

Guidelines for Submitting Academic Promotion and Tenure recommendations

2022 – 2023 Academic Year

I. Submission Deadlines

March 17, 2023 – All recommendations for the awarding of Continuous Appointments (tenure) and/or for promotion must be received in Academic Services to be sent to the Chancellor's Office by this date.

II. Review and Decision-Making Processes

On the UNMC campus, decisions regarding each individual recommendation for promotion or tenure are made at three successive levels: the Department (or equivalent unit), the College (or Eppley Institute, Munroe-Meyer Institute, or the Library of Medicine), and the Chancellor's Office. If a recommendation successfully advances through each of these levels, it is then submitted to the President and the Board of Regents for information.

The Department Chair has a responsibility to assist every new faculty appointee in selecting a major area of emphasis. All faculty members need and deserve this counsel as part of their career development. This selection would be compatible with activities required to achieve the long-term goal of promotion to full Professor. It is recognized that circumstances may make change in professional emphasis necessary. However, this must be carefully considered because frequent deviations may delay achievement of a record of professional excellence required for advancement.

Every faculty member must be evaluated annually by their department chairperson or immediate supervisor for merit review, as well as to assess progress toward promotion and/or tenure. Both parties should clearly understand the specific areas of academic endeavor in which the individual faculty member is concentrating their efforts. These annual evaluations serve as a preamble to the promotion and tenure review process.

At the department (where appropriate) and college/institute levels, it is expected that the chairpersons and deans/directors will establish a peer review mechanism to advise them. These departmental and college/institute committees serve a vital role in: (1) assuring that the individual's accomplishments are properly documented, (2) assessing the relative merit of their accomplishments, and (3) formulating a recommendation to the chairperson or dean/director regarding award of continuous appointment (tenure) and/or promotion. These peer review committees may be either elected or appointed, in accordance with the rules and regulations of each academic unit. Regardless of their method of selection, it is expected that these committees represent a cross section of the academic disciplines and fields of endeavor of the faculty in each academic unit. The chair of each college or institute peer review committee should have attained the rank of Professor. It is preferable that the college/institute committee be made up of senior, tenured faculty.

Recommendations from peer review committees should be communicated in writing to the appropriate chairperson or dean/director and should include a summary of the principal reasons advanced in supporting or opposing each individual's candidacy for promotion or tenure. These written recommendations should be forwarded along with all promotion/tenure documentation through each successive level of review.

After receiving the recommendation of the appropriate peer review committee, the chairperson or dean/director will then decide whether to advance the recommendations to the next level in the decision-making process. Once these decisions are made, they should be communicated in writing to the candidate/department, whether positive or negative. In forwarding promotion and tenure recommendations to the dean, the department chairperson must submit a comprehensive letter of evaluation for each candidate as described in Section V.B. - Documentation. In recommending candidates to the Chancellor, the dean should provide a brief summary of his/her primary reasons for supporting each recommendation in addition to detailed documentation from peer review committees, chairpersons, etc., in particular including a narrative from the college/institute Promotion and Tenure Committee in support of its actions. Also, it is expected that the Chancellor will be notified in advance of final action on negative decisions as well as any other problematic issues relating to tenure and/or promotion.

III. Conflict of Interest

To ensure objectivity during the promotion and tenure (P&T) process, any conflicts of interest that create an apparent or actual bias by evaluators must be declared and managed. All committee evaluators who have a relationship with the candidate should make that relationship known, consistent with University policies and this guideline. A conflict of interest can occur when an evaluating party might realize professional or personal gain or loss based on the outcome of the P&T outcome of a candidate. Promotion and tenure committees should establish policies/procedures to ensure that committee members with an actual or potential conflict of interest recuse themselves during candidate decisions.

If a candidate believes there is a potential or actual conflict of interest between themselves and a P&T committee member, there should be a committee procedure to allow the candidate to petition for that committee member to recuse themselves during the promotion and tenure decision of the candidate.

IV. Appeal Process

A negative decision at the department level may be appealed within the college/institute. Each college/institute must have an appropriate appeals mechanism including notification of the dean/director that an appeal is occurring. An individual wishing to appeal a department-level decision must present their arguments in writing to the dean within 15 days after receiving written notification of the department chairperson's decision, and all such appeals must be resolved prior to the submission deadline noted at the beginning of this document. Decisions by college deans not to recommend promotion or tenure will normally be considered final, with the exception that an individual who alleges that the decision was prejudiced or capricious may submit a written appeal to the Chancellor within 15 days after receiving written notification of the dean's decision.

SUMMARY OF REVIEW AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Department Peer Review Committee (where applicable)

- Ensure complete and accurate documentation of each candidate's academic accomplishments.
- Assess the merits of the candidate's accomplishments in relation to the campus, College, and departmental criteria for promotion and tenure.
- Advise the appropriate academic administrator (in detail, in writing) regarding their promotion and/or tenure recommendation.

Department Chairperson (or equivalent Academic Administrator)

- Review all documentation, including recommendations formulated at each prior level of review.
- Decide whether to advance the recommendation to the next level.
- Notify appropriate individuals (in writing) of all decisions.
- Forward positive recommendations to the next level, along with written summary of the primary reason(s) for supporting the recommendation (detailed summary by chairperson).

College/Institute/Library Peer Review Committee

- Review all documentation, including recommendations formulated at each prior level of review.
- Decide whether to advance the recommendation to the next level.
- Notify the appropriate Dean or Director (in writing) of all decisions.
- Forward sufficiently detailed positive and negative recommendations to the appropriate Dean or Director along with a written summary of the primary reason(s) for supporting or opposing the recommendation.
- Ensure appropriate confidentiality of committee recommendations until final approval of recommendations by the Chancellor

Dean or Director

- Review all documentation, including recommendations formulated at each prior level of review.
- Decide whether to advance the recommendation to the next level.
- Notify appropriate individuals (in writing) of all decisions.
- Forward positive and negative recommendations to the next level, along with written summary of the primary reason(s) for supporting or opposing the recommendation (including the detailed summary prepared by the chairperson; brief summary by dean).

Chancellor

- Review all documentation, including recommendations formulated at each prior level of review.
- Make decision on recommendation from Dean or Director.
- Report to President and Board of Regents for their information.

IV. General Criteria

The following are considered the minimum criteria for assessing promotion and/or tenure qualifications, although departments and colleges can add or expand their own specific¹ criteria for assessing both promotion and tenure recommendations. Note that the promotion and tenure decisions are related but separate processes. Most of the colleges have developed examples of “Levels” of performance for each of the areas of evaluation (teaching, scholarly activity, patient care, if applicable, and professional service) to assist them in the review process. All individuals involved in the review process should, however, become familiar with the following general information.²

A. PROMOTION

Assistant Professor. Individuals being recommended for promotion to this rank should have completed the terminal degree and/or certification(s) that are standard prerequisites for an academic appointment in their discipline. Exceptions to this requirement will be limited to those cases where documented professional accomplishments are sufficient to merit waiver of the standard. Additionally, the candidate must show promise in the areas of teaching³, scholarly activity³, patient care³ (if applicable) and professional service.³

Associate Professor. To be promoted to this rank, an individual must display a sustained record of accomplishment in two of the areas of academic endeavor (teaching, scholarly activity, patient care, if applicable, and professional service); which two areas are of prime importance may vary by discipline, department, College/Institute, as well as individual within a unit. This record of accomplishment must document an emerging reputation of regional or national scope in the candidate's academic discipline. Professional publications will be an important element in assessing regional or national recognition, although other factors will also be considered such as evidence that the candidate is a key member of a scholarly team or plays a key role in supporting the activities of multiple investigators. If the candidate's accomplishments are primarily limited to two areas of academic endeavor, they must still maintain competency in a third area.

Prior to eligibility for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, an individual will normally have served four to six years at the rank of Assistant Professor. Promotion to Associate Professor prior to four years is possible, but such a recommendation usually represents exceptional accomplishments on the part of the candidate. A small number of faculty may be expected to remain at the rank of Assistant Professor until retirement.

Professor. Promotion to this rank should be reserved for those individuals who have sustained a record of outstanding accomplishment in two of the areas of academic endeavor (teaching, scholarly activity, patient care (if applicable) and professional service) **and** have fully achieved national or international recognition for their contributions in their respective disciplines. As with promotion to Associate Professor, which two areas are of prime importance may vary by discipline, department,

¹It should be noted that the **specific** criteria, which the departments and colleges establish usually reflect more rigorous standards for both promotion and tenure than those described in the **general** UNMC guidelines and include criteria related to the professional discipline.

²For additional general information regarding terms and conditions of employment, faculty members are advised to consult the Academic Services website: <http://www.unmc.edu/academicservices>, and the *Bylaws of the Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska*.

³See Section V.D. Documentation, for more complete descriptions of these traditional academic activities used at UNMC.

College/Institute, as well as individual within a unit. Professional publications will be an important element in assessing national or international recognition although other factors will be considered such as evidence that the candidate is a key member of a scholarly team or plays a key role in supporting the activities of multiple investigators. If the candidate's academic accomplishments are primarily limited to two areas of endeavor, they must still maintain competency in a third area.

An individual being considered for promotion to Professor normally will serve in the rank of Associate Professor for five to seven years. Promotion to the rank of Professor prior to five years is possible, but such an exceptional recommendation must be supported by and must reflect truly outstanding accomplishments on the part of the candidate. A number of faculty may be expected to remain at the rank of Associate Professor until retirement. The rank of Professor is among the highest honors the University can bestow on a faculty member; it should therefore be granted only to faculty who have earned national or international reputations in their respective disciplines.

In addition to full-time faculty, individuals holding **part-time** or courtesy⁴ appointments must meet the same criteria for promotion as full-time faculty members. Colleges that grant academic appointments with qualifying titles (e.g., "clinical", "adjunct", or "research") are expected to establish appropriate criteria for promotion in these ranks. All part-time, volunteer, and courtesy appointments are by definition "Special Appointments" (see Section 4.4.1 of the *Regents Bylaws* regarding "Special Appointments").

B. TENURE

The *Board of Regents Bylaws* provide for four appointment types: Special, Specific Term, Health Professions and Continuous (tenure). At UNMC, only the Health Professions Appointment is used for faculty who anticipate achieving tenure. The Specific Term Appointment is used on the other campuses. Detailed information about each appointment type can be found in the *Board of Regents Bylaws*: Special - Section 4.4.1; Specific Term - Section 4.4.2; Continuous - Section 4.4.3; and Health Professions - Section 4.4.7.

For faculty with **Health Professions Appointments**, there is no mandatory tenure review. These individuals may request review for a Continuous Appointment at any time or may never request such a review. The awarding of a Continuous Appointment is governed by Section 4.4.3 of the *Bylaws*. Failure to achieve a Continuous Appointment is governed by the employment contract.

Since a **Continuous Appointment** (tenure) represents the most significant commitment that the University can make to a faculty member, it is imperative that the review process for tenure recommendations be extremely critical. In general, it is expected that the candidate for tenure will have displayed a **sustained** record of accomplishment in two areas of academic endeavor (teaching, scholarly activity, and professional service) relative to his/her academic rank and discipline. If the candidate's accomplishments are limited to two areas, competency must be demonstrated in the third area. Specific criteria for each of these three areas may vary among colleges and departments, and

⁴An academic appointment is a "Courtesy Appointment" when the individual holding this appointment is a paid employee of the University but is not receiving remuneration for that particular academic appointment. (For example, an individual could be paid as a managerial-professional staff member and also hold an unpaid faculty appointment in a given department, college or institute. The faculty appointment would then be called a "Courtesy Appointment." If the individual were **not** otherwise employed by the University, such an unpaid appointment would be classified as a "Volunteer Appointment.")

the areas of academic endeavor that are viewed as most important also may vary by discipline, department, College/Institute, as well as individual within a unit.

Decisions regarding tenure recommendations should be made independently of any prior or concurrent promotion recommendations. Although documentation of academic accomplishments is required in both review processes, it is a University policy that tenure and promotion are separate matters.

V. Documentation

The individual's academic accomplishments must be accurately and completely portrayed for the review and decision-making processes. It is essential that the following documentation be developed at the first level of the review process (department or equivalent unit) and forwarded through each successive level of review. This documentation should provide evidence that the faculty member has sufficient academic preparation for their role and has met standards of conduct within the organization.

Documentation for the promotion/tenure review process involves more than enumerating publications, grant dollars, courses taught, etc. It is incumbent upon the faculty member submitting for promotion and/or tenure review to document and explain his/her accomplishments so that they can be understood by and acknowledged as significant by the well-educated professional who may or may not be an "expert" in the candidate's particular field of endeavor. Accordingly, the faculty member under review must prepare clear and succinct narratives of the highlights and importance of his/her academic accomplishments in teaching, scholarly activity, patient care (if applicable), and professional service.

Each of the narratives, one for each of the three or four areas of academic endeavor, **Teaching, Scholarly Activities, Patient Care (if applicable) and Professional Service** shall be no more than two pages in length (8 ½ " x 11", 10 pt font). See complete descriptions of narratives in D. 1, 2, 3 or 4 below. **Development of succinct narratives is an activity that takes time and thought. The narratives should focus on accomplishments since the last promotion that supports a sustained record of accomplishments. Narratives should emphasize the significance/impact and emerging reputation of the accomplishments to the college, university, and profession. The narratives are not meant to reiterate the content in the Curriculum Vitae.** NOTE: Faculty members holding appointments (paid or Courtesy) in more than one academic unit must concurrently pursue the documentation and review processes in each department if promotion is proposed in both units. **Separate transmittal forms are required.**

- A. **UNMC Transmittal Form**. If the chairperson decides to recommend promotion and/or tenure for a faculty member, this form (APPENDIX A) provides the cover sheet on which their approval is needed.
- B. **Chairperson's Letter**. In order to recommend a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure, a chairperson must submit to the dean a **comprehensive** letter of evaluation and support. This letter and all other supporting documentation will provide the basis for objective review at the college, campus, and university levels. For individuals being recommended for tenure, Associate Professor or Professor, it is extremely important that the chairperson's letter identify the areas of academic endeavor (i.e., teaching, scholarly activity, patient care, if applicable, and/or professional service) upon which the recommendation is based. Also, the chairperson's letter should contain summaries of teaching evaluations by professional students, graduate students, etc.

C. **Curriculum Vitae**. All candidates for promotion or tenure must submit a current curriculum vitae in the format specified in APPENDICES B and C along with the summary narratives of accomplishments.

D. **Narratives – Academic Portfolio**

The faculty member under review must prepare clear and succinct narratives, both quantitatively and qualitatively, of the highlights and importance of his or her academic accomplishments in a) teaching, b) scholarly activities, c) patient care (if applicable), and d) professional service to the University, to peer professionals and to the public. The Academic Portfolio is not meant to reiterate the curriculum vitae. In addition to a description of previous accomplishments, it is helpful to the Promotion and Tenure Committee for candidates to highlight significant aspects of their career development and those achievements in which they take particular pride. More extensive help and examples in developing Teaching and Academic Portfolios are available on the [Academic Affairs website](#).

1. **Evidence of Teaching Accomplishments**. Candidates must describe the extent and general nature of their teaching experience at UNMC since their last major review or at least a minimum of the previous two years. The up to two-page narrative on teaching should address the assessment of the value of and contributions to student educational experiences and not consist solely of a recapitulation of hours spent. It should include specific courses taught or participated in, involvement in continuing education programs, teaching activities related to high school or other outreach programs, undergraduate, graduate (M.S. and Ph.D.) students, medical, allied health, pharmacy or dental students, residents, postdoctoral research associates or fellows. It should also place the candidate's teaching contribution in the context of the overall curricular components (e.g. 40% of a particular graduate course; 20% of the lectures in a core unit). Descriptions of materials and techniques that demonstrate innovative approaches to teaching at all levels from high school to undergraduate, graduate, postgraduate, or continuing education programs should be presented (e.g., development of electronic learning (eLearning) materials, audiovisual materials, new teaching techniques, computer software, syllabi, new courses or programs including online courses or web-based modules, innovative laboratory exercises, simulation techniques, or parts of UNMC Initiatives like the SMDEP program), particularly if they have undergone any form of peer-review. Formal mentoring of faculty, staff or students is encouraged, can be utilized as substantial evidence of teaching accomplishment, and should be documented with letters or evaluations from mentees or current students including documentation of accomplishments of the mentees and students. In some instances, scholarly activity and teaching may overlap. Do not submit actual teaching materials, detailed lecture outlines, etc. Some of this detail may be in Appendix C of the C.V. and does not need to be repeated in the narrative. Evidence of teaching effectiveness should be submitted as summaries of teaching evaluations by peers, professional students, graduate students, residents, and practicing professionals (continuing education). These can be provided in summary form by the department chairperson or by a staff member or committee charged to perform this task.
2. **Evidence of Scholarly Activity**. Scholarly activities should be interpreted broadly and should not be limited to those activities ordinarily characterized as basic or clinical research. Scholarly activity includes collaborative research, teaching or service contributions and interprofessional collaborations but may also include the synthesis of new ideas, writing of textbooks and monographs, development of patient safety, quality of care documents, or enduring eLearning materials, and the application of fundamental knowledge to research, technology transfer,

software design, website design, or other activities related to information sciences, and the development of innovative teaching methods. A complete list of publications in the original literature along with a complete listing of patents, patents pending, intellectual claims submitted and any licensed products are required for this evaluation., Much of this detail should be incorporated into the Curriculum Vitae and does not need to be repeated here. Recognition of scholarly activity also is demonstrated by invitations to chair or organize symposia, CME presentations, editing of books in a professional discipline, participation in national/international symposia, etc.

Successful acquisition of extramural funds through peer-reviewed mechanisms or through corporate research programs and publications of results in the peer-reviewed literature are the most effective indicators of the quantity and quality of research. The ability to conduct an effective program of creative activity is also of primary importance. Activities that are critical to enhancing UNMC's mission, such as clinical-translational activities and multi-investigational projects such as program project or training programs are highly valued. The degree of involvement and significance of these collaborations should be documented. Obviously, basic and clinical research are very important expressions of scholarly activity and in some units always will be valued as a primary consideration. However, other units also might recognize other types of scholarly activity such as being the Director of a Core Facility or of educational scholarship in the development of innovative teaching methods, the synthesis of new concepts based on data already published by the candidates or others, technology transfer successes, software design, website design, or other activities related to information sciences, etc. The two-page summary should highlight those accomplishments that in the candidate's opinion, are most noteworthy and of lasting value. These accomplishments should be reflective of efforts since the last tenure/promotion review and may be supported by no more than five (5) reprints.

3. Patient Care (If applicable). Faculty involved in the delivery of patient care need to document the quality and productivity of their activities. These areas of patient care can be direct (such as within the hospital or various outpatient clinics) or indirect (as provided by diagnostic, specialized tests, procedural or other professional work). The applicant should outline the extent of their patient care responsibilities, such as Sharing Clinic supervision and monitoring of students in the clinics.
4. Evidence of Outstanding Professional Service. While seemingly difficult to document, every effort should be made to provide evidence of outstanding professional service. Formal mentoring of junior faculty is encouraged and documentation can be provided as evidence of service (or of teaching). In clinical departments, this might include documentation of increased referrals, the implementation of new methods of quality improvement, development of community outreach programs, improvement of clinic management, consultantships, etc. In both the basic and clinical sciences outstanding professional service might be documented by: leadership positions in local, state, or national professional associations and societies; consultantships; university committee work; service on advisory boards for granting agencies; journal editorships, service on editorial boards or manuscript reviewing service; invited professional lectureships; participation in Quality Council activities, service as a Quality Officer, efforts on quality improvement teams, mentorship of junior faculty, mentorship awards, etc. In addition, relevant public service or community outreach such as shadowing or the High School Alliance should be cited. A faculty member should demonstrate the ability to cooperate with other professionals involved in service and educational functions. There should be evidence of

commitment to continued upgrading of professional knowledge and skills. The written narrative on professional service can be used to elaborate on any or all of the above.

- E. External Letters of Evaluation.** Candidates for the rank of Associate Professor and Professor must provide their department chairperson (or review committee) with the names of at least three acknowledged authorities in the candidate's discipline who might be contacted to provide letters of evaluation. These letters must come from acknowledged authorities outside the University of Nebraska. In addition, the Promotion and Tenure Committees, department chairs, deans/directors may seek input from additional outside experts of their own choosing. The external letters of evaluation should attest to the emerging (Associate Professor) or established (Professor) regional or national reputation. The three or four written narratives (one each for teaching, scholarly activity, patient care, if applicable, and professional service) may be used to describe one's emerging or established reputation, and where possible, should be shared with outside reviewers.

Samples of evaluation request forms can be found in the [Promotion and Tenure section of the Academic Affairs website](#), including:

- **Sample Evaluation Request Letter** (sent to individuals recommended by the candidate)
 - **Sample Evaluation Request Letter – Additional Input** (sent to individuals not recommended by the candidate)
- F. Copies of Publications.** Candidates for PROMOTION should submit copies of not more than five (5) of the most important publications which were printed or accepted for publication since their last promotion. Candidates for TENURE also should submit copies of not more than five (5) of the most important publications. If these publications serve as the basis for excellence in scholarly activity, these should be a primary focus of the written narrative on Scholarly Activity.

VI. Post-Tenure Review

1. **Purpose.** The post-tenure review process is intended to assist tenured faculty in achieving their professional goals and maximizing their contributions to the University throughout their professional careers, to provide assurance to the public that tenured faculty are accountable for their performance and productivity, and to provide continued peer involvement in the review of tenured faculty members.
2. **Applicability of Review Process.** The post-tenure review process is applicable to all members of the faculty who have been on a Continuous Appointment (Tenured) pursuant to Board of Regents Bylaws 4.4.3 for a period of four years or more. A faculty member shall not be subject to a post-tenure review more than once every four years. A faculty member shall be reviewed in accordance with the post-tenure review process in either of the following circumstances.
 - a. A faculty member shall be reviewed [required review] in accordance with the post-tenure review process when the faculty member receives, after the fourth year of being on continuous contract:
 - (1) A written annual evaluation from the unit administrator⁶ that identifies a substantial and chronic deficiency⁷ in the faculty member's performance and clearly states that if the faculty member does not make substantial, acceptable progress toward remedying the deficiency by the next annual evaluation, a post-tenure review will be initiated; and
 - (2) Notification deriving from the next annual review that the unit administrator has determined that the substantial and chronic deficiency identified in the previous evaluation has not been remedied, that a post-tenure review is appropriate, and that the dean or director concurs. Ordinarily, the faculty member shall be provided notification by June 30 that a review will be scheduled for the following academic year. Upon recommendation of the unit administrator and approval of the dean or director, a faculty member subject to post-tenure review under this section may be exempted or deferred for review if there are clearly extenuating circumstances (such as health problems) and an alternate plan for addressing the problems is adopted.
 - b. A faculty member requests a review [elected review] in accordance with the post-tenure review process. The purpose of such a review would be to provide helpful evaluation and assistance to the faculty member in planning a prospective program by which the faculty member can maximize his or her contributions to the University and more fully realize his or her professional goals.

3. Initiating the Post-Tenure Review Process.

- a. The unit administrator shall consult with the faculty member and establish a schedule for the conduct of the review. The unit administrator shall construct a post-tenure review file that states whether this was an elected review or a required review. In the latter case, it shall contain a clear identification and description of the deficiency or deficiencies, copies of the faculty member's last

⁶Unit administrator refers to the departmental chair, dean, or director who has direct responsibility over the candidate.

⁷The standards for substantial and chronic deficiency shall be determined by the faculty in each unit (College or Institute) and, when approved by the appropriate dean or director and the Chancellor, shall become part of its evaluation procedures.

three annual reviews, such other materials as are relevant, and a document suggesting ways in which the deficiency could be removed.

- b. The faculty member shall have the opportunity to supplement the post-tenure review file throughout the review process by including any information the faculty member believes to be material and helpful to the Review Committee or to administrators involved in the review process. Unless a waiver is provided, the faculty member may have access to letters of recommendation. The unit administrator shall cooperate with the faculty member to provide relevant information and shall periodically notify the faculty member of additions to the file. The faculty member shall be given access to all materials in the post-tenure review file. If the faculty member acknowledges a deficiency in performance, they are encouraged to include in the file, a plan to remedy the deficiency or to otherwise maximize the faculty member's achievement of professional goals and contribution to the unit's mission. The plan should have specific goals and timetables for their achievement.
- c. The faculty member and the unit administrator may include in the file a response to material provided by the other.
- d. The unit administrator shall provide the Review Committee with a copy of the procedures and schedule for the post-tenure review.

4. Appointing the Post-Tenure Review Committee.

- a. A Post-Tenure Review Committee shall be selected to conduct the review of the faculty member's performance. The unit Promotions and Tenure Committee may serve in this role, however, the Review Committee shall be composed of a group of tenured senior faculty from within and outside the unit who hold an academic rank at least equal to that of the faculty member to be reviewed. The Review Committee shall include a majority from representation of the discipline and mission of the faculty member under review. Ordinarily the Review Committee should be composed of three individuals capable of providing a fair and unbiased assessment of the faculty member's performance.
- b. Initially, the unit administrator and the faculty member shall meet and attempt to agree on the composition of the Review Committee, which must be approved by the dean or director.
- c. If the unit administrator and the faculty member are unable to agree on the composition of the Review Committee, the Committee shall be chosen by the dean or director in accordance with IV.4.a above. If the dean or director is the unit administrator, the Chancellor shall choose the committee.

5. Conducting the Post-Tenure Review

- a. The Review Committee shall review the file constructed for the post-tenure review and may meet with the unit administrator and the faculty member, either together or separately. The Committee may utilize information not included in the file with the approval of the unit administrator and the faculty member.
- b. If the Review Committee determines that it would be helpful to have an assessment by outside reviewers, such as for the review of scholarship by peers at other institutions, the Committee

shall notify the unit administrator and the faculty member. Thereafter, such outside reviews shall be obtained in accordance with the same procedure utilized by the unit to obtain outside reviews for purposes of making tenure decisions. A written report of the findings of the outside reviewers shall be provided to the unit administrator, the dean or director, and the faculty member.

- c. In accordance with the schedule for the review established by the unit administrator, the Review Committee shall make a written report of its findings and recommendations, if any. This Report shall be provided to the unit administrator, the dean or director, and the faculty member.
- d. If the post-tenure review is conducted at the request of the faculty member pursuant to section IV.2.b of this procedure, the written report of the Review Committee shall be provided solely to the faculty member. The faculty member, at his or her discretion, may keep the Report confidential, share it with the unit administrator, or share it with the unit administrator and dean or director. If requested by the faculty member, the unit administrator and dean or director shall provide a written response to the Report, indicating the extent to which he or she agrees or disagrees with the findings and recommendations of the Report, and why. At the request of the faculty member, the Report and any response from administrators shall be made part of the faculty member's permanent personnel record.

The faculty member, unit administrator, and dean or director shall work together to develop and implement those recommendations on which they mutually agree.

6. Preparing the Post-Tenure Review Committee Report

- a. The purpose of the Review Committee Report is to provide an assessment of the performance of the faculty member subject to review and, where appropriate or necessary, provide recommendations to maximize the faculty member's contributions to the unit and the University. The Review Committee Report is advisory and shall include part (1) below and, as appropriate, parts (2) through (5):
 - (1) An assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's performance;
 - (2) Recommendations of ways, if any, in which the faculty member could enhance achievement of his or her professional goals and his or her contributions to the mission of the unit, including suggestions, where appropriate, for adjustment in the faculty member's responsibilities, goals and timetables for meeting the goals, and criteria for assessing the faculty member's achievement of enhanced performance;
 - (3) An evaluation of any proposed plan submitted by the unit administrator or the faculty member to remedy any deficiency in the faculty member's performance and any recommended modification to such a plan;
 - (4) Recommendations of ways, if any, in which the unit administrator could provide professional development support to assist the faculty member in enhancing achievement of his or her professional goals and his or her contribution to the mission of the unit;
 - (5) Recommendations for sanctions to be imposed upon the faculty member for performance characterized by substantial and chronic deficiency.

- b. The Review Committee, if it believes that inappropriate criteria have been used to evaluate the faculty member, shall also indicate that fact in its Report.
- c. The Review Committee shall make one of the following findings, to be clearly stated in its Report:
 - (1) The faculty member has no identified substantial and chronic deficiencies. If the Review Committee finds that the faculty member's performance does not reflect any substantial and chronic deficiency or deficiencies for the period under review, the faculty member and the unit administrator will be so informed in writing and the review is thereby completed.
 - (2) The faculty member has substantial and chronic deficiencies. The Review Committee shall state and describe the deficiency or deficiencies in its Report, which shall include the elements listed under 6.a, item (1) and (2) through (5) as appropriate. The Committee shall provide a copy to the faculty member and the unit administrator.
- d. The unit administrator shall allow the faculty member being reviewed an opportunity to provide a written response to the Review Committee Report. The Report and any response from the faculty member shall be made a part of the faculty member's permanent personnel record.

7. Completing the Review Process under a Finding of Substantial and Chronic Deficiency

- a. Upon receipt of a Review Committee Report and the faculty member's response, if any, the unit administrator shall meet with the faculty member reviewed to consider the Report and any recommendations therein. The unit administrator shall then provide the faculty member and the dean or director 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, if any. The appraisal shall include, where appropriate:
 - (1) the extent to which the unit administrator accepts or rejects the findings and recommendations of the Review Committee Report and the reasons for doing so; the unit administrator may reject the Review Committee's findings only for compelling reasons, communicated in writing to the faculty member and the dean or director;
 - (2) a plan outlining the expectations of the unit administrator as to how the faculty member can remedy any deficiency in performance or enhance the faculty member's professional goals and contribution to the unit, including specific goals and time tables for achieving such goals and the criteria to be applied in making such a determination;
 - (3) the resources the unit administrator is willing and able to provide the faculty member to assist in implementing the plan;
 - (4) any adjustment in assignment or responsibilities of the faculty member; and
 - (5) any sanction to be imposed on the faculty member related to his or her performance. Sanctions governed by Regents Bylaws shall only be imposed following the procedure prescribed in the Bylaws.

- b. The dean or director, after review and consultation, may accept, modify, or reject the unit administrator's written appraisal and recommendations. Where the dean's or director's appraisal differs from that provided by the Review Committee or where the dean or director accepts recommendations that differ from those provided by Review Committee, the recommendations may be modified or rejected only for compelling reasons, communicated in writing. The dean's or director's written response shall be provided to the faculty member and to the unit administrator.
- c. A faculty member dissatisfied with the results of the post-tenure peer review and the unit administrator's subsequent appraisal, or the dean's/director's acceptance, modification or rejection of it, may pursue any appeal or remedy otherwise available to faculty members relating to matters that affect their employment status.⁸
- d. Progress toward achieving the goals and timetables set out in the unit administrator's plan, as approved by the dean/director, will be reviewed in subsequent annual reviews of the faculty member by the unit administrator and dean or director. If the faculty member fails to substantially achieve the goals and timetables defined in that plan, those administrative processes defined by the Regents Bylaws (and different from post-tenure review) may be initiated as appropriate.

⁸By University regulations and tradition, faculty members have appealed adverse personnel decisions up the chain of administration from deans or directors to the Chancellor. This process would be unaffected by the regulations governing post-tenure review. In addition, faculty have the option of invoking established University procedures administered by the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee or the Professional Conduct Committee of the Faculty Senate. Allegations of violation of academic freedom, procedural irregularity and professional misconduct are currently handled through those Committees. In the unusual case in which a recommendation of termination is made against a tenured faculty member, established University procedures would require the case to be heard by an Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee.

APPENDIX A: Transmittal Form for Recommending Promotion and/or Tenure*

Name: _____ Degree(s): _____
 Department/Division: _____ College: _____
 Initial UNMC Rank: _____ Date of Initial Rank: _____
 Current Rank: _____ Date of Last Promotion: _____
 Appointment Type: Special Health Professions Continuous
 Effective Date of Promotion and/or Tenure (if approved): _____
 Tenure Requested: Yes No
 Promotion Proposed: Yes No Proposed Rank: _____
 Are you petitioning that a Committee Member be recused from your P&T decision process? Yes No
 If yes, which Committee Member? _____

Recommendations

Department/Division	Promotion	Tenure	Signature
Department Committee	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	_____
Department Chairperson	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	_____
Individual notified in writing on:	_____		

College	Promotion	Tenure	Signature
College Committee	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	_____
Dean	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	_____
Individual notified in writing on:	_____		

Chancellor's Office	Promotion	Tenure	Signature
Chancellor	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	_____
Dean of College/Institute Director notified in writing on:	_____		

Appeals

Appeals Filed: Yes No If "yes," attach all documentation

* Faculty members holding appointments (paid or courtesy) in more than one academic unit, must concurrently pursue the documentation and review processes in each department in which promotion is proposed. Separate Transmittal Forms are required.

APPENDIX B: Curriculum Vitae (CV) Format

Name in full

Campus address

Education (indicate years attended¹ and degrees granted)

Post-degree training (include years¹)

Continuing education training (optional)

Academic appointments in reverse chronological order, (i.e., list present position first) indicating years²

Certifications and licenses

Grant/contract support in reverse chronological order, (i.e., list present support first) and for each grant supply the following information:

- Grant title
- Funding agency
- Start and end dates
- Total dollars (direct cost)
- Name of principal investigator and name of co-investigator

Study sections (list agency, study section title, role, begin and end dates)

Patents (list both those pending and those awarded)

Other appointments or positions not given above (e.g., private practice)²

Consulting positions² (academic, government, and industry; also include editorial duties)

Military service²

Honors and awards

Memberships and offices in professional societies

Committee assignments (list service on departmental, medical staff, college, medical center, and university committees since appointment or last promotion; note years of service¹ and chairs)

Presentations (include primarily invited presentations at regional, national, and international meetings; and invited seminar presentations at institutions outside the University of Nebraska Medical Center. Presentations associated with voluntary, non-refereed abstracts or preliminary communications also may be included, but limited to the 5 most significant or recent presentations.)

Community Service/Outreach

Publications

Publications are to be organized in chronological order (old to new) under the following headings. Please note that inclusive pagination is required where appropriate.

- a. Articles published in scholarly journals
- b. Articles accepted for publication in scholarly journals (please attach copy of letter of acceptance)
- c. Articles submitted for publication in scholarly journals
- d. Books published (also note books in preparation, submitted or in press)
- e. Chapters in books
- f. Books or journals edited
- g. Abstracts and preliminary communications (limit to one page of most recent and important)
- h. Published audiovisual or computer-based educational materials and computer software (video, audio, multimedia slides and video, slides and audio, broadcast, etc.; indicate which have been “peer-reviewed” by hosting site such as MedEd Portal).
- i. Published continuing education materials, on-line courses.

¹ Indicate month and year (e.g., September 2018 to June 2020)

² These items should comprise a complete list of gainful employment since acquisition of the terminal degree. If there are gaps in this chronology, an explanation should be offered, including dates as defined in footnote 1.

APPENDIX C

Teaching Activities

Documentation in support of Teaching Activities should be provided since the last major review or a minimum of the last two years using the following items as a guide. Examples of teaching activities include: classroom teaching, course coordinator or faculty participant, clinical instruction, research supervision, continuing education, interprofessional educational activities, innovative teaching methods, community outreach, and educational scholarship (the latter of which has the greatest potential impact for “double-dipping” in teaching and scholarly activity). Do not provide specific teaching materials, lecture outlines, etc.

- a. Listing of lectures given in team-taught courses (include number of lectures)
- b. Listing of courses for which you were coordinator/supervisor
- c. Listing of courses (course number and name, only) taught by you giving the total number of hours involved in course/courses
- d. Information on teaching of Graduate Students, especially as pertains to supervision of thesis and dissertation research
- e. Information on teaching activities related to those in residency training (medical, pharmacy, etc.)
- f. Listing of continuing education lectures/courses given
- g. Course/lecture/training evaluation materials and outcome assessments

Teaching Portfolio (optional)

Faculty who have a major teaching role are encouraged to develop a more extensive Teaching Portfolio which can be used to help develop the teaching narrative. In addition, faculty may want to consider including their Teaching Portfolio as a supplement for review by the P&T Review Committee separate from the required documentation.

Information for developing a teaching portfolio is available and detailed on the UNMC [Academic Affairs website](#).