

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE ASSOCIATE IN ARTS PROGRAM

Policies and Procedures for Promotion

1. Promotion Policies

1. Introduction

The University of Delaware Associate in Arts Program (AA Program) is primarily a multidisciplinary program designed for students to complete the Associate in Arts degree program at three academic centers located in three Delaware Technical and Community College campuses throughout the state. To assure that candidates, the AA Program, and the University are well served, the AA Program will establish a Promotion Committee which must be sensitive to the special situation of the AA faculty, as indicated by the AA Program's charter, and in accordance with the standards set forth by the University.

2. Committee Composition

1. The Promotion Committee shall be elected by the faculty and shall consist of three full-time AA Program faculty members, one from each campus of the Program. Committee members shall be elected for a term of three years, of an appropriate rank, and, if possible, in the candidates' disciplines. The terms of the members should be staggered so as to provide continuity. Where possible, the faculty member who has served the longest on the Committee shall be the chairperson.
2. In the case of a candidate seeking promotion to Associate or Full Professor, the Committee shall request that at least one but no more than two faculty members who are in the candidate's discipline, from the University, but not from the AA Program, also serve on the Committee. The actual number of faculty members selected from the candidate's discipline shall be set by an agreement reached between the faculty member and the AA Promotion Committee. Such members of the Committee shall serve for only one year.

3. General Considerations

1. All decisions to grant promotion shall follow the review of credentials both by appropriate faculty committees and by administrative officers.
2. Faculty are appointed to regular faculty positions in keeping with the contractual provisions for continuing full-time, non-tenure track faculty.

4. Committee Responsibilities

The Committee is responsible for the following:

1. Advising faculty members on how to prepare the dossier, what the regulations and procedures are, and other relevant matters.
2. Reviewing the dossier of the candidate seeking promotion.
3. Seeking two kinds of confidential evaluations: 1) those from a significant sample of former students randomly selected from the final grade rosters of all the candidate's courses since the last promotion; and 2) those from former students who may have been selected by the candidate but not by the committee. This second group of student evaluations must be clearly marked as selected by the candidate.
4. Arranging one or two classroom observations of the candidate by the chairperson of the promotion committee or by the faculty member who is from the candidate's department and serving on the committee.
5. Obtaining at least four confidential letters of evaluation. These letters shall assess the candidacy of persons seeking promotion to Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor. The writers of these letters shall be qualified persons who are not from the University of Delaware but who are informed about, and sensitive to, the special situation of the University AA faculty. The candidate and the committee shall both suggest names of potential reviewers, and the candidate shall have the opportunity to comment upon unacceptable reviewers, although the final selection of reviewers will be made by the Committee.

5. Candidate's Rights and Responsibilities

The faculty member seeking promotion has the following responsibilities:

1. She/he shall consult the appropriate resources regarding content and preparation of the dossier.
2. She/he may submit the names and addresses of persons qualified to speak to the candidate's performance. If the candidate is seeking promotion to Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor, this list, which is mandatory in these cases, must include at least two qualified reviewers who are external to the University and who can comment knowledgeably about the candidate's achievement. Solicitation of these evaluations must follow certain guidelines:

1. The Promotion Committee may suggest at least two reviewers as well.
 2. She/he shall supply such evidence that she/he feels may be necessary for a fair evaluation of her/his performance.
 3. The Committee ultimately selects the reviewers and solicits the confidential reviews; however, the candidate shall have the opportunity to comment upon unacceptable reviewers.
 4. Each request for a peer review should be accompanied by a letter soliciting the evaluation, a curriculum vitae or biographical statement describing the reviewer's credentials, a description of the faculty member's primary duties and responsibilities in the AA Program, and a copy of the AA Program's Promotion Criteria.
 3. The candidate must submit a completed dossier to the chairperson of the AA Program's Promotion Committee in accordance with the established schedule.
 4. The candidate may submit a list of students for written evaluations. For these evaluations, the students will not be randomly selected but will be the sole choice of the candidate. These student evaluations must be clearly marked as the candidate's selection.
 5. After any length of service, the faculty member has the right to apply for promotion and has the sole right, at any step, to advance the dossier or to submit a letter of withdrawal from the promotion process.
2. Review Procedures for Candidates Seeking Promotion.
1. The members of the Promotion Committee establish the composition of the Committee according to the rank that the candidate is seeking.
 2. After initial review of the dossier, the Committee may (indeed, is encouraged to) consult with the candidate regarding additional evidence that might clarify the dossier.
 3. The Promotion Committee will make a recommendation to the whole body of AA faculty, which, together with the outside committee member(s) from within the University, will vote on the candidate's application.

4. The result of the review, which will include the numerical vote, recommendations, and the reasons for the decision, will be transmitted in writing to the candidate and, if the candidate decides to continue, to the Director of the AA Program.
5. After receiving the Committee's recommendations, any candidate wishing to appeal must do so, in writing, to the chairperson of the AA Program Promotion Committee within five (5) working days.
6. Upon receipt of a written appeal, the Committee will hold a hearing with the candidate within five (5) working days.
7. The final decision of the Committee will be forwarded, in writing, to the candidate and the AA Program Director.
8. The AA Program Director shall review the dossier and shall either endorse or recommend against promotion in a written notification to the candidate and the AA Program Promotion Committee. The Director shall also forward the dossiers and statements of action on them to the appropriate committees and individuals.

3. Schedule

The time schedule for the promotion process is as follows:

15 March	Candidate notifies the campus faculty coordinator in writing of his or her intention to apply for promotion. The Program Promotion Committee begins the process of soliciting evaluations.
September 1	Dossier to Promotion Committee and Program Director
October 1	Committee's recommendation to the Program Director.
October 15	Program Director's recommendation to the College Committee and Dean.
December 1	College Committee's recommendation to the College Dean.
January 2	Dean's recommendation to the University Promotions and Tenure Committee.
February 15	University Promotions and Tenure Committee recommendations to Provost.
February 28	Provost's recommendations.

Five (5) working days allowed for candidate's written appeal. Five (5) working days allowed for Committee hearing.

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE AA PROGRAM PROMOTION CRITERIA

4. Introduction

It is the candidate's responsibility to present the best case for promotion. The AA Program embraces a wider range of academic disciplines than most other academic units in the College of Arts & Sciences. Therefore the case made by a candidate must be judged within the context of the candidate's discipline and of the AA Program. It is incumbent upon the candidate to provide evidence showing that she/he meets the criteria of the AA Program, and the evaluation of this evidence is a matter of professional academic judgment.

5. Terms of Evaluation

To rate the teaching, research, and service of a candidate, the Promotion Committee will employ the following terms:

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory High Quality Excellent

The basis for these ratings will be the evidence which, as indicated in Organization and Presentation of Materials, section B, a candidate must present. The definitions of these ratings are given below, in accordance with the qualifications for promotion to each rank.

6. Standards of Promotion

1. Promotion to the Rank of Assistant Professor

For promotion to this rank, a candidate should provide the evidence that justifies the following ratings: high quality in two categories and satisfactory in one category, with a minimum of high quality in teaching. To be rated high quality in teaching, the candidate must meet the high standards of the AA Program. To be rated high quality in scholarship, the candidate must show evidence of scholarly activity as well as potential for future growth. To be rated satisfactory in scholarship, the candidate must show some evidence of scholarly activity. To be rated high quality in service, the candidate must show sufficiently meaningful involvement and leadership in the AA Program, the University, and the community. To be rated satisfactory in service, the candidate must show meaningful involvement in, and contribution to, the AA Program and the University.

2. Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

A merely satisfactory or adequate record as an Assistant Professor is not sufficient; there must be clear indications that the candidate has attained high levels of accomplishment and will continue to contribute. As a result, the candidate should provide evidence and documents entitling him or her to the following ratings: excellent in one category, high quality in another, and satisfactory in a third, with a minimum of high quality in teaching. To be rated as excellent in teaching, the candidate must meet the high standards of the AA Program, which particularly stresses outstanding teaching, and show significant potential for growth. To be rated high quality in teaching, the candidate must satisfy the high standards of the AA Program. To be rated excellent in scholarship, the candidate must show evidence of significant and continuing scholarly achievement as well as potential for future growth. To be rated high quality in scholarship, the candidate must show sufficiently meaningful scholarly activity as well as potential for future growth. To be rated satisfactory in scholarship, the candidate must show some evidence of scholarly activity and achievement. To be rated excellent in service, the candidate must show significant and continuing involvement and leadership in the AA Program, the University, and the community. To be rated high quality in service, the candidate must show sufficiently meaningful involvement and leadership in the AA Program, the University, and the community. To be rated satisfactory in service, the candidate must show meaningful involvement in, and contribution to, the AA Program and the University.

3. Promotion to the Rank of Professor

This rank is reserved for individuals who have established reputations in their disciplines and whose contributions to the University's mission are unquestioned. Academic contributions are expected to be primarily at the national/international levels. The candidate must present sufficient evidence and materials to justify the following ratings: excellent in one category and high quality in two categories, with a minimum of high quality in teaching. To be rated as excellent in teaching, the candidate must meet the high standards of the AA Program, which particularly stresses outstanding teaching, and show significant potential for growth. To be rated high quality in teaching, the candidate must satisfy the high standards of the AA Program. To be rated excellent in scholarship, the candidate must show evidence of significant and continuing scholarly achievement as well as potential for future growth. To be rated high quality in scholarship, the candidate must show evidence of sufficiently meaningful scholarly activity as well as potential for future growth. To be rated excellent in service, the candidate must show significant and continuing involvement and leadership in the AA Program, the University, and the community. To be rated high quality in service, the candidate must show sufficiently meaningful involvement and leadership in the AA Program, the University, and the community.

7. Organization and Presentation of Materials.

The Faculty member's dossier should conform to the following pattern:

1. Introductory Material
 1. Contents and Guidelines
 - a. Recommendation for Promotion Form
 - b. A table of contents
 - c. A copy of the college's and the AA Program's promotion and tenure criteria
 2. Application for Promotion
 - a. Candidate's letter requesting promotion
 - b. A curriculum vitae
 - c. Candidate's statement (optional)
 3. Internal Recommendations
 - a. The AA Program committee's recommendation
 - b. The AA Program Director's recommendation
 - c. College committee's recommendation (if any)
 - d. College Dean's recommendation or endorsement
 - e. University committee's recommendation
 - f. Any appeal materials (appeals and rebuttals)
 4. External Recommendations
 - a. Letters of evaluation from peer reviewers together with supporting material. These letters will be numbered sequentially for reference.
 - b. Candidate's statement (optional)

2. Evidential Material

1. Teaching

A candidate can achieve an appropriate rating by providing evidence of mastery of the subject matter; sensitivity to the interests, needs and concerns of students; and the ability to broaden the students' perspectives. One must incorporate into the dossier several kinds of evidence of this excellence.

1. Peer evaluations that attest to the candidate's pedagogical competence, knowledge of the subject matter, organization and

preparation, ability to stimulate intellectual curiosity and willingness to work, innovative capacity and the like.

2. Student evaluations, properly tabulated and summarized, with means, standard deviations, and the rate of return for each question. The procedures used in administering the evaluations should also be described. Only those evaluations obtained since the last promotion may be included.
3. Verbatim copies of student comments from student evaluations may also be included, subject to the faculty member's judgment.
4. Syllabi, bibliographies, or course outlines which are new or innovative.
5. Interactions with students which relate to learning but which take place in non-traditional settings.
6. Detailed self-evaluations, including the analysis and appraisal of the following:
 - (1) course objectives and success in meeting them,
 - (2) innovative techniques and methods in teaching performance, including success with the innovations, and
 - (3) new courses designed by the candidate or old courses restructured by him or her.
7. Class visitations by AA promotion committee chairperson and/or by a faculty member from the candidate's discipline.
8. (Optional administrative evaluations. The candidate may request a visit by his or her Faculty Coordinator or the AA Program Director. The faculty member will consult about the best date of the visit, the administrator will explain his or her criteria of evaluation in advance, and, after the visit, the administrator will provide the faculty member a written statement of his or her teaching effectiveness.)

2. Scholarship

Evidence which can justify an appropriate rating should be of the following kinds:

1. Research, as normally represented by publication of scholarly work or presentations at appropriate colloquia, seminars, conferences, and invited lectures.
2. Creative development in those fields in which a faculty member is given public recognition for his professional contributions to society or to the University.
3. Professional development involving presentations at, or chairing of, sessions at professional meetings, serving as an officer or committee member of a professional organization, editorial duties, professional consulting, legal consulting, and other similar activities.
4. To meet the criterion of high quality in scholarship, the candidate must provide appropriate evidence of scholarly activity. The best evidence of scholarly activity is original contributions to an academic discipline, but there are also other types of important and germane types of scholarly activity. Listed below are some of these scholarly activities. The candidate may wish to document others.
 - (1) attainment of a terminal degree in the candidate's field (Lack of this degree or its equivalent should not disqualify candidates who can demonstrate exceptional achievement).
 - (2) study in addition to degree work.
 - (3) training or publication equivalent to a degree.
 - (4) publication of articles, books, monographs, reviews, papers, and proceedings.
 - (5) presentations at workshops, conferences, seminars, conventions, professional meetings, and lectures.
 - (6) Conception and development of research topics.
 - (7) ability to secure grant awards.
 - (8) collecting and analyzing data for a useful purpose, such as a survey.
 - (9) development of and participation in cooperative projects with other faculty, departments, Programs, or universities.

- (10) attendance at and involvement in professional meetings, clinics, workshops, etc., geared toward professional development.
 - (11) presentations at, or chairing of, professional meetings, clinics, workshops, etc., geared toward professional development.
 - (12) editorial duties.
 - (13) consultant activities in the professional area.
 - (14) service as learning, where the faculty member organizes a community project applying his or her professional expertise, producing scholarly publications, and requiring evaluations by participants and outsiders.
5. Professional Activity Prior to University Employment - Scholarly productivity for appointment at the rank of Associate Professor generally cannot be based on work completed in earning the doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree prior to arrival at the University of Delaware. The research involved for that degree was one of the reasons for initial employment; promotion, on the other hand, must consider evidence of scholarship accomplished subsequent to that performed for the degree.

3. Service

The candidate must provide evidence demonstrating meaningful involvement and leadership.

To meet the criteria for service, the candidate may provide evidence from the following areas:

1. University Service

- (1) Academic and nonacademic advisement of students (career, professional, or personal).
- (2) Departmental committees and special assignments.
- (3) College senates, committees, and special assignments.
- (4) University Senate, committees, and special assignments.

- (5) Administrative and quasi-administrative appointments.
 - (6) Participation in student affairs related activities.
2. Community service (local, state, regional, national, international), such as election or appointment to boards, commissions, committees, or legislative bodies.
 3. Creative activities outside the normal professional calling of the faculty member; for example, participation in orchestras or ensembles, one-man shows of paintings, musical, or literary productions, and the like, which enhance or improve the University as a community where learning and personal development take place.