

PROMOTION IN RANK - NCTA

General Description

Promotions to higher rank are benchmarks in the process of faculty development and recognition. Initial decisions on recommendations for promotion are made by peers and administrators at the college level. The Board of Regents gives final approval to all promotions.

The guidelines that follow contain general criteria and procedures for promotion to specific ranks. However, a candidate for promotion cannot assume that meeting minimal criteria is automatically sufficient for promotion. Promotion decisions will be based upon an evaluation of a candidate's entire record. Employees with faculty rank who have long-term formal assignments other than teaching may be considered for promotion based on their performance in those alternate assignments. Specific criteria for promotion will be developed in writing at the time of appointment collaboratively between the Dean and the faculty member.

Criteria for Promotion to Specific Rank

Instructor

The instructor rank is largely used for persons who have not completed master's degrees or who lack other specific qualifications. In these cases, the criteria for promotion from instructor are agreed upon at the time of hiring and are given in the letter of offer. In the case of faculty members lacking a master's degree, promotion to the rank of assistant professor generally occurs at the beginning of the semester following the receipt at NCTA of official transcripts indicating the awarding of a master's degree.

Assistant Professor

Appointment to the rank of assistant professor signifies that a faculty member is well qualified to embark upon a full-fledged academic career. Qualifications include completion of a master's degree in the discipline, documented technical expertise, and demonstration of promising ability to facilitate student career success. In the period between appointment as an assistant professor and promotion to associate professor, terms expressed in the letter of offer, in the position description, in this document, and in the annual evaluations provide guidance regarding professional development to the faculty member, and to peers and administrators charged with judging progress toward promotion.

Associate Professor

To attain the rank of associate professor, the candidate should be an accomplished teacher, and document service in keeping with the individual's job responsibilities. These are the minimum requirements for promotion to the rank of associate professor at NCTA:

1. A master's degree in an appropriate field.
2. Six years of successful experience at the assistant professor rank.
3. For a minimum of six years immediately prior to applying for promotion, candidate has documented and reported assessment of student learning outcomes and documented use of the results to improve learning.
4. For a minimum of six years immediately prior to applying for promotion, candidate has conducted student evaluation of instruction in all courses.
5. Is competent and up-to-date in the subject matter taught.
6. Documented competence at facilitating student success.
7. Uses appropriate instructional technology.
8. Is involved in college-wide activities such as clubs, committees, etc.
9. Is supportive and nurturing to students both in and out of class.
10. Advises students accurately and regularly.
11. Gets along well with colleagues and other college employees.
12. Uses college resources efficiently and appropriately.

Professor

The rank of professor is the highest academic rank at NCTA. The rank of professor is reserved for those faculty members whose achievements are sufficient to merit recognition as distinguished authorities in their field and who hold the professional respect of their colleagues. Although it is the objective of the college to have all faculty sufficiently qualified to eventually gain promotion to professor, associate professors may stay at that rank for the duration of their careers.

To attain the rank of professor, most phases of the candidate's work must be judged excellent, evidencing a level of sustained high performance in the salient areas of the candidate's work assignment. Peers and administrators evaluating a candidate for promotion to the rank of professor should review documentation of the entire academic career to date. That record may include outside evaluations. The record of a successful candidate for promotion to the rank of professor must show evidence of sustained excellence over an extended period of time. These are the minimum requirements for promotion to the rank of professor at NCTA:

1. Doctoral degree in a relevant discipline. Doctorates geared towards improving teaching or improving the delivery of educational programs are considered relevant.
2. Seven years of successful experience at the associate professor rank.
3. For a minimum of seven years prior to consideration for promotion to professor, the candidate has documented and reported assessment of student learning outcomes and documented use of the results to improve learning.
4. For a minimum of seven years prior to consideration for promotion to professor, candidate has conducted student evaluations of instruction.
5. Documented excellence at facilitating student success (examples – student SLO attainment, student retention rate, student graduation rate, student pass rate on national exams, student contest results, student transfer rate, student successful completion of subsequent coursework, student self-assessment on course evaluations, employer assessment).
6. Documented high level expertise in the subject matter taught (examples – recent in-service education completion, consultancy assignments, student success, industry assessments).
7. Documented proficiency with appropriate instructional technology.
8. Provides leadership in college-wide activities such as clubs, committees, etc.
9. Is supportive and nurturing to students both in and out of class.
10. Advises students accurately and regularly.
11. Gets along well with colleagues and other college employees.
12. Uses college resources efficiently and appropriately.

Promotion Guidelines

Procedures for promotion are established by Board of Regents Bylaws and by academic tradition. The procedures outlined below should be followed in implementing the promotion process. Subject to approval by the appropriate college officials, divisions may adopt additional procedures which will accommodate needs appropriate to their specific missions and disciplines.

Division promotion deadlines may be adjusted annually, based upon the campus deadlines established by the Dean. The college deadlines must provide adequate opportunity for due process in the consideration of an applicant's submission of materials, including time to initiate proper responses to adverse recommendations.

Candidates are responsible for preparing an organized and succinct documentation file to support their promotion requests. Division chairs may advise candidates as to the form and substance of a documentation file. The only anonymous materials that can be included in the files are student evaluations. Documentation should be organized to comply with instructions from the Dean. The

recommendations from each review become a part of the file.

Files are to be submitted electronically in PDF format. Each of the 12 sections of the promotion file should be searchable as an independent chapter of one PDF file. Candidates are encouraged to use Adobe Pro to create their electronic promotion portfolio. Cover letters are to be attached as a second PDF file.

Except as provided in the following section, the candidate is entitled to access all materials in the file. Anyone with relevant information for inclusion into the file may provide that information at any time during the review process. The candidate must be informed of the content and source of any substantive new evidence added to the existing file. The candidate has a right to review and respond in writing to any such added material with the response becoming a part of the documentation file prior to any further consideration.

A candidate may choose to enhance their file with external letters of support from peers, industry representatives and community members. The promotion file should include a description of the qualifications of each reviewer, the relationship of the reviewer to the candidate, and a copy of the letter soliciting the review. The letter soliciting the review should use neutral language asking for an evaluation (not a letter of support) and should indicate to the reviewer whether or not the candidate has waived the right to read the letters.

Any unit that intends to solicit outside reviews as part of its promotion 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. A candidate shall have the opportunity to propose names to the panel, but the final identification of the reviewers remains the responsibility of the person charged with conducting the review. The faculty member also has the right, unless waived, to have a copy of any review received and to append a written response to each copy of the review that is to be used for evaluation purposes.

A candidate may waive the right to access outside reviews and/or the right to know the identity of outside reviewers. The scope of the waiver shall be clearly indicated in writing prior to solicitation of outside reviews. A copy of any waiver executed by a faculty member shall become a part of the file. Any letter soliciting an outside review shall inform the potential reviewer of the extent to which the contents of the review or the identity of the reviewer will be known to the candidate.

A candidate may request that a colleague assist in preparing appropriatedocumentation. Both the candidate and the adviser should be aware of the potential conflict of interest that may arise should the adviser be required to vote on the nomination later in the process. An agreement to provide counsel and advice to the candidate does not imply a commitment to support the candidate's nomination.

Review Procedures

Review shall be conducted at five levels:

1. Division Chair
2. College Committee
3. Dean
4. Vice President
5. Board of Regents

If a negative recommendation occurs at any two sequential steps in this process, the promotion request is denied and the application does not move forward. At any level of the consideration process, a candidate may request that the promotion request be withdrawn from further consideration and such request shall be honored without prejudice to future attempts to secure promotion.

As the first step in the review process, the division chair reviews the entire record and makes a recommendation that is transmitted in writing to the candidate and to the college committee. If the chair/head or unit administrator recommends against promotion, the candidate must be informed of the negative recommendation within two working days, and has five working days to respond and ask for reconsideration. If the recommendation against promotion is inconsistent with previous annual evaluations, the administrator must, as part of the recommendation, submit a written explanation of the inconsistency. When division chairs are reviewed for promotion, this step is skipped and the promotion consideration goes directly to the college committee.

Normally it is expected that the chair/head or unit administrator will participate in the deliberations at the committee level as a nonvoting member. Under all circumstances, the chair/head or unit administrator shall have the opportunity to meet with the committee to discuss the promotion request.

A promotion request is first considered at the college level by a committee of four colleagues. The committee normally is composed of the persons in the college who hold the rank equal to or higher than that to which a candidate aspires. When this is not possible, the appropriate peer evaluation committee shall consist of colleagues who, by virtue of rank, credentials, and experience, are able to make informed judgments about the candidate. The Faculty Senate shall submit four names of potential committee members for consideration by the Dean and the Dean shall pick two out of the list of four. The Dean's Council shall elect two additional members of the committee.

The discussion at all meetings should be free and candid, and shall be based on material in the file. Candidates shall be given an opportunity to review and respond to any substantive new material introduced at a committee meeting. It is the responsibility of the individual conducting the meeting to make the necessary judgments concerning the substantive nature of any new material, to convey new information to the person being evaluated and, if necessary, to delay the vote or decision until the person has had the opportunity to respond. Candidates may be given a maximum of five working days to respond in writing to any new information. The committee recommendation and the vote of the committee, which may be done by secret ballot, are transmitted in writing to all involved parties by way of the Promotion File Transmittal Form.

If the candidate is not recommended for promotion by the division chair or the faculty committee, the candidate may request reasons for the adverse recommendation. The faculty member may develop a rebuttal statement to be added to the promotion file.

Following the completion of deliberations by the college committee, the Dean reviews the entire record for quality of the application and to ensure that proper standards and procedures are being applied by the college. Based on this review, the Dean makes an independent recommendation that is transmitted in writing to the Vice President, Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources, to the candidate, and to the division chair. If the Dean recommends against promotion, the candidate must be informed of the ability to obtain reasons. If the decision of the Dean recommends promotion, the documentation file must be transmitted to the Vice President for consideration.

The Vice President reviews the documentation file and makes an independent decision concerning promotion. As part of the review process, the Vice President is encouraged to discuss problematic cases with the Dean. If the Vice President makes a negative recommendation, the process terminates. If the Vice President recommends in favor of promotion, the nomination is forwarded to the Board of Regents for final approval.

If a candidate feels college procedures are not being followed, the first recommended course of action is

to discuss the situation with the responsible administrators. If the issue is not resolved to the satisfaction of the candidate, the candidate is encouraged to meet with the Dean to discuss the issue.

Content of Promotion Portfolio

The candidate is responsible for submitting a succinct and organized promotion portfolio. The college may consider the development of an electronic submission format for promotion portfolios. Generally, the portfolio consists of a 3-ring binder, 3 inches or smaller starting with an **Administrative Section** that contains:

1. Promotion File Transmittal Form (blank copy attached).
2. A letter of transmittal from the candidate to the Division Chair requesting consideration for promotion, including a brief statement from the candidate justifying the application for promotion.
3. Letters of appointment or position descriptions, reappointment and record of any position changes.
4. Curriculum Vitae.

A **candidate’s evidence section** divided into 12 sections is required for promotion to each rank, each section addressing the criteria for promotion listed earlier in this document. Each of the 12 sections should consist of an introductory page with a brief narrative explaining how the faculty member meets the criteria. For sections 3 and 4, involving student learning outcomes and student evaluation of instruction, the candidate shall include a table at the beginning of the section providing a summary of each issue. This is the recommended format for the table:

Table 3. Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Measurement and Use of Results

Year	SLO measured (Y or N)	Documented application of results (Y or N)	Notes/references
2016	Y	Y	All courses completed. Summary attached
2015	Y	Y	All courses completed
2014	Y	Y	All courses completed
2013	N	N	Process had not been initiated at NCTA
2012	N	N	
2011	N	N	

Table 4. Summary of Student Evaluation of Instruction Results

Year	SEI measured (Y or N)	Summary results (question 4 ?)	Notes/references
2016	Y	3.4	All courses completed in all years. Summary attached for all years
2015	Y	4	
2014	Y	3.2	
2013	Y	4.5	
2012	Y	4.2	
2011	Y	3.2	

Supporting evidence may be included in each section. If supporting evidence is submitted, it should be preceded by a table of contents. Summary documents from annual evaluations may be included in the portfolio. Summary information is required as evidence of engagement in the complete student learning outcomes process. Candidates are also required to provide evidence of student evaluation of instruction conducted in each class. Evaluators may request additional information from the candidate but it is the responsibility of the candidate to provide a complete and organized portfolio that makes a compelling case for promotion.

Raises Associated with Promotions

Promotion to the rank of associate professor shall be accompanied by a 7% raise and promotion to the rank of professor shall be accompanied by a 9% raise.

Procedures, Timeline and Responsible Party

Timeline	Responsible party	Action
July 1	HR office	Human resources office informs individuals eligible for promotion
July 15	Dean	Announcement of the availability of raises with promotion
September 15	Candidate	Candidate submits application
September 20	Division chair	Division Chair review completed
October 1	Candidate	Deadline for candidate submission of additional information based on Chair review
October 15	Chair of committee	College committee review completed
November 1	Candidate	Deadline for candidate submission of additional information based on committee review
November 15	Dean	Dean review completed
December 1	Business Office	Inform IANR of promotion decisions
	VP	VP review completed
	Board of Regents	Board of Regents review completed

References

The primary sources of guidance for the development of this document and the evaluation and promotion of faculty at NCTA are:

1. The Bylaws of the University of Nebraska Board of Regents (<http://nebraska.edu/board/bylaws-policies-and-rules.html>)
2. The University of Nebraska-Lincoln *Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty: Annual Evaluations, Promotion, and Tenure* (http://svcaa.unl.edu/documents/tenure_guide.pdf)
3. The UNL Institute for Agriculture and Natural Resources *Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty: Annual Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment* (<http://ianr.unl.edu/img/resources/IANR%20Guidelines%20for%20Evaluation%20of%20Faculty%20Promotion%20Tenure%20Reappointment%202015.pdf>).

Promotion File Transmittal Form

NEBRASKA COLLEGE OF TECHNICAL AGRICULTURE
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

Faculty Member _____ Current Rank _____ Date of Rank: _____
Proposed Promotion to Rank of: _____

ACTION BY DIVISION CHAIR

Recommended _____ Not Recommended _____ (Initial one) Date _____

Division Chair Signature _____

Comments (attach additional documents, if necessary): _____

ACTION BY APPOINTED RANK & PROMOTION COMMITTEE

Recommended _____ Not Recommended _____ (Initial one) Date _____

Committee Chair Signature _____

Comments (attach additional documents, if necessary): _____

ACTION BY DEAN

Recommended _____ Not Recommended _____ (Initial one) Date _____

Dean Signature _____

Comments (attach additional documents, if necessary): _____

ACTION BY VICE PRESIDENT

Recommended _____ Not Recommended _____ (Initial one) Date _____

Vice President Signature _____

Comments (attach additional documents, if necessary): _____

ACTION BY BOARD OF REGENTS

Recommended _____ Not Recommended _____ (Initial one) Date _____

Comments: _____