

COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE

Approved May 18, 2026

Effective dates: Candidates pursuing promotion and tenure that were hired prior to Fall Semester 2022 may select which guidelines to follow (Feb 2021 or May 2026) to guide reviews that are initiated prior to Fall Semester 2027 and completed prior to June 30 2028; thereafter the May 2026 Guidelines will be followed. Candidates hired after Fall 2022 will use the May 2026 Guidelines for all reviews. All candidates will use May 2026 Guidelines for reviews related to reappointment, annual evaluation, merit, and mid-tenure.

COLLEGE MISSION STATEMENT

We create a resilient, healthy, and beautiful world,
Within a diverse and inclusive culture of rigorous inquiry and
innovation, United by the transformative power of planning and
design.

COLLEGE CULTURE STATEMENT

Our intellectual environment thrives because of our Diverse
perspectives, Dynamic close-knit community, and Pursuit of
meaningful impact.

COLLEGE VALUES

Demand Excellence | Be Courageous | Practice Empathy | Look Beyond | Inspire Impact

COLLEGE ETHOS

The College of Architecture brings together an array of disciplines to address real problems and difficult challenges with innovative and collaborative action. United by a commitment to the transformative power of planning and design, students and faculty come together in a creative environment integrating problem-based learning, rigorous research, scholarly and creative output, and community-focused engagement. By merging disciplinary theory and professional practice we innovate, add value, and give form to all aspects of the designed environment.

GUIDELINES FOR THE ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY FOR REAPPOINTMENT, MERIT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

The College of Architecture and its Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) offer the following guidelines for reappointment of non-tenured positions, merit (salary adjustment), promotion, and tenure (continuous appointment). Performance evaluation is an essential process for advancement and provides feedback on how one's activities relate to the goals of the Accredited Degree Program(s), College, and University. This is not a set of policies or a checklist, but rather a general guide intended to help candidates, mentors, faculty, and administrators engage documentation that effectively conveys the quality of accomplishments that merit consideration for advancement.

Each tenure-leading faculty member, in coordination with the Associate Dean for Faculty and Academic Programs, shall select a faculty mentor. This typically occurs following the first semester in the College. The mentors are available for advice and guidance.

The purposes of these evaluation guidelines are to:

- promote the highest quality faculty performance and the greatest impact.
- assist faculty members and mentors in setting annual and individual long-term goals.

- relate the earning of promotion and/or continuous appointment to the tripartite mission of the University and the College Ethos,
- identify types of activity which are considered important for promotion and/or continuous appointment.
- identify types of evidence which may be submitted for making promotion and/or continuous appointment decisions

These guidelines shall be in accordance with the:

- University of Nebraska Board of Regents Bylaws.
Available on the University of Nebraska Board of Regents website (<https://nebraska.edu/regents/bylaws-policies-and-rules/>)
- University of Nebraska-Lincoln Bylaws.
Available on the Office of the Chancellor website (<https://chancellor.unl.edu/bylaws-university-nebraska-lincoln/>)
- University of Nebraska-Lincoln Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty: Annual Evaluations, Promotion, and Tenure.
Available on the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor website (executivevc.unl.edu/faculty/evaluation-recognition/guidelines)
- UNL EVC Promotion and Tenure Memo and Dates.
Available on the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor website (executivevc.unl.edu/faculty/evaluation-recognition/promotion-tenure)
- College of Architecture Bylaws, Mission Statement, and Values.
Available on the College of Architecture website (<https://architecture.unl.edu/resources/faculty-student-resources/faculty-resources/>)

GENERAL CRITERIA

Each tenure and/or promotion case is considered on its own merits and there are no guarantees or direct scripts for success. Annual and cumulative reviews are “qualitative evaluations” of “excellence in creativity and significance of contribution” judged relative to specific disciplines. As such, this guide attempts to offer “reasonable assistance to understand the components of that judgment” for the candidate, candidate mentors, College faculty and committee reviewers, peer reviewers, and reviewing administrators.

Faculty members:

- will be evaluated on the basis of their apportionment of (1) teaching, (2) research/creative activity, and (3) service in contribution to the tripartite mission of the University.
- with a typical teaching, research, service FTE apportionment will need to show activity in all areas but may choose to concentrate activity in teaching and one other area.
- are encouraged to find meaningful and impactful integration between two or more areas so that they cumulate into a cohesive “*initiative*” relevant to: the individual faculty members expertise and/or interest; the discipline, contemporary practice, and the professions represented by Accredited Degree Programs in the College, and the Accredited Degree Programs’ and College’s mission and ethos,
- show cumulative evidence of performance quality as well as annual evaluations showing satisfactory progress.

It is recognized that some faculty members have an administrative apportionment. For promotion in academic rank, evaluation must be in direct correlation with the mutually agreed upon apportionment. The determination must be made on the same basis and criteria as those used for persons who are engaged in traditional teaching, research/creative activity, and/or service assignments. However, faculty members with an administration apportionment will be reviewed based upon the duties as described in their contract letter. Scholarly work productivity should be considered and evaluated in accordance with the amount of time allotted for such activity.

TYPICAL SCHOLARLY EVIDENCE²

Typical scholarly evidence demonstrating performance in the three categories of teaching, research/creative activity, and service are listed below. In general, quality is better than sheer quantity and as such substantial works, national recognitions, and peer reviewed work are considered greater than less substantial, regional, or non-peer reviewed activity.

- Publication in refereed journals, books, proceedings, or journals with national or international circulation;
- Acquisition of grants, contracts, or other funded opportunities resulting in nationally disseminated outcomes;
- Presentation of refereed papers at professional organization's conferences, seminars and/or colloquia;
- Exhibition and/or peer-reviewed public presentation of creative work including local, regional or national juried shows, curated and invitational exhibitions, and other venues;
- Work cited in regard to teaching, research/creative activity, professional practice, service and engagement;
- National or international awards, fellowships, honors, letters of commendation, etc.;
- Appointment to national or international boards, organizations, societies, etc. with active contributions.

-
- 2 Refereed materials are publications reviewed by “expert readers” prior to the publication of the material. They are also referred to as Peer Reviewed. Refereed materials are significant to the research and literature of most academic fields. Non-refereed materials use less rigorous standards of screening prior to publication. The term “scholarly materials” is often used to describe refereed materials, but this term is not exclusive to refereed material. Non- refereed materials may not be scrutinized as intensely as refereed materials, but they can still be considered scholarly.

INDIVIDUAL NARRATIVE/CANDIDATE STATEMENT

Since judgments of excellence are relative to specific disciplines, it is incumbent upon the candidate to craft the written narrative that establishes the overall importance, identity, and specific criteria for which that faculty member will be evaluated. The narrative is flexible but should be in accordance with this guide and the documents above and reflective of the College's and relevant Accredited Degree Program's mission statement and ethos. As such, a candidate will develop their individual narrative in the first, and each subsequent year of service, in order to gain feedback from their mentor, the faculty, and Accredited Degree Program Lead during annual reviews. The intent of the narrative should be summarized in a descriptive statement; however, the narrative is scholarly trajectory found in the intersecting statements and actions of teaching, research, service, and the focused accumulation of the related scholarly activities. A detailed description of the Candidate Statement is found in Section II.B. of the UNL Documentation Request for Promotion and/or Tenure; available on the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor website (executivevc.unl.edu/faculty/evaluation-recognition/promotion-tenure)

It is important for faculty to be aware of the contents of the College of Architecture Working Report on Distinction for articulation of the value of the three mission categories (research/scholarship/creative work, teaching, and service) in the College of Architecture.

Teaching

Consideration for reappointment, promotion and tenure will require evidence that the individual is an effective teacher. Candidates must exhibit not only the general competence for the area of the professional curriculum for which they are responsible, but also a commitment to responsible and thoughtful teaching.

Criteria for the evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance will incorporate both qualitative and quantitative elements. Qualitative elements include: the candidate's command and engagement of students with the subject; the organization and effectiveness of course materials relative to course objectives; and the ability to incorporate contemporary research and practice into the teaching mainstream. Quantitative elements include: student evaluations with comparisons to appropriate College- or Accredited Degree Program-wide ratings and documentation of new course development, curricular development, and innovation in teaching.

Teaching activities may include:

- instruction
 - courses, labs, clinics, workshops, seminars
 - facilitating faculty, student, and/or staff learning
 - mentoring faculty
- advising, supervising, and mentoring students
 - mentoring, and career advising
 - advising in labs, fieldwork, research projects, theses, and dissertations
 - supervising teaching, research, and learning assistants (GTAs, GRAs, ULAs, and GLAs) and internships
 - directing collaborative research, design projects, and presentations with students
 - supervising independent study or student initiatives
- developing learning activities
 - developing, reviewing, and redesigning courses
 - developing and revising curricula
 - developing teaching materials, manuals, and software
 - developing off-campus activities such as study-abroad and distance education
 - developing web-based or computer-enabled courses or programs
 - implementing innovative teaching methods such as blended learning

- enhancing the organization of teaching material for open College accessibility
- sustaining teaching effectiveness
 - participating in professional development or The Peer Review of Teaching Project
 - conducting formative and/or evaluative assessments improve effectiveness of teaching and learning
 - participating in workshops and continuing education
- community engaged teaching
 - developing and delivering community-based instructions such as service-learning, on-site courses, community workshops, professional workshops, and collaborative programs
 - developing and delivering off-campus teaching activities such as study-abroad courses and experiences, international instruction, and distance education
 - developing and delivering instruction to communities and other constituencies
- scholarship of teaching or scholarship about taught work

Evidence of teaching effectiveness may include:

- descriptions of teaching activities
 - clarity in statement of teaching philosophy, self-appraisal, and its impact on courses
 - summary of responsibilities and activities
 - portfolio containing syllabi with clear outcomes, assignments, examinations
 - portfolio of student work samples from courses – when properly documented will aid in the validation of quality of course objective accomplishments
- documented outcomes
 - external evidence of student learning through student achievement of awards, scholarships, and standardized tests
 - student publications or creative activity based-on course-related work
 - student development evidenced by participation in professional societies and community work
 - nomination by students, alumni, or peers for teaching excellence
- judgments about teaching
 - comments on effectiveness of teaching from students or alumni
 - statements from peer review on observations of teaching effectiveness
- eminence measures
 - teaching awards, fellowships, honors, letters of commendation, etc.
 - invitations to teach or conduct workshops at other institutions
 - accomplishments of former students (e.g. placement of students, dissertation awards, etc.)
 - leadership or major active responsibility with respect to national or international organizations and/or their activities
 - appointment and active contributions to national or international commissions
- scholarship of teaching and engagement or scholarship about taught work
 - textbooks and other educational materials developed and used or disseminated
 - publication in refereed journals, books, proceedings, or journals with national or international circulation
 - acquisition of grants, contracts, or other funded opportunities resulting in disseminated outcomes
 - presentation of refereed papers at professional seminars and colloquia
 - work known and cited in regard to teaching and engagement or taught works

Research/Creative Activity

The evidence of this trajectory is manifest through a record of significant work in either research or creative activity. Scholarship and research may cover a broad range of topics but must have meaningful impact for the discipline, contemporary practice, and/or the profession, as well as for the particular faculty member's field of expertise. Quantity of publications should be considered, and faculty members must show sustained production each year; however, the quality of publications or other creative work should be the focus of the evaluation. Indicators of quality

include elements such as the significance or originality of the work, soundness of the research methods employed, the effectiveness with which the findings are communicated, and the acceptance and impact of the work. Candidates must indicate what the judgement for acceptance is based on (e.g. submitted abstract, full paper, etc.).

The College of Architecture values innovation in planning, design, and the built environment and recognizes the research/creative activity profile of its faculty members may differ from those of disciplines with traditional research roles.

- The College disciplines are served by blind, peer-reviewed edited, and curated popular and scholarly journals. Their significance shall be affirmed by recognized experts.
- A primary goal of the College is to contribute to the growth and development of the disciplines, contemporary practice, and/or professions through research and creative activity. Work that has not been disseminated does not advance knowledge.
- Candidates who select significant professional/design/creative activities and products (in lieu of scholarship in its more traditional form) must present a record of high quality that is recognized nationally or internationally. Documentation of the quality and impact includes its public dissemination (invited lectures, juried papers, publications, etc.), comments from peers, and receipt of awards or grants.
- Evidence to support research, scholarly, and profession/design/creative activities must be public and should emphasize innovation, importance to the discipline/profession, and include the percentage of responsibility borne by the candidate.

Research and creative activity may include:

- disseminated scholarly research
 - textbooks and other educational materials written
 - refereed journals, books, proceedings, or journals with national or international circulation
 - editing books, journals, or other leading publications
 - acquisition of grants, contracts, or other funded opportunities whose results become disseminated
 - preparation of patent applications
- disseminated creative activity
 - explorative design or prototyping activity odesign and development of built projects
 - competition entries resulting in recognition
 - curated solo or group exhibits
- disseminated community engaged research and creative activities
 - community design consultation and projects
 - community engaged research though public programs and events
 - conducting directed or contracted research
 - conducting and reporting program/occupancy evaluation research or public policy analysis for other institutions and agencies
 - developing innovative solutions that address social, economic, or environmental challenges (e.g., intellectual property, inventions, patents, products, prototypes, services, and practices)
- grants, entrepreneurial, and related activity that result in disseminated products
 - developing and submitting successful research grant proposals
 - obtaining funding and managing grants
 - directing research teams
 - engaging in entrepreneurship and related activities

Evidence of research and creative activity may include:

- descriptions of research and creative activity
 - clarity in statement of research and creative activity, self-appraisal, and impact on problems addressed and/or

- integration of research/creative activity with teaching and/or service
- portfolio of sample research/creative activity
- documented outcomes
 - textbooks and other educational materials published
 - publication in refereed journals, books, proceedings, or journals with national or international circulation
 - edited books, journals, or other leading publications
 - grant proposals submitted, internal and external funding received
 - presentation of refereed papers at professional seminars and colloquia
 - work known and cited in regard to research/creative activity or research engagement
 - granted patents or disclosures of innovation
- judgments about research and creative activities
 - evaluations from peer or administrative reviews
 - evaluations from curators, critics, reviewers, experts in the field
- eminence measures
 - editorial or editorial board position
 - invited chapters in prestigious publications
 - invited papers and guest lectures
 - invited exhibitions
 - invitations to participate in prestigious design competitions
 - selection as juror for competitions and exhibitions

Service

All faculty members are expected to engage in Accredited Degree Program and College service with increased involvement of University service by faculty at higher ranks. Service within the College and University will typically consist of participation on committees and other task forces though may involve other types of activities as well. A portion of internal service may be counted towards teaching activity when it serves the operations and advancement of teaching.

One may also focus efforts to meet the land-grant tradition of providing service to the larger public realm, outside and external to the University. Not all activities engaged in by faculty members in settings external to the University are undertaken to help fulfill the university's or unit's public service missions. College mission statements and ethos are important in this regard because the University's mission is too broad to offer guidance related to specific fields.

Faculty members working towards promotion, tenure, and merit adjustments on the basis of service are recommended to keep the percentage of service appropriate to their FTE. The College aims to promote a more active and reciprocal nature of interaction between its faculty members and the public through engagement and other methods which encourage an active two-way production of disciplinary knowledge.

Service activity may include:

- institutional service
 - providing leadership in or making significant contributions to program, College, or University committees or other appointed groups
 - developing and revising major policies
 - participating in campus governance
 - representing the University for its advancement
 - mentoring faculty or staff
 - student recruitment
 - advising student groups

- disciplinary and professional service
 - leadership or major active responsibility with respect to national or international organizations and/or their activities
 - appointment to national or international boards, organizations, societies, etc. with active contributions
 - election or appointment to professional boards, task forces, or committees; organizing and managing conferences
 - serving on accreditation bodies
 - reviewing grant applications
 - serving as editor or on the editorial board of a professional journal
 - serving as peer reviewer for conference submissions or proceedings
 - reviewing articles, books, and other creative works for journals and presses
 - serving as peer reviewer for promotions and tenure or other professional awards and acknowledgements
 - adjudicating for design competitions
 - reviewing and testing discipline-specific software and other electronic applications
- community service
 - informing general audiences through seminars, conferences, and lectures
 - interpreting technical information for a variety of audiences
 - serving as an expert witness
 - testifying before the legislature and congressional committees
 - editing newsletters in one's field
 - serving as an expert for the press and other media
 - assisting organizations with planning and design issues
- community engaged research and creative activities
 - consulting and providing technical assistance and/or services to public and private organizations
 - writing papers, planning, programming, or conducting design activities that establish a position for the general public
 - collaborating with schools, businesses, advocacy groups, community groups, and civic agencies to develop policies
 - providing leadership or making significant contributions to community development activities
- grants or scholarship related to service
 - acquisition of grants, contracts, or other funded opportunities resulting in disseminated outcomes
 - presentation of refereed papers at professional seminars and colloquia
 - publication in refereed journals, books, proceedings, or journals with national or international circulation
 - work known and cited in regard to research/creative activity or research engagement

Evidence of service activity may include:

- descriptions of service activity
 - clarity in statement of service activity, self-appraisal, and contribution and impact and/or integration of service with teaching and/or research/creative activity.
 - portfolio samples of service activity if relevant or analysis of work accomplished
- documented outcomes
 - publications about service or engagement or work resulting from participation with public
 - number of people served and benefited
 - official reports resulting from activity
 - changes in professional practice, institutional processes, or public policy
 - grant proposals, contracts, and awards
 - business or community growth
 - acknowledgement from audience or client
- judgments about service

-evaluations and letters recognizing service o evaluations from sponsoring organizations o evaluations from peer review

- eminence measures

- honors or awards recognizing service
- election or appointment as an officer in professional organization
- replication of activity or outcomes in other settings
- documentation of changes in practice

ACCREDITED DEGREE PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Each Accredited Degree Program shall form a single Accredited Degree Program Review Committee on an annual basis to conduct reviews related to reappointment, evaluation, mid-tenure, tenure, and promotion to associate actions. Each Review Committee will include three tenured faculty from the appropriate Accredited Degree Program, including the lead, and excluding the FAC representative. If an Accredited Degree Program has fewer than three eligible faculty (including the lead) available to serve, a single “+Up” Review Committee will be formed to support all review actions during the academic year. The FAC shall determine the membership of the +Up Review Committee for each Accredited Degree Program as necessary. The FAC will solicit input from the relevant lead and the candidate(s) within the Accredited Degree Program regarding possible +Up Review Committee members from among eligible faculty within the College of Architecture. The FAC will create a list of colleagues who, by virtue of rank, credentials, and experience, are able to make informed judgments about the candidate(s). The FAC will make the final decision on +Up Review Committee membership for each Accredited Degree Program as needed for each academic year. It is preferable that Review Committee members hold rotating three-year terms to support increased continuity when possible.

ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

The Annual Evaluation process is intended to support the career development of each faculty member, while at the same time, strengthen the College. All faculty are to be evaluated annually. These evaluations provide faculty members with a written record of continuing expectations and accomplishments, an ongoing critique of strengths and weaknesses, and a set of base documents that support the annual distribution of performance-based salary adjustments and other rewards. Therefore, the purpose is twofold:

- to provide each faculty member an opportunity to engage in self-assessment and goal setting relative to his/her work and career; and
- to provide an opportunity for the faculty member and an administrator to discuss his/her contributions to the work of the College and to identify possible areas of excellence and areas of continuing development as well as ways to support accomplishing that development.

Process

By February 15, each faculty member shall submit to the Dean and Associate Deans:

- Annual Performance Review Activity Report (see Appendix A) and CV update (with current evaluation period’s activities highlighted)
 - o Faculty Narrative (summary of highlights related to significance, impact, teamwork and goals; including reflection and self- assessment related to career goals and plans)
 - o Future Goals and Objectives (short-term (one year) and long-term (3-5 years) with anticipated outcomes and impacts)
- Student Course Evaluations (including numerical summary and student comments)
- Any supporting documentation

At the end of the review process, all materials will be returned to the faculty member.

Using the Annual Performance Review Form, the Dean and Associate Dean(s) will assess the performance of that faculty member based on criteria and standards appropriate to the faculty member’s rank. The Dean will meet with the faculty member to discuss the results of the evaluation and to offer suggestions for further growth. The Dean and Associate Dean(s) and the faculty member will sign off on the evaluation, a copy of which will be placed in the faculty

member's personnel file. If the faculty member does not agree with the Dean on the evaluation, the faculty member has one week to sign the evaluation and write a letter of rejoinder that will be included in their file.

For tenure-track (probationary) and professor of practice faculty, the annual evaluation documentation is forwarded to the Accredited Degree Program Review Committee for discussion of the performance of the individual faculty members and vote for recommendation of reappointment. Upon completion of the review, the Review Committee will provide a written statement to the Dean and Associate Dean(s) concerning progress of each tenure-track faculty member, and record of the vote for recommendation of reappointment. This, too, will be included in the faculty member's personnel file.

Annual evaluations for probationary faculty prior to the tenure consideration focus primarily on suitability for reappointment, and an assessment of promise for tenure. Consequently, it should be clear that positive annual evaluations which are satisfactory for annual reappointment may not be cumulatively sufficient for tenure. Similarly, promotion primarily reflects a level of personal achievement; although it is to be regarded as positive recognition of one's work, it cannot be taken as a guarantee of tenure.

Reappointment Notification Dates

Regents Bylaws indicate the timing for reappointment decisions. When a tenure-track faculty member is in their first year, they must be notified by March 1 if they will not be reappointed for their second year. When a tenure-track faculty member is in their second year, they must be notified by December 15 if they will not be reappointed for their third year. A tenure-track faculty member in their third year or beyond must be given 12 months notice if they will not be reappointed (May 1 is the UNL deadline for this notification).

Adjunct faculty will meet with the appropriate Accredited Degree Program Lead and the Associate Dean for Faculty and Academic Programs to discuss their teaching evaluations and other matters relevant to their adjunct assignment. The Associate Dean will write a review letter for the adjunct faculty focused on teaching. If the adjunct faculty member does not agree with the Associate Dean's assessment, they may write a letter of rejoinder that will be included in their file.

CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION BY ACADEMIC RANK

Decisions to promote faculty members and to award tenure determine the quality of the faculty for decades to come. Recommendations should be awarded only when in the best interest of the College of Architecture and the University of Nebraska, particularly for to the granting of tenure, as the consequences are of long term and significance.

Promotions are based on merit and are earned by high levels of achievement as evidenced by contribution to the overall missions of the University, College and Program. For successively high levels of faculty rank, higher levels of achievement should be expected. A candidate for promotion to associate professor should present evidence showing "real promise" that he/she will become a leading expert in their respective field. Promise should, in fact, be fortified by tangible, developing evidence. A candidate for promotion to professor should show "promise fulfilled" based on evidence of attainment of national or international stature in a field. [For additional discussion, see Section V. PROMOTION IN RANK of the Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty: Annual Evaluations, Promotion, and Tenure accepted May 12, 1989 Revisions Approved by the Academic Senate on December 4, 2001 (https://svcaa.unl.edu/documents/tenure_guide.pdf)]

Continuous Appointment (Tenure)

Tenure (continuous appointment) is a privilege accorded to a faculty member after he/she has demonstrated the professional and personal qualifications required for acceptance as a permanent member of the faculty. The issue of tenure shall be based on the following criteria:

- the candidate's addition as improvement of the overall quality of the College and the Accredited Degree Program tenured staff;
- the opportunity of the College and Accredited Degree Program to better improve itself through the awarding of tenure to the candidate;
- the candidate's likelihood of maintaining or improving his/her quality and his/her contributions to the College and Accredited Degree Program over the long period typically involved in a continuous appointment.

The award of tenure is a long term commitment by the university to the candidate, and therefore, requires a rigorous, in-depth evaluation of the faculty member's accumulated accomplishments and a determination of whether the performance is likely to meet expectations for the indefinite future. The individual's primary assigned responsibilities and apportionment, chosen scholarly focus, and job announcement/position description determine the requirements for qualification as a permanent faculty member. The tenure decision ultimately is based on an evaluation of the quality and quantity of work accomplished during the probationary period and is an expectation and prediction of the quality and quantity of a faculty member's future performance.

Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to associate professor will be recommended only if an individual shows signs of accomplishments as measured by an appropriate assessment of his/her work. The record of accomplishment must document an emerging reputation of regional or national scope in the candidate's field. Additionally, it shall be clear that the individual shows significant promise in two of the three mission categories of the land-grant institution (teaching, research/creative activity, service). That promise must be supported by tangible, developing evidence. In any promotion review, consideration will be given to the performance of the individual in all three of these areas. However, the three need not be treated equally. Their interpretation and weight should reflect the definition of the position to which the individual has been appointed or to which he or she might be promoted. For most faculty members, the primary basis for promotion and tenure will be evidence of the high quality of both teaching and research/creative activity, with consideration also being given to evidence of valuable public engagement or service to the University and professional communities.

Hiring a new faculty member with tenure

To be eligible for an initial appointment in the College with tenure the individual must be a tenured faculty member at a comparable university. Requests for such appointment will be reviewed by the Accredited Degree Program Committee (of the whole) and College FAC; each will provide a recommendation to the Dean. In cases where the new hire will serve as the College's dean, the College FAC will make its recommendation to the Executive Vice Chancellor.

Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion from associate professor to professor will be reserved for faculty whose achievements are sufficient to merit widespread recognition as a distinguished authority in their profession, evidencing a level of sustained accomplishment. A recommendation for promotion of an associate professor should be based upon an assessment of the candidate's entire academic career. The record must show the candidate has made contributions of appropriate magnitude, independence and quality in research, teaching, and service, and has demonstrated the ability to sustain contributions to the profession and to the Accredited Degree Program and College.

Promotion to Associate Professor of Practice

Promotion will generally be awarded only if the evidence shows that a candidate's teaching accomplishments are excellent and the research, creative activity, and/or public engagement record is also sufficiently strong to meet the requirements for promotion. In every instance, the record of teaching, research, creative activity, and service must be thoroughly documented and compared with the incumbent's current position description and apportionment as found in his/ her contract.

Promotion to Full Professor of Practice

Promotion must include evidence of national or international stature in a field, supervision of graduate or professional students to degree completion, and that he/ she is a leading scholar and teacher, architect, landscape architect, interior designer, planner, creative artist, designer in a related field, or provider of public service, or according to the primary assigned contractual responsibilities.

Process

In March, the Dean and Associate Dean(s) will review the status of all faculty members to determine their eligibility for tenure and/or promotion consideration. The Associate Deans will meet with the eligible candidates to determine whether or not a review will be conducted during the next academic year.

Probationary Tenure Track Faculty:

During their probationary period a faculty member shall be reviewed annually. The tenure process complements the annual review process and includes annual reappointment, mid-tenure review, and final review for tenure (and typically promotion to Associate Professor). The annual evaluation (as previously described) is particularly significant in that it provides guidance to the faculty member toward achieving both promotion and tenure. All annual review letters and forms shall become a part of a faculty member's dossier.

For an assistant professor, a mid-term review (at the beginning of the fourth year) will be conducted following the same process as the review for tenure and promotion with one exception: solicitation of only two external letters of evaluation rather than three. Upon completion of five years time-in-rank, an assistant professor will be subjected to a tenure and promotion review to be conducted during the next academic year, the sixth year of service to the University.

Associate professors without tenure will normally be notified at the end of their second year of service that a mid-term review will be conducted during their third year of service. Upon completion of four years time-in-rank, an associate professor will be subjected to a tenure and/or promotion review to be conducted during the next academic year, the fifth year of service at the University.

An assistant or associate professor may be nominated by an Accredited Degree Program Committee for promotion/tenure at an earlier time or may request early consideration. In rare circumstances, the probationary period for tenure can be extended. Descriptions, procedures, eligibility, and deadlines are available on the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor website (executivevc.unl.edu/faculty/pre-tenure-extensions).

Process for Tenure Consideration

Candidates submit the external abbreviated review dossier to the Accredited Degree Program Lead as a draft June 15 and in final form July 1. In the fall of the sixth year (fall of fourth year for mid-tenure review), the candidate shall submit a file for internal examination. Documentation for this file must follow the format as requested by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (available on the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor website executivevc.unl.edu/faculty/evaluation-recognition/promotion-tenure). UNL deadlines and rules are established in a letter from the Executive Vice Chancellor to the Deans, Chairs and Directors. The College deadlines have been established to provide adequate opportunity for due process in the consideration of an applicant's nomination, for candidate response, and time for reconsideration of adverse decisions.

TIMELINE³

June 15	Candidates submit draft dossier for external review to Accredited Degree Program Lead
July 1	Candidates submit dossier for external review to Accredited Degree Program Lead; pool of external reviewers are identified.
July 15	External reviewers are selected and sent an abbreviated file for consideration.
September 10	Recommendations from external reviewers are due to the Accredited Degree Program Lead for inclusion with the candidate's documentation. The candidate's documentation becomes available for review by the appropriate Accredited Degree Program Review Committee.
October 10	The Accredited Degree Program Review Committee votes on tenure (and promotion) and submits their written recommendation to the Dean; a copy is sent to the FAC.
November 2	The FAC reviews the materials relative to both criteria and processes as documented herein, conducts a vote on tenure (and promotion) and submits their written recommendation to the Dean.
January 29	The Dean submits nominations for tenure with promotion to the Executive Vice Chancellor. Decisions not to recommend tenure/promotion must also be reported.

Three external letters from faculty of professorial rank (preferably full professor level, but in any case holding rank at or above the rank being sought) at other R1 institutions, who are qualified to assess the scholarly impact of the candidate's work, to be provided. Any exceptions to this expectation must be approved in advance by the cognizant dean and vice chancellor or their designees. Refer to the UNL Executive Vice Chancellor website for further clarification. These letters are solicited by the Accredited Degree Program Lead in accordance with the procedures suggested in the UNL Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty, and placed in the candidate's file along with (a) an indication of whether the candidate has waived his/her right to read the letter, (b) an indication of whether the candidate has waived his/her right to know the identity of the outside reviewers, (c) an explanation of why these persons were selected to do the external review, and (d) an explanation of the process followed to secure these letters. Once the final identification of reviewers has been made, if the candidate has not waived his/her right to know the identity of the outside reviewers, the candidate shall have the right to enter formal, written objections to any reviewer in the file. (These letters may also be used as part of the promotion process.)

³ If any of the indicated dates falls on a weekend, the first business day following that date will serve as the deadline. Adherence to these dates is critical for full deliberation and consideration of a case.

It is the responsibility of the individual being considered to examine the materials, (a) through (d), from the previous paragraph regarding external letters and to see that they are accurate and complete. The faculty member considered may want to seek advice from their mentor, other faculty, or the Accredited Degree Program Lead to make sure no important information has been overlooked. The individual being considered for tenure/promotion is guaranteed access to all materials submitted for his/her evaluation and the opportunity to respond in writing. A possible exception to this “right of access” is outside evaluations that, with the faculty member’s consent, will be kept confidential. The only anonymous materials that can be included in the file are student evaluations.

After the file has been compiled, it will undergo review at the following levels:

- The Accredited Degree Program Review Committee, consisting of three tenured members of the relevant Accredited Degree Program, including the lead, will make a tenure recommendation to the Dean, which will also be placed in the candidate’s file.
- The Accredited Degree Program Review Committee, consisting of three tenured members of the relevant Accredited Degree Program, including the lead, will make a promotion to associate professor recommendation to the Dean, with a copy placed in the candidate’s file. *It should be noted that simultaneous promotion and tenure at the required tenure consideration date is the normal case for advancement from assistant to associate professor.*
- The College FAC will review the materials relative to both criteria and processes as documented herein, conduct a vote on tenure (and promotion) and advise the Dean through an independent recommendation (with copies placed in the candidate’s file); including assessment of all applicable procedures and guidelines to ensure these have been followed fairly and in accordance with university policies.
- The Accredited Degree Program Review Committee may request reconsideration in the event the members of the College FAC do not concur with the recommendation made by the Review Committee. The request for reconsideration is normally made by the lead to the members of the College FAC.
- The Dean will make a recommendation to the Executive Vice Chancellor with copies to the College FAC, the Review Committee, and the candidate’s file. If the members of the College FAC or the Dean disagree with the recommendation of the Accredited Degree Program Review Committee, the reasoning underlying the decision is transmitted to the Executive Vice Chancellor.

If, at any point in the process, there is a recommendation against granting tenure or promotion, the candidate must be informed of the right to request reasons for adverse recommendation and of the right to request reconsideration.

Tenured Faculty:

Consideration for promotion to full professor can be initiated by the faculty member in question, or with the candidate’s consent, the Accredited Degree Program Lead, and/or another faculty member in the College. The candidate may stop the College process at any time.

In order to encourage full promotion and individual focus and program development, tenured but not fully promoted faculty may submit documentation of their cumulative record of accomplishments and goals for review by all College tenured full professors (or College FAC, if appropriate) every other year beginning one full year after tenure was awarded.

Documentation should clearly state:

- the importance and impact of one’s individual program,
- the linkages between the candidate’s primary responsibilities through their program, and
- a description of how the work is related to the larger missions of the relevant Accredited Degree Program, College and University.

Documentation will include focus on evidence justifying that the candidate has accomplished significant creative scholarship and impact.

When promotion is to be considered, the candidate will prepare a cumulative documentation file. Three external letters from faculty of professorial rank at other universities evaluating the candidate's work as a scholar and his/her contributions to the profession are to be provided. These letters are solicited by the Accredited Degree Program Lead in accordance with the procedures suggested in the UNL Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty and placed in the candidate's file along with (a) an indication of whether the candidate has waived his/her right to read the letter, (b) an indication of whether the candidate has waived his/her right to know the identity of the outside reviewers, (c) an explanation of why these persons were selected to do the external review, and (d) an explanation of the process followed to secure these letters. Once the final identification of reviewers has been made, if the candidate has not waived his/her right to know the identity of the outside reviewers, the candidate shall have the right to enter formal, written objections to any reviewer in the file. (These letters may also be used as part of the promotion process.)

The candidate's documentation file will undergo review at the following levels:

- The Full Professor Review Committee, consisting of three tenured full professors within the College faculty (the lead may be a part of this committee) will vote and make a recommendation to the Dean, which will also be placed in the candidate's file.
- The College FAC will review the materials and make an assessment of all applicable procedures and guidelines to ensure these have been followed fairly and in accordance with university policies.
- The Dean will make a recommendation to the Executive Vice Chancellor, with copies to the Accredited Degree Program Lead, the Full Professor Review Committee, the FAC, and to the candidate's file.

Professors of Practice:

The process for promotion in faculty rank used for Professors of Practice will be similar to those of tenured or tenure-track faculty with some clarification. The external letters shall be from faculty of higher rank (tenure-track or not) at other universities and/or leading practitioners evaluating the candidate's work as a Professor of Practice. His/her contributions to the profession should be provided.

Appendix A

Annual Performance Review Activity Report
College of Architecture
20XX
DUE: February 15, 20XX

Faculty Member: _____

Date of Last Promotion/Tenure: _____

Current Rank: _____

Evaluation Period: 20XX Calendar Year

**Evaluator Name, Title and Accredited Degree
Program:**

The Annual Evaluation process is intended to support the career development of each faculty member, while at the same time, strengthen the College. All faculty are to be evaluated annually. These evaluations provide faculty members with a written record of continuing expectations and accomplishments, an ongoing critique of strengths and weaknesses, and a set of base documents that support the annual distribution of performance-based salary adjustments and other rewards. Therefore, the purpose is twofold:

- to provide each faculty member an opportunity to engage in self-assessment and goal setting relative to his/her work and career; and
- to provide an opportunity for the faculty member and an administrator to discuss his/her contributions to the work of the College and to identify possible areas of excellence and areas of continuing development as well as ways to support accomplishing that development.

Process

By February 15, each faculty member shall submit to the Dean and Associate Dean and Associate Deans:

- Annual Performance Review Activity Report and CV update (with current evaluation period's activities highlighted)
- Faculty Narrative (summary of highlights related to significance, impact, teamwork and goals; including reflection and self-assessment related to career goals and plans)
- Future Goals and Objectives (short-term (one year) and long-term (3-5 years) with anticipated outcomes and impacts)
- Student Course Evaluations (including numerical summary and student comments)
- Any supporting documentation

At the end of the review process, all materials will be returned to the faculty member.

Using the Annual Performance Review Form, the Dean and Associate Dean(s) will assess the performance of that faculty member based on criteria and standards appropriate to the faculty member's rank. The Dean will meet with the faculty member to discuss the results of the evaluation and to offer suggestions for further growth. Both the Dean and the faculty member will sign off on the evaluation, a copy of which will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. If the faculty member and the Dean cannot agree on the evaluation, each will write a letter to also be placed in the file.

Annual Performance Review Activity Report
 College of Architecture
 20XX
 DUE: February 15, 20XX

Faculty Member: _____

Date of Last Promotion/Tenure: _____

Current Rank: _____

Faculty Summary. *A summary of the highlights related to significance, impact, teamwork and goals.*

Apportionment: _____% Teaching (T) _____% Research/Creative Activity (R/CA) _____% Service (S) _____% Admin

Goals and Objectives for the period (20XX) being evaluated

G1.	
G2.	
G3.	
G4.	
G5.	

Performance Activities for the period (20XX) being evaluated *(list completed and in progress)*

2019 Goal(s)	Activity	T	R S C A	S	Evidence	Impact	Faculty Comment	Evaluator Comments *as appropriate
	<i>As listed in CoA Guidelines: 89-132 (T), 166-214 (R), 241-303 (S). List activity similar to CV entry. Include co-authors, date of completion (or in progress), venue,</i>				<i>As listed in CoA Guidelines: 62-76, 135-165 (T), 216-239(R), 305-326 (S). Include selection process (double blind peer reviewed, peer reviewed, editorial selected, jury reviewed, invited) and what was evaluated (abstract, paper, poster, etc.)</i>	<i>Dissemination (self, regional, national, international), acceptance rate journal impact factor, publication prestige, presentation or conference significance</i>	<i>Add additional information or comments as needed (describe work accomplished, project completion date, expected publication date, etc.)</i>	

Annual Performance Review Activity Report
 College of Architecture
 20XX
 DUE: February 15, 20XX

Faculty Member: _____

Date of Last Promotion/Tenure: _____

Current Rank: _____

2019 Goal(s)	Activity	T	R S C A	S	Evidence	Impact	Faculty Comment	Evaluator Comments *as appropriate
	<i>funding agent, or journal.</i>							

Faculty Reflection Statement. *A reflection related to significance, impact, teamwork and goals.*

Evaluator Comments. Please provide information related to impact, areas of excellence, areas needing improvement and provide an overall rating of Below Expectations, Meets Expectations or Exceeds Expectations in each of the 3 areas below.

Evaluator Comments: Teaching

Annual Performance Review Activity Report College
of Architecture
20XX
DUE: February 15, 20XX

Faculty Member: _____

Date of Last Promotion/Tenure: _____

Current Rank: _____

Evaluator Comments: Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity

--

Evaluator Comments: Service

--

Faculty Future Goals and Objectives 20XX

	Faculty Goals, objectives and comments	Evaluator Comments
G1:		
G2:		
G3:		
G4:		

Evaluator Summary Comments

--

Faculty Member Full Name

Evaluator Full Name

Faculty Member Signature

Date

Evaluator Signature

Date