NAME OF FACULTY} file as a candidate for {PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE}. This file is evaluated by the appropriate faculty in our department, the College Executive Committee and Dean, the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor.

If you agree to review {NAME OF FACULTY} work, I will send you additional material (e.g., copies of his/her published research and grant proposals) related to the work s/he discusses in his/her statement. At that time, feel free to let me know if you want anything else.

Please begin your review by identifying your current rank and institutional affiliation and the relationship, if any, that you have with {NAME OF FACULTY} (e.g., dissertation advisor, current or past collaborator, or former colleague). Again, your name will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law if {NAME OF FACULTY} has signed the relevant waiver.

We hope that you will agree to help us. I know that writing reviews is time-consuming and I thank you for your help. If at all possible, we would like to know whether you will help us assess {NAME OF FACULTY} work by {AN APPROPRIATE DATE GIVEN THE UNL AND COLLEGE PROMOTION AND TENURE SCHEDULE}. We must submit our recommendations on {NAME OF FACULTY} candidacy to the College by {DATE}. You may send the review to me by letter to the above address, by FAX to {FAX NUMBER}, or by e-mail to me at {E-MAIL ADDRESS}.

Again, thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

{NAME}
Professor and Chair

cc: {CHAIR OR DIRECTOR OF SECOND UNIT IF JOINT APPOINTMENT}

REVISED: Model Letter for Sending Files to External Reviews

(fill-in capitalized text and correct references to his/her and s/he)

DATE

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY, STATE, ZIP

Dear NAME:

I want to thank you for agreeing to assist us by providing an assessment of the work of {NAME OF FACULTY}, a candidate for {PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSOR AND/OR TENURE}. {NAME OF FACULTY} holds a joint appointment in the {FIRST UNIT} (%FTE) and the {SECOND UNIT} (%FTE) with their tenure home residing in the {APPROPRIATE UNIT}.

Enclosed you will find a copy of {NAME OF FACULTY} current vitae and a statement that s/he wrote identifying his/her most significant work and indicating why s/he thinks it is significant and what its impact is or will be. I have also enclosed a copy of the waiver form signed by {NAME OF FACULTY} indicating whether s/he has waived his/her rights to read the external reviews in his/her file, to write comments on them to be included in the file, and to know the identity of those who submit reviews. {NAME OF FACULTY} signature indicates that s/he {DESCRIBE THE WAIVERS, IF ANY, THAT THE CANDIDATE HAS SIGNED}. {IF THE CANDIDATE HAS WAIVED ANY OR ALL OF THE RIGHTS INCLUDE THIS STATEMENT} We will keep the described material and/or information confidential to the extent permitted by law if {NAME OF FACULTY} has signed the relevant waiver.

We seek an objective assessment of the quality and significance of {NAME OF FACULTY} work, especially the work s/he discusses in his/her statement. In your professional judgment, what is the nature and extent of {NAME OF FACULTY} contributions? Based on your assessment, how do you rate his/her potential for sustaining and exceeding what s/he has done thus far? Your letter will become part of {NAME OF FACULTY} file as a candidate for {PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE}. This file is evaluated by the appropriate faculty in our department, the College Executive Committee and Dean, the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor.

Enclosed for your review are {department to indicate materials being sent} (for example, copies of published research and grant proposals, teaching or outreach portfolio, etc.) related to the work s/he discusses in his/her statement.

Please begin your review by identifying your current rank and institutional affiliation and the relationship, if any, that you have with {NAME OF FACULTY} (e.g., dissertation advisor, current or past collaborator, or former colleague). Again, your name will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law if {NAME OF FACULTY} has signed the relevant waiver.

I know that writing reviews is time-consuming and I thank you for your help. If at all possible, we would like to receive your assessment of {NAME OF FACULTY} work by {AN APPROPRIATE DATE GIVEN THE UNL AND COLLEGE PROMOTION AND TENURE SCHEDULE}. We must

UNL Department of Chemistry
DRAFT_Procedures for Faculty Evaluation

submit our recommendations on {NAME OF FACULTY} candidacy to the College by {DATE}. You may send the review to me by letter to the above address, by FAX to {FAX NUMBER}, or by email to me at {EMAIL ADDRESS}.

Again, thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

{NAME}
Professor and Chair

cc: {CHAIR OR DIRECTOR OF SECOND UNIT IF JOINT APPOINTMENT}

EMAIL REQUEST SOLICITING EXTERNAL REVIEWS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (to be followed by letter)

Dear Professor Frank:

As you know, the use of external reviews has become expected practice in considering candidates for tenure and promotion. On behalf of my colleagues, I write to ask you for a professional favor: to assess the work of Dr. Jean Doe, a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

If you agree to review Dr. Doe's work, I will send you additional material (e.g., copies of his/her published research and grant proposals

Need to standardize grant proposal inclusion between this and the subsequent letter.

related to the work s/he discusses in his/her statement. We would need to receive your remarks by [INSERT DATE]. Your letter will become part of Dr. Doe's file as a candidate for tenure and promotion. This file is evaluated by the appropriate faculty in our department, the College Executive Committee and Dean, the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Chancellor, the President's office, and the Board of Regents. Your name will be kept confidential in accord with the candidate's signed waiver to the extent permitted by law.

We hope that you will agree to help us. I know that writing reviews is time-consuming and I thank you for your help. Please notify me at your earliest convenience whether or not you would be able to write this review [e-mail: XXXXXX@unl.edu; phone: 402-472-XXXX; fax 402-472-2044 (this is a private fax to ensure confidentiality).]

Sincerely yours,

[INSERT NAME]

[Associate] Professor of Chemistry

Chair of Review Subcommittee for [INSERT NAME]

Follow up letter:

Date

Professor B. Frank
989 Academic Hall
Fortunate University
Nirvana, New Jersey 00001

Dear Professor Frank:

As you know, the use of external reviews has become expected practice in considering candidates for tenure and promotion. On behalf of my colleagues, I write to ask you for a professional favor: to assess the work of Dr. Jean Doe, a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

Enclosed you will find a copy of (i) Dr. Doe's current vitae, (ii) a statement that s/he wrote identifying his/her most significant work and indicating why s/he thinks it is significant and what its impact is or will be, and (iii) copies of up to ten reprints, preprints or other relevant documents. I have also enclosed a copy of the waiver form signed by Dr. Doe indicating that s/he [DESCRIBE THE WAIVERS, IF ANY, THAT THE CANDIDATE HAS SIGNED]. We will keep the described material and/or information confidential to the extent permitted by law.

We seek an objective assessment of the quality and significance of Dr. Doe's work, especially the work that s/he discusses in his/her statement.

- i) In your professional judgment, what is the nature and extent of Dr. Doe's contributions?
- ii) Are his/her contributions accepted as significant, innovative and authoritative?
- iii) Has Dr. Doe become an independent, productive and original investigator?
- iv) Is Dr. Doe's success with outside funding commensurate with a significant research program?
- v) How does Dr. Doe compare with others in his/her area and at approximately the same stage of development?
- vi) Based on your assessment, how do you rate Dr. Doe's potential for sustaining and exceeding what s/he has done thus far?

Please begin your review by identifying your current rank and institutional affiliation and the relationship, if any, that you have with Dr. Doe (e.g., current or past collaborator, or former colleague, etc.).

Your letter will become part of Dr. Doe's file as a candidate for tenure and promotion. This file is evaluated by the appropriate faculty in our department, the College Executive Committee and Dean, the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Chancellor, the President's office, and the Board of Regents. Again, your name will be kept confidential in accord with the signed waiver to the extent permitted by law.

We hope that you will agree to help us. I know that writing reviews is time-consuming and I thank you for your help. We would like to receive your remarks by [INSERT DATE]. If you are unable to write this review, please notify me at your earliest convenience [e-mail: XXXXXX@unl.edu; phone: 402-472-XXXX; fax 402-472-2044 (this is a private fax to ensure

UNL Department of Chemistry
DRAFT_Procedures for Faculty Evaluation

confidentiality).] You may send your review to me by letter to the above address, or by FAX or e-mail.

Again, thank you in advance for helping us with this very important decision.

Sincerely yours,

[INSERT NAME]
[Associate] Professor of Chemistry
Chair of Review Subcommittee for [INSERT NAME]

Enclosures: Detailed CV
Description of Research Activities
Selected Supporting Documents (Maximum of 10)
Waiver of Right to See Information