

**INSTITUTE OF
AGRICULTURE AND
NATURAL RESOURCES**

**GUIDELINES FOR THE
EVALUATION OF FACULTY:**

**ANNUAL EVALUATION,
PROMOTION, TENURE,
AND REAPPOINTMENT**

March 27, 2015
Updated December 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section I.	Introduction	3
	A. Definitions.....	3
	B. IANR forms related to the evaluation of faculty members.....	4
Section II.	Annual Evaluation.....	4
	A. General guidelines	4
	B. Who is to be evaluated	4
	C. What informs annual evaluation	4
	D. What is being evaluated.....	5
	E. The role of peer review in annual evaluation	5
	F. The annual evaluation rubric.....	5
	G. The responsibility of the supervisor in annual evaluation	6
	H. Faculty members' right to review their annual performance evaluation.....	6
	I. Guidance relating to faculty members at Research, Extension, and Education Centers (REEC)	6
Section III.	Reappointment.....	7
	A. General Guidelines	7
	B. Reappointment recommendation of probationary and special appointment faculty members	7
Section IV.	Tenure and/or Promotion in Rank.....	7
	A. General guidelines.....	7
	B. Who is eligible for tenure and/or promotion.....	7
	C. IANR promotion criteria.....	7
	D. IANR tenure criteria	8
	E. Annual feedback toward tenure and/or promotion.....	8
	F. Tenure and/or promotion files	8
	G. External letters of review.....	9
	H. Unit promotion and tenure committee	10
	I. Directors of REECs, centers, institutes, and program leaders	10
	J. IANR deans	10
	K. Guidance unique to decisions about tenure	11
	L. Guidance unique to decisions about promotion in rank.....	11
	M. When a candidate is being considered for tenure and promotion simultaneously.....	11
	N. Tenure and/or promotion materials review process.....	12
	O. Recommendation notification timelines.....	13

SECTION I -- INTRODUCTION

The Bylaws of the University of Nebraska Board of Regents and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln *Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty: Annual Evaluations, Promotion, and Tenure* provide foundational guidance for the evaluation of faculty, including promotion and tenure, within IANR. As permitted by policies referenced in the aforementioned documents, IANR has developed the supplemental guidelines identified below. These provide additional guidance and clarification about the policies, procedures, requests, and expectations in response to unique needs of IANR. To reduce confusion, this document combines relevant material from both the source documents and the additional material unique to IANR into one inclusive set of guidelines. However, this document does not replace or supersede the University Bylaws or UNL Guidelines documents. The most recent version of the UNL Guidelines document is located at <https://ianr.unl.edu/policies/promotion-and-tenure>.

Each of the following sections addresses one of the major evaluation activities: annual evaluation, reappointment, and tenure and promotion. A general overview of each activity is found in the *UNL Guidelines for Evaluation of Faculty: Annual Evaluations, Promotion, and Tenure*.

The senior administrators of IANR recognize that the application of evaluation policies and procedures, as well as the metrics used to inform evaluation, can create or reinforce disparities that disadvantage certain groups or individuals, particularly those who possess attributes that are underrepresented within the Institute and/or minoritized in society¹. These disparities are often perpetuated through factors such as unacknowledged and unchecked structural and cognitive biases, discrimination, and inequitable systems and processes. Those conducting evaluations are expected to educate themselves about inequities in an atmosphere of trust and respect and to implement strategies that facilitate acknowledgment of and reflection on biases, values, attitudes, and behaviors and the effects these factors can have on performance evaluations.

A. Definitions.

Unit: any administrative unit within IANR to which faculty members are assigned or affiliated (e.g., academic unit (e.g., department, school), engagement zone, center, institute, program)

Unit leader: department head/chair, school director, engagement zone leader, program leader.

Supervisor: the person in an administrative role who has responsibilities for evaluating faculty performance.

Specific term/probationary faculty members: these are faculty members who have a *specific term* tenure-line position but who are not yet tenured. These faculty members are eligible for both tenure and promotion. Regardless of work station and/or affiliation with a center, institute, program, division, etc., the tenure home unit for specific term faculty members is a department or school. (The only exceptions are those which were established prior to January 2020).

Special appointment faculty members: these are non-tenure line faculty members who are appointed for a specific term, usually one to three years. Those in the professor of practice, research professor, extension professor, extension educator, forester, and geoscientist ranks are

¹ Minoritization often occurs on the basis of race; ethnicity; gender and gender expression; age; visible and non-visible disability; nationality; sexual orientation; citizenship status; veteran status; religious/non-religious; spiritual or political beliefs; socio-economic class, job, role or position; or other differences among people that result in misunderstanding

eligible for promotion. Those who have lecturer, senior lecturer, visiting, research associate, and post-doctoral appointments are not eligible for promotion. While it is possible to designate adjunct faculty members as “assistant”, “associate”, or “full”, this is not required. The criteria for using rank designations for adjunct faculty is determined at the unit level with the approval of the deans. Determinations of adjunct faculty members’ rank is determined at the unit level; their materials do not route through the multitier evaluation process described in Section III.

Faculty practice faculty members: these are special appointment faculty members in professor of practice and research professor positions. Faculty practice faculty members are eligible for promotion, but not tenure.

- B.** IANR forms related to the evaluation of faculty members. Unit leaders or their administrative assistants have access to all required forms related to the evaluation of faculty.
 - 1. Academic Performance Evaluation and Professional Development of Faculty Form (located in Sharepoint)
 - 2. An annual report of faculty accomplishments and impacts is to be completed through Activity Insight (instructions located at <http://ianr.unl.edu/activity-insight-resources>).
 - 3. Position Description (located in Box)
 - 4. IANR Annual Faculty Progress Form (located in Sharepoint)

SECTION II -- ANNUAL EVALUATION

A. General guidelines.

- 1. Bylaws and policies of the NU Board of Regents (subsequently referred to as *University Bylaws* <https://nebraska.edu/regents/bylaws-policies-and-rules>)
- 2. *UNL Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty: Annual Evaluations, Promotion, and Tenure* (subsequently referred to as *UNL Guidelines* (http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/documents/tenure_guide.pdf)).

B. Who is to be evaluated. All faculty are to be evaluated annually.

C. What informs annual evaluation. The basis for the annual evaluation is the faculty member’s:

- 1. self-appraisal of annual accomplishments
- 2. updated CV
- 3. other pertinent data available to the supervisor (e.g., course evaluations)
- 4. annual peer review of faculty accomplishments as appropriate
- 5. annual peer review of progress toward promotion and/or tenure (as appropriate)
- 6. the supervisor’s observations of the faculty member’s performance.

The faculty member’s annual report of faculty accomplishments must be submitted through Activity Insight (<https://ianr.unl.edu/activity-insight-resources>) by January 15 of the year following the calendar year for which the faculty member is being evaluated, although some units may request submission prior to that date. The faculty member’s self-appraisal is important documentation of annual accomplishments. Failure to submit a self-appraisal through Activity Insight and an updated CV by the deadline can result in a “Needs Improvement” or “Unsatisfactory” evaluation. If a supervisor uses additional information to that submitted by the faculty member or peer review committee (see above) to inform their evaluation, the faculty

member must be a) informed that this additional information is being taken into consideration, b) given the opportunity to review this information for themselves, and c) given the opportunity to present supplementary information.

- D. What is being evaluated.** Supervisors evaluate the quality and impact of a faculty member's accomplishments (e.g., products, outcomes) and contributions, in light of their apportionment and position description, over the course of the evaluation period. Faculty members should document accomplishments in each area of their apportionment in light of the expectations identified in their position description and unit (e.g., department, school, college, extension) documents. While faculty members may be given credit for contributions and accomplishments outside their apportionment and that are not stated in their position description, these contributions and accomplishments do not replace apportionment and job description expectations unless previously agreed upon and approved by the faculty member's supervisor or other appropriate IANR administrator. Faculty members' contributions to the culture/climate and inclusive excellence within the unit and IANR are subject to evaluation regardless of apportionment and position description. It is also expected that faculty members will contribute to an atmosphere of intellectual honesty and demonstrate integrity, academic responsibility, and ongoing professional development in all aspects of their work. A faculty member may receive an overall rating of "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory" for deficiencies in only one performance area, despite accomplishments in other performance areas. This includes the faculty member's contributions to culture/climate and inclusive excellence within the unit.
- E. The role of peer review in annual evaluation.** Annual peer review is expected of all tenure-line faculty members who are not fully promoted and/or not yet tenured. Annual peer review is expected of all faculty practice-, research faculty-, and Extension faculty-line faculty members who are not fully promoted.

The composition of the unit peer review committee (including how faculty members are selected for service on this committee) is determined at the unit level, and must be documented to ensure consistency, transparency, and fairness. The peer review committee reviews the faculty member's annual report of accomplishments (i.e., Activity Insight report) and CV in conducting their annual review of the faculty member's accomplishments. For those not yet fully promoted, an outcome of this review is a peer review committee indication of whether or not, in their judgment, the faculty member is making progress toward promotion and/or tenure (see Section IV.E). Unit peer review committees document their review using the *IANR Annual Faculty Progress Form*. The results of this review should inform the supervisor's evaluation.

- F. The annual evaluation rubric.** Supervisors of IANR faculty members are required to use a standard *Academic Performance Evaluation and Professional Development of Faculty* form and rubric. The form has spaces for the supervisor to document their evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments; impacts; and organizational, team, and communication competencies. "Good Work" is the performance rating that is the standard of excellence expected of all IANR faculty. "Outstanding Work" is the performance rating given when the faculty member documents significant successes beyond normal expectations, and "Extraordinary Year" is reserved for the occasional year in which the faculty member achieves meaningful programmatic impacts and accomplishments far above their peers. A "Needs Improvement" performance rating is used when a faculty member falls below expectations in one or more areas of their apportionment, and when it is believed that corrective action will result in the faculty member being able to return to a satisfactory performance rating. A "Needs Improvement" rating is not to be used

in more than two consecutive years. A substantial chronic deficiency in performance warrants an “Unsatisfactory” performance rating. For tenured faculty members, an “Unsatisfactory” performance rating may trigger post-tenure review.

- G. The responsibility of the supervisor in annual evaluation.** The annual performance review should provide feedback on how well the faculty member is performing in relation to their assigned duties and, most importantly, where and how the faculty member might improve that performance. It serves neither the faculty member nor the institution's best interest when the evaluation is overstated or understated, or when it does not indicate how the faculty member might improve. Even faculty members who receive a rating of “Outstanding Work” and “Extraordinary Year” may benefit from constructive feedback about how they might improve their performance.
- H. Faculty members’ right to review their annual performance evaluation.** The *UNL Guidelines* require that prior to finalization of the supervisor’s written evaluation, the faculty member must be given the opportunity to meet with the supervising administrator to discuss their performance evaluation. The finalized written evaluation is given to the faculty member for review and signature. The faculty member’s signature on the evaluation indicates that they received it, not that they are in agreement with all aspects of the evaluation. The faculty member has the option of including written comments on the evaluation form, or of including a separate letter that will be attached to the supervisor’s evaluation and becomes part of the faculty member’s personnel file.
- I. Guidance relating to faculty members at Research, Extension, and Education Centers (REEC).** Annual evaluation of faculty members whose work stations are at an REEC are conducted by their department head/school director or, in the case of extension educators, their Engagement Zone coordinator or program leader (as appropriate). For faculty members whose work station is at an REEC, the REEC director should communicate prior to January 15 with the faculty member’s supervisor about their assessment of the faculty member’s performance and contributions to the REEC. The REEC director does not conduct an annual evaluation of the faculty member. The observations of the REEC director inform the supervisor’s annual evaluation of the faculty member.
- J. Guidance relating to faculty members contributing to IANR Program Areas or who have a formal affiliation with a center or institute.** Annual evaluation of faculty members who have a formal affiliation with a center (e.g., Plant Sciences Innovation Center) or institute (e.g., Daugherty Water for Food Global Institute) are conducted by their department head/school director. The program leader or director should communicate prior to January 15 with the faculty member’s supervisor about their assessment of the faculty member’s performance and contributions to the program or center/institute. The program leader or center/institute director does not conduct an annual evaluation of the faculty member, however, their observations inform the supervisor’s annual evaluation of the faculty member.
- K. Guidance relating to a faculty members with a joint appointment.** For faculty members with a minority appointment in an academic unit, the minority unit leader provides feedback to the leader of the majority unit on the faculty member’s accomplishments and contributions to the minority unit. This may be done verbally or in writing, but must be done before the annual evaluation is finalized. It is expected that the majority unit leader will incorporate this feedback into their written evaluation of the faculty member.

SECTION III -- REAPPOINTMENT

- A. General guidelines.** For faculty members on specific term appointments (tenure leading probationary faculty members), the specific term of their appointment is one year. With satisfactory annual reviews, reappointment is assumed and automatic up to the tenure notification date specified in the faculty member's letter of offer (or properly executed addendum or approved request for tenure extension). If a negative tenure decision appears inevitable, it is in the best interest of both the university and the faculty member to notify the faculty member of non-reappointment at the earliest possible date.

Many faculty members with special appointment contracts (non-tenure leading) have an appointment for a stated term. Exceptions are often, but not always, extension educators, foresters, and geoscientists. The stated term of special appointments generally range from 1-3 years, but may, in special circumstances, be up to 5 years.

For special appointment faculty members on a faculty practice line (i.e., professor of practice, research professor, and extension professor), specific action by an appropriate administrator is required to reappoint the faculty member to another stated term. If action is not taken, continuation for an additional 12 months is assumed and automatic. In the event of non-reappointment, if the stated term of the appointment expires at the end of one year or sooner, notice shall be given by an appropriate administrative officer not less than three months in advance of the termination date. If the stated term of appointment expires after one year of continuous service, but not later than two years, notice shall be given by an appropriate administrative officer not less than six months in advance of the termination date. If the stated term of appointment expires three years or more, notice shall be given by an appropriate administrative officer no less than 12 months in advance of the termination date.

- B. Reappointment recommendation of probationary and special appointment faculty members.** If the appropriate administrator, after reviewing the entire record, recommends reappointment to another stated term, this is forwarded to the dean(s) by indicating appropriately on the "Faculty Annual Progress Form" referenced above in B.4.

SECTION IV – TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION IN RANK

- A. General guidelines.** *University Bylaws* and the *UNL Guidelines* at the web sites identified in Section II.A.
- B. Who is eligible for tenure and/or promotion.** To be eligible for tenure, a faculty member must be appointed to a specific term tenure-line position. Tenure-eligible faculty members have probationary year-to-year appointments until granted tenure. Unless already fully promoted, probationary faculty are eligible for promotion. Special appointment (non-tenure line faculty members) who are in professor of practice, research professor, extension professor, extension educator, forester, and geoscientist positions are eligible for promotion if they are not already fully promoted.
- C. IANR promotion criteria.** A recommendation for promotion shall be based on "IANR Criteria for Appointment and Promotion in Rank". Unit and disciplinary specific criteria for promotion is

available through each unit leader's office.

D. IANR tenure criteria. The University Bylaws (Section 4.5) state that each major administrative unit of the university shall prepare written standards which shall be used in making all decisions on awarding continuous appointment (tenure). In IANR, a recommendation for tenure shall be based upon the IANR standards, "Criteria for Granting Continuous Appointment, The University of Nebraska Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources" which can be found at <https://ianr.unl.edu/policies/promotion-and-tenure>.

E. Annual feedback toward tenure and/or promotion.

1. The appropriate administrator will provide for a peer review committee of three or more faculty members who are eligible to vote on an application for tenure and/or promotion. This committee may be the unit Promotion and Tenure Committee/Promotion Committee or may be a separate committee specially charged with conducting annual peer review. A committee member shall not be eligible to provide feedback on or engage in committee discussions leading to a recommendation of progress toward promotion on a candidate aspiring to a rank not yet achieved by the committee member. Committee members who are not tenured are not eligible to provide feedback on or engage in committee discussions leading to a recommendation on a pre-tenure line faculty member's progress toward tenure.
2. The unit's peer review committee should provide written feedback to the faculty member regarding progress toward tenure and/or promotion of each promotable and tenure eligible faculty member. This should be done annually.
3. The faculty member may, but is not required to share previous year's supervisor's performance evaluations with the unit peer review committee.
4. The appropriate administrator reviews the peer review committee's comments on progress towards tenure and/or promotion and makes an informed yet independent appraisal of the faculty member's progress. For faculty members located at REECs, who have a formal affiliation with a center or institute, or who, through formal affiliation, are contributing to the priority programs of IANR, this appraisal is made with input from the REEC director, or leader of the center, institute or program. The appropriate administrator then shares his/her appraisal, as well as that of the peer review committee and REEC director (or equivalent, if appropriate), in a meeting with the faculty member to review their annual evaluation.
5. The unit peer review committee and unit leader should use the IANR "Faculty Annual Progress Form" for written feedback to faculty.
6. If a negative tenure decision appears inevitable, it is in the best interest of both the university and the faculty member to notify the faculty member of non-reappointment at the earliest date possible.

F. Tenure and/or promotion files. The candidate is responsible for documenting the case for tenure and/or promotion. This includes writing candidate statements that illustrate the significance of their contributions, accomplishments, and impacts, and including appropriate documentation of these contributions, accomplishments and impacts through their CV; student, peer and administrator reviews and evaluations; and other supporting material.

The current IANR Documentation Request for Promotion and/or Tenure is found on the IANR Promotion and Tenure web page at <https://ianr.unl.edu/policies/promotion-and-tenure>. While the appropriate administrator is responsible for providing material to be included in the administrative section, it is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that this material is organized appropriately and that all the necessary elements are included.

The department head/school director (or other appropriate administrator) sets the date for submitting the file to permit adequate time for deliberations and due process at each stage of review. The candidate is entitled to access all materials in the file and to know the identity of everyone who reviews the file. Candidates must be informed of the content and source of any substantive new evidence to be added to the existing file, and they have a right to add commentary in response to any of this new information at any point as their materials progress through each stage of review.

- G. External letters of review.** In IANR, external review letters are mandatory for tenure and/or promotion files of tenure line faculty members who are being considered for tenure and/or promotion (associate or full); and faculty practice faculty members who have appointments of professor of practice, research professor, or extension professor who are being considered for full promotion (external letters are not needed for promotion from assistant to associate). Extension educator and forester files do not require external review.

The UNL Guidelines state as mandatory procedures:

A candidate may waive the right to access outside reviews and/or the right to know the identity of outside reviewers. Such waivers shall not be assumed, implied or coerced, and must be executed in writing prior to solicitation of outside reviewers. The scope of the waiver shall be clearly indicated in writing. A copy of any waiver executed by a faculty member shall become a part of the file. (A copy of “Waiver of Right to See Information Form” is located at <https://executivevc.unl.edu/faculty/evaluation-recognition/promotion-tenure>).

All external evaluation letters must assess the quality and impact of the candidate’s research or creative activity; extension education and/or engagement/outreach; and/or teaching. When external reviewers are solicited for reviews, they should receive copies of the candidate statement(s), CV, and any other materials (e.g., examples of publications) that will allow them to evaluate the quality and impact of the candidate’s work across all areas of their work responsibility. Disciplinary expectations and unit-level guidelines exist that help determine what material external reviewers receive.

Those conducting external reviews should be asked to not provide an assessment of whether the candidate would be tenured or promoted at their institution.

It is the responsibility of the unit leader, the chair of the tenure and promotion committee, or the dean—not the candidate—to solicit external letters for review. The *UNL Guidelines* state: *Any unit that intends to solicit outside reviews as a part of its review process shall develop rules for solicitation of such reviews that are consistent with this section. In situations where outside review is undertaken, the faculty member is entitled to know how, and by whom, the panel of potential reviewers is to be identified and selected. Every reasonable effort must be made to assure that the external reviewers represent an appropriate subset of peers; a candidate shall have the opportunity to propose names to the panel and to object to the inclusion of others, but the final identification of the reviewers remains the responsibility of the person charged with conducting the review.*

It is preferable that reviewers have full professorial rank, however, external reviewers must occupy a rank equal to or above that being considered for the candidate. Reviewers must be chosen who are qualified to judge the quality of the candidate’s outcomes, products,

accomplishments and impacts because of their own knowledge of the field. With few exceptions, it is expected that reviewers hold faculty or administrator positions at institutions comparable to or more highly-regarded than UNL.

When external reviews are required, the tenure and/or promotion file must include at least three external (to UNL) and independent letters of review. “Independent” means letters will be from individuals who have had no (or only limited) professional or personal relationships with the candidate and who have been chosen by the unit leader (or the tenure and promotion committee or dean, as appropriate) for their ability to provide an objective assessment. These would not include dissertation advisors, current or former collaborators, former colleagues, personal friends or others who have any special relationship to the candidate. For cases in which the extreme prominence of a candidate for full professor makes independent letters impracticable, special care should be taken to solicit letters from exceptionally prominent reviewers.

A document should be included in the candidate’s file that clearly identifies whether the external reviewers were nominated by the unit (e.g., unit leader, P&T committee) or the candidate, the qualifications of each reviewer, and the relationship (if any) of the reviewer to the candidate. A copy of the letter template soliciting the review should also be included in the candidate file. While a unit leader may determine their unique template, a sample letter, “Model Letter Soliciting External Reviews” is located at <https://executivevc.unl.edu/faculty/evaluation-recognition/promotion-tenure>. Other external letters of review, not independent and/or solicited by the unit, may be included but must be so identified in the file.

- H. Unit promotion and tenure committee/promotion committee.** In IANR departments and schools, the department head/school director will provide for a P&T committee of three or more faculty members with tenure and who are eligible to vote on an application for promotion. These committees will evaluate materials for candidates for tenure and/or promotion for probationary, tenured-not fully promoted, and special appointment (non-tenure line) faculty members, with the exception of extension educators and foresters. For faculty members with extension educator and forester appointments, the appropriate administrator will provide for a promotion committee consisting of three or more faculty members who are eligible to vote on an application for promotion. A committee member shall not be eligible to engage in committee deliberations or vote on a recommendation for a candidate aspiring to a rank not yet achieved by the committee member. Committee members who are not tenured are not eligible to engage in deliberations or vote on a recommendation for a candidate being considered for tenure.
1. The unit leader shall not be a member of the promotion and tenure/promotion committee.
 2. The promotion and tenure/promotion committee may be either appointed or elected in accordance with the rules of each administrative unit.
 3. For tenure-line and faculty practice-line faculty members, one or more faculty members with work station assignments at an REEC shall be included on the committees of those administrative units with one or more faculty members located at an REEC.
 4. An administrative unit may include IANR faculty members from outside the unit in order to meet the minimum committee size and REEC representation requirements.
- I. Directors of REECs, centers, institutes, and program leaders.** Promotion and/or tenure recommendations are provided by the candidate’s primary supervisor. Directors of REECs and other centers and institutes, program leaders, and engagement zone coordinators provide a letter to be included in the Administrative Section of the candidate’s dossier when the candidate has a formal

affiliation with entity overseen by the leader. This letter should be evaluative of the candidate's work, accomplishments and contributions but stop short of providing a recommendation for promotion and/or tenure. The letter should be received prior to evaluation of the dossier by the appropriate peer review committee.

- J. Units in which a faculty member has a minority appointment.** For faculty members with a minority appointment in an academic unit, the minority unit leader provides a letter evaluative of the candidate's accomplishments and contributions to the minority unit. This letter is inserted to the Administrative Section prior to evaluation of the dossier by the majority unit leader.
- K. IANR deans.** The IANR deans are the deans of CASNR, ARD, CED, and CEHS. The deans evaluate and make recommendations on decisions related to tenure and/or promotion for all IANR faculty members. The deans who oversee apportionment responsibilities that correspond with the apportionment of candidates make joint recommendations for tenure and/or promotion decisions. The dean of CEHS is involved in the joint recommendations on all candidates who are faculty members in CEHS units.
- L. Guidance unique to decisions about tenure.**
1. The tenure evaluation process must be initiated in time to be concluded prior to the tenure notification date specified in the letter of offer.
 2. Faculty members have a right to request an extension to the tenure notification date. Extensions may be granted with the approval of the unit leader, dean(s), and IANR vice chancellor for extenuating circumstances that may interrupt a faculty member's ability to meet the standards for tenure eligibility. A faculty member who is granted a tenure extension cannot be held to a higher standard than that which is expected of any faculty member submitting materials on time. A faculty member submitting a request for tenure extension may submit materials according to their original timeframe without this being considered early.
 3. No person may be considered for tenure without his/her consent. Refusal to be considered at the mandatory time, however, is equivalent to resignation no later than at the end of the probationary period.
 4. At any level of the consideration process, a candidate may request that the nomination be withdrawn from further consideration, recognizing that if materials are being considered at the mandatory time that withdrawing materials is tantamount to resignation at the end of the probationary period.
 5. If tenure is being considered at the mandatory time, the file continues to advance to the IANR vice chancellor, regardless of the decision by the IANR dean(s).
 6. The IANR vice chancellor reviews the documentation file and makes an independent recommendation to the chancellor. If the IANR vice chancellor recommends against tenure and after reconsideration continues to recommend against tenure, the candidate has the right to appeal the decision to the chancellor. All nominations are forwarded to the chancellor, regardless of the decision at the dean(s) or IANR vice chancellor levels.
- M. Guidance unique to decisions about promotion in rank.**
1. Consideration for promotion is not compulsory. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to determine if and when they wish to be a candidate for promotion and to compile the file documenting evidence justifying promotion.
 2. Any member of the faculty, the unit leader, or a peer evaluation committee may encourage a

faculty member to submit his/her promotion application.

3. Promotion applications shall only be considered according to the published timeline.
4. At any stage of the consideration process, a candidate may request that their application be withdrawn from further consideration. Withdrawing an application for promotion does not have negative impact on the person's employment or status with the university.
5. If the IANR dean(s) recommend against promotion, the promotion process terminates. The candidate and the unit leader each have a right to appeal the decision to the IANR vice chancellor.
6. If the IANR dean(s) recommend promotion, the IANR vice chancellor reviews the documentation file, including letters from the unit committee, unit leader, and dean(s) to make an independent recommendation to the chancellor. If, in the evaluation process, a negative recommendation has been made by one of the reviewing parties and the IANR vice chancellor also makes a negative evaluation and the reconsideration process is complete, the process terminates. In this case, each of the reviewing parties making a positive recommendation has the right to appeal the decision to the chancellor.

N. When a candidate is being considered for tenure and promotion simultaneously.

1. The candidate's letter of intent should clearly indicate that they wish to be considered for both tenure and promotion.
2. The candidate shall submit only one file documenting their achievements. This file will be used to consider both tenure and promotion.
3. Groups or individuals acting on the file must make recommendations on tenure and promotion separately. For promotion and tenure committees, this means that they will conduct two separate votes, one for promotion and one for tenure. These votes and the reasons for them should be documented in the same letter.

O. Tenure and/or promotion materials review process.

1. Action taken by each of the reviewing parties (committee through the IANR vice chancellor) should be recorded on the "Faculty Promotion Tenure Recommendation Form.
2. The candidate must be informed of their right to obtain reasons for a negative recommendation. The candidate may request that reasons (and/or clarification of reasons) are provided in writing. Reasons provided in writing become part of the candidate's tenure and/or promotion documentation file.
3. The candidate has the right to request reconsideration of a negative recommendation at each stage of consideration. A reconsideration should be requested and deliberations completed before materials are advanced to the next stage.
4. An application is first considered at the unit level by the unit's promotion or promotion and tenure committee.
5. The recommendation of the committee, including the vote of the committee and a description of the reasons for the recommendation, are transmitted in writing to the unit leader, with a copy to the candidate and to the candidate's promotion file.
6. Following completion of deliberations by the unit's promotion or promotion and tenure committee, including any reconsideration of an initial decision, the unit leader reviews the entire record, which includes the letter from the unit's promotion or promotion and tenure committee, and makes an independent recommendation that is documented in writing and addressed to the dean(s), with a copy to the candidate. The documentation of the unit leader's recommendation becomes part of the candidate's file. The unit leader notifies the chair of the unit's promotion or promotion and tenure committee of the recommendation.
7. Following deliberations by the unit leader, including any reconsideration of an initial decision,

the IANR dean(s) with responsibility for any part of the candidate's apportionment review the candidate's materials and meet to determine a joint recommendation. The dean of CEHS participates in the deliberations for CEHS faculty members regardless of the apportionment configuration. The dean(s) document their recommendation to the IANR vice chancellor in writing, with a copy to the candidate, the candidate's promotion file, and the candidate's unit leader.

8. The four IANR deans meet to determine a joint recommendation, which is documented in writing using the Faculty Promotion Tenure Recommendation Form. This documentation is included in the candidate's file, which is transmitted to the IANR vice chancellor.
9. The IANR vice chancellor reviews the documentation file, including letters from the unit committee, unit leader, and dean(s) to make an independent recommendation to the chancellor.
10. If the chancellor decides against tenure and/or promotion, the IANR vice chancellor shall transmit the decision in writing to the dean(s), the unit leader, and the candidate.
11. Positive recommendations are reported to the Board of Regents.

P. Recommendation notification timelines.

1. The candidate must be notified of a group's or individual's recommendation within two working days of the decision.
2. The candidate must inform a group or individual not recommending promotion and/or tenure of their intent to request reconsideration (appeal the decision) within two working days after receipt of notification of the negative recommendation.
3. The candidate will have five working days after the initial notification to prepare the reconsideration/appeal which can be presented orally, in writing, or both.
4. The group or individual to whom the reconsideration is being made must inform the candidate of the decision within five working days after the reconsideration/appeal has been presented.