

**University of Delaware**  
**College of Health Sciences**  
**Department of Behavioral Health and Nutrition**

**GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION, TENURE AND REVIEW**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

The mission of the Department of Behavioral Health and Nutrition (BHAN) encompasses scholarship, teaching, and service. Faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure must demonstrate achievements in all areas where workload has been assigned. Although all faculty are subject to the same set of criteria for promotion and tenure, demonstration of those criteria will vary depending upon individually assigned roles and workload. Since the mission of the University encompasses scholarship, teaching, and service, faculty members should strive for excellence in all three areas. For further information, faculty should consult the current University Guidelines as listed in the Faculty Handbook for guidance: <http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/>.

**II. EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

Several questions are asked about a candidate who is being evaluated for tenure. The first question is whether the candidate would improve the overall quality of the BHAN's tenured staff. The second question is whether BHAN is better able to improve itself by granting promotion and tenure or by hiring anew. The third question is whether the candidate is likely to maintain or improve his or her quality and his or her contributions to the unit over the long period typically involved in a tenured appointment. BHAN will not accept a lifetime obligation if there is serious doubt on any of these points. Following is a description of the criteria and specifics incorporated into the promotion and tenure evaluation of a candidate.

**A. Teaching**

A major goal of the Department of Behavioral Health and Nutrition is to encourage all faculty to strive for excellence in teaching. Hence, faculty members with teaching responsibilities must demonstrate high quality in teaching performance. Indicators of teaching performance may include student evaluations, faculty peer evaluation, course materials, learning outcome measures, teaching awards, new course development, and development of new curricula and programs. It is understood that high quality teaching includes activities both inside and outside the classroom, such as advising undergraduates and mentoring honors and graduate students.

**B. Scholarship**

Scholarship includes all endeavors and activities that contribute to the generation and/or advancement of knowledge areas within the Department of Behavioral Health and Nutrition. The ultimate goal for faculty is to have an externally funded, sustainable program of research. As scholars, faculty members must demonstrate excellence, independence and leadership in scholarly endeavors, activities and accomplishments as well as collaboration as appropriate to

meet scientific goals. Findings of research endeavors are disseminated to appropriate audiences through a variety of media including peer-reviewed professional publications and scientific presentations.

Three primary indicators of scholarly performance are the publication record, sponsorship of the candidate's research, and written comments from outside peer evaluations in the candidate's field. These three indicators are now briefly addressed.

Regarding the publication record, publication in peer-reviewed scientific and technical journals and publications of scholarly books (including textbooks) will be considered important indications of scholarly achievement, as will patents or other indications of professional inventive accomplishments. Peer-reviewed publications that are indexed are weighed more heavily than those that are not. Lesser weight shall be attached to non-peer-reviewed publications, unless the significance of such work is established through outside evaluations. When developing their scholarship statement, candidates are encouraged to identify a small number of key publications and to indicate the quality of the journals, and, when appropriate, the number of citations and any other evidence that will assist the university committees in evaluating the impact on the professional community. The candidate should describe his/her contributions to co-authored work.

Obtaining contracts and grants to carry out scholarly research, while largely regarded as promise for future work, also reflects upon the quality of those activities. It is expected that faculty will develop and maintain rigorous research programs; clear evidence of the sustainability of this research is expected, although specific funding levels will not be employed as a condition for promotion or the granting of tenure.

Significant weight is placed on letters from external experts. Such letters are to address the aggregate importance of the candidate's work in furthering the field and an assessment of the candidate's likely future as a contributing scholar/expert in the field. The selection of reviewers is carried out as described below in "Review Procedures".

Special Note for faculty hired at the same rank as the previous institution: Unless otherwise noted in the faculty appointment letter, all work at rank, even if conducted at other institutions of higher education, shall be considered for promotion and tenure. It shall be the faculty member's responsibility to include evidence of this work in his/her dossier and to clearly identify when and where this work was performed. Scholarly productivity for promotion to 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.

### **C. Service**

Service on departmental, college, and university committees and/or service to the profession is expected of all faculty members (consistent with workload assignment), and is considered in the evaluation of the candidate for promotion. Service to the university will be measured by the contributions made by the faculty member on university, college and departmental committees and administrative assignments. Evaluation letters from the Committee Chairperson or from those affected by the candidate's work and having knowledge of it may be sought in the case of especially significant or demanding activities. Service to the community and the profession that contributes to the department's mission will be considered. Overall, service activities should be in line with the faculty member's professional expertise.

### III. STANDARDS OF PROMOTION

The Department of Behavioral Health and Nutrition maintains an excellent reputation for providing a quality educational experience for its students. With the belief that an active research agenda can enhance quality teaching, we particularly value faculty profiles demonstrating clear linkages among scholarship, teaching, and service activities.

- We value excellent performance and significant contributions in scholarship along with high quality performance and contributions in teaching, and service.
- We consider indexed peer-reviewed publications of greater merit than non-indexed or non-peer-reviewed publications, unless evidence such as outside peer evaluations or impact clearly establishes the significance of the latter.
- We value collaboration; however, we place greater value on those collaborative projects in which the candidate has demonstrated a significant contribution in a leadership role.
- We value evidence of a focused and sustained record of research, as illustrated by publications in quality journals and growth in levels of funding.

#### A. Criteria for Promotion of Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

##### **For appointment or promotion to:**

**ASSISTANT PROFESSOR.** The candidate must have an earned doctoral degree, and must demonstrate ability and desire to make positive contributions in all three areas of scholarship, teaching and service.

- High quality teaching performance should be documented through positive student evaluations of teaching and positive peer evaluations of teaching.
- Goals in the area of scholarship should be presented in a well-articulated plan for defining/expanding a program of research through internal and external funding and with timely dissemination of results.
- Documented service contributions should include participation in appropriate professional organizations.

**ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR.** The candidate must demonstrate excellent achievement in scholarship and high quality performance in teaching and service commensurate with assigned workload. There must be clear indication, based on documented evidence and outside peer evaluations, that the candidate has in fact attained appropriate levels of accomplishment for promotion to this rank. Information derived from online citation indexes (e.g., Web of Science) such as h-index and total number of citations may be used to evaluate the candidate's overall research productivity and impact to the field.

- **High quality achievement in teaching** should be documented through positive student and peer evaluations. The quantitative student evaluation scores will be compared to the departmental average, with the expectation that "high quality" achievement is documented with quantitative evaluations. Mentorship of students and/or course/curriculum/program development makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.

- **Excellent achievement in teaching** should be documented by peer reviews of a candidate's teaching that attest to the rigor, quality, depth, and applicability of course material. Student evaluations must similarly document excellence in teaching, with the expectation that "excellent" achievement is documented with quantitative and qualitative student evaluations. Further evidence of excellence may include publications or textbooks related to teaching, and a portfolio documenting new course/program development or significant course/program revisions, use of teaching innovations, supervision of honor's and master's theses and doctoral dissertations, samples of student work, and/or receipt of teaching awards. In evaluating teaching, the Committee considers all pertinent evidence of a candidate's contribution to the departments' teaching objectives.
- **High quality achievement in scholarship** is demonstrated by an independent, clearly focused program of research with dissemination of research findings in indexed peer-reviewed professional journals, grant submissions, presentation of research at national or international meetings.
- **Excellent achievement in scholarship** is demonstrated by the candidate meeting all of the guidelines for high quality achievement in scholarship, and a publication record that demonstrates the candidate has the capacity for original work in his or her field; is doing meritorious work; and shows promise of continuing to make significant contributions to research. Specific areas for assessment include:
  1. Having been successful in obtaining internal or external funding support for research as Co-Principal Investigator or Principal Investigator,
  2. Presenting research at national or international meetings
  3. A demonstrated ability to publish in journals objectively identified as high quality in his or her field of study
  4. A demonstrated ability to lead a research paper as indicated by first or senior author designation (as appropriate)
  5. Having a publication record that demonstrates excellence, and contributes notably to the advancement of knowledge as reflected by comments solicited from external reviewers in his or her field.

For a typical candidate with a 50% allocated workload to scholarship, a minimum of six (6) data-based publications in high-quality, peer reviewed journals is deemed essential for reviewers to assess whether the candidate has demonstrated excellence in his or her body of work. Additional publications, acquired grants, and other scholarly activities making a stronger case for excellence. The onus is on the candidate to clearly demonstrate that they have attained excellence and will continue to achieve excellence in their scholarship.

- **High quality service** contributions should include regular participation in appropriate professional organizations, service on school and college committees, and when possible, contributions to civic or government organizations or boards. Having served in leadership positions in service activities makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.

**PROFESSOR.** This rank is reserved for individuals who have established professional reputations as scholars and are renowned experts (i.e., national or international) in their fields, and whose contributions to their profession and the University's mission are excellent. There should be unmistakable, clear documented evidence and outside peer evaluations of significant

development and achievement (consistent with workload assigned) in teaching, scholarship, and service since the last promotion. The candidate must demonstrate excellent performance in scholarship, and high quality performance in teaching and service commensurate with assigned workload. Some examples of evidence of national or international recognition are: 1) citations of the candidate's work in indexed, peer-reviewed professional journals; 2) awards recognizing scholarly achievement (e.g., attaining fellowship status or serving as an officer in professional societies), and 3) serving as a scholarly expert (e.g., keynote speaker, symposium panelist, grant proposal reviewer). Information derived from online citation indexes (e.g., Web of Science) such as h-index and total number of citations may be used to evaluate the candidate's overall research productivity and impact to the field. Achievement in teaching must be documented in several ways detailed below, including quantitative student evaluation scores that are consistently above the departmental mean.

- **High quality** teaching performance should be documented through positive student and peer evaluations. The quantitative student evaluation scores will be compared to the departmental average and student qualitative responses will also be considered, with the expectation that "high quality" achievement is documented. Mentorship of students and/or course/curriculum/program development makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.
- **Excellent** achievement in teaching should be documented by peer reviews of a candidate's teaching that attest to the rigor, quality, depth, and applicability of course material to the level of the students. Student evaluations must similarly document excellence in teaching, with the expectation that "excellent" achievement is documented with quantitative student evaluation scores that are above the departmental mean. Further evidence of excellence may include publications or textbooks related to teaching, and a portfolio documenting new course/curriculum/program development, use of teaching innovations, samples of student work, and/or receipt of teaching awards. In evaluating teaching, the Committee considers all pertinent evidence of a candidate's contribution to the departments' teaching objectives.
- **High quality** achievements in scholarship must demonstrate a clearly focused and sustained program of research. Candidates must demonstrate continued productivity in research from their promotion to Associate Professor via refereed publications in objectively high-quality journals within the candidate's area of study that are data-based and contributes to the advancement of science. In addition, candidates are expected to prepare and deliver presentations of research findings at national or international professional meetings and have submitted external research proposals.
- To be rated as **excellent** in scholarship, a candidate must have met all of the guidelines for high quality achievement in scholarship and 1) have been successful in obtaining appropriate and sustained external funding support for his or her research, 2) demonstrated evidence as a Principal Investigator and/or Co Principal Investigator on research grants, and 3) have a publication record that continues to demonstrate excellence and notable contributions to his or her field of study, commensurate with their assigned workload, as indicated by solicited comments from external reviewers. For a typical candidate with a 50% allocated workload to scholarship, a minimum of twelve (12) data-based publications in high-quality, peer reviewed journals since their promotion to Associate Professor is deemed essential for reviewers to assess whether the candidate has demonstrated excellence in his or her body of work.

- **High quality** service contributions should include leadership in appropriate national or international professional organizations and on department, college, or university committees. Participation in government organizations or boards strengthens the case for promotion.

## **B. Criteria for Promotion of Continuing-Track (CT) Faculty**

### **For appointment or promotion to:**

**ASSOCIATE INSTRUCTOR.** The candidate must complete a successful peer review at the end of the third two-year contract for promotion to this position. A terminal degree is not required. The candidate must demonstrate positive contributions in the areas where workload is assigned.

- Contributions to teaching should be documented through positive student evaluations of teaching and positive peer evaluations of teaching. Additional positive contributions may include innovations in teaching, mentorship of students, and/or course, curriculum, or program development.
- Scholarship broadly defined includes the scholarship of teaching and service. The plan for the scholarship of teaching may include giving professional presentations, publishing articles in journals including those of pedagogy of the field, contributing to writing of textbooks, developing innovative ways of teaching, introducing of new technology in teaching, etc. The scholarship of service could include creative and innovative advisement, scholarly articles on service, or developing innovation in service.
- Documented service contributions should include participation in appropriate professional organizations. Additional examples of service contributions include service on department, college or university committees, involvement in accreditation of academic programs, creative or innovative advisement, scholarly articles on service, or developing innovation in service.

**SENIOR INSTRUCTOR.** The candidate must have completed a successful peer review at the thirteenth-year review for promotion to this position. A terminal degree is not required. The candidate must demonstrate continued positive contributions in all areas of assigned workload since the last promotion.

- Contributions to teaching should be documented through positive student evaluations of teaching and positive peer evaluations of teaching. Additional positive contributions may include innovations in teaching, mentorship of students, and/or course, curriculum, or program development.
- Scholarship broadly defined includes the scholarship of teaching and service. The plan for the scholarship of teaching may include giving professional presentations, publishing articles in journals including those of pedagogy of the field, contributing to writing of textbooks, developing innovative ways of teaching, introducing of new technology in teaching, etc. The scholarship of service could include creative and innovative advisement, scholarly articles on service, or developing innovation in service.

- Documented service contributions should include participation in appropriate professional organizations. Additional examples of service contributions include service on department, college or university committees, involvement in accreditation of academic programs, creative or innovative advisement, scholarly articles on service, or developing innovation in service. Having served in leadership positions in service activities provides additional support for a successful peer review.

**ASSISTANT PROFESSOR.** The candidate must have an earned doctoral degree, and must demonstrate high quality in one role, aligned with preponderance of assigned workload. A minimum of five external review letters are required for promotion to Assistant Professor. When the predominant role in the workload is teaching or service, appropriate *external* evaluations can be performed locally, but should be *external* to the academic unit. When scholarship is the predominant role in the workload, the *external* evaluation should be performed by individuals outside the University community.

- High quality teaching performance may be documented through positive student and peer evaluations, evidence for activities to improve instruction, learning outcome measures, or other materials demonstrating student learning
- Goals in the area of scholarship should be presented in a well-articulated plan. Scholarship broadly defined includes the scholarship of teaching and service. The plan for the scholarship of teaching may include giving professional presentations, publishing articles in journals including those of pedagogy of the field, contributing to writing of textbooks, developing innovative ways of teaching, introducing of new technology in teaching, etc. The scholarship of service could include creative and innovative advisement, scholarly articles on service, or developing innovation in service.
- Documented service contributions should include participation in appropriate professional organizations.

**ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR.** The candidate must demonstrate excellence in one role aligned with preponderance of assigned workload and high quality performance in the other two areas. There must be clear indication, based on documented evidence and peer evaluations, that the candidate has in fact attained appropriate levels of accomplishment for promotion to this rank. A minimum of five external review letters are required for promotion to Associate Professor. When the predominant role in the workload is teaching or service, appropriate *external* evaluations can be performed locally, but should be *external* to the academic unit. When scholarship is the predominant role in the workload, the *external* evaluation should be performed by individuals outside the University community. Candidates for promotion to this rank must have served for at least six years at the rank of Assistant Professor.

- **High quality achievement in teaching** may be documented through student and peer evaluations. The quantitative student evaluation scores will be compared to the departmental average, with the understanding that innovative pedagogy may initially result in lower student evaluation scores. Additional indicators of high quality teaching include positive learning outcome measures or other materials demonstrating student learning. Mentorship of students and/or course/curriculum/program development makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.

- **Excellent achievement in teaching** should be documented by peer reviews of a candidate's teaching that attest to the rigor, quality, depth, and applicability of course material. Student evaluations should similarly document excellence in teaching, with the understanding that innovative pedagogy may initially result in lower student evaluation scores. Further evidence of excellence may include supervision of honors and master's theses and doctoral dissertations, samples of student work, and/or receipt of teaching awards. In evaluating teaching, the Committee considers all pertinent evidence of a candidate's contribution to the departments' teaching objectives.
- **High quality achievement in scholarship** may include giving professional presentations at the local or regional level, contributing to writing of textbooks, publishing articles in journals including those of pedagogy of the field, developing innovative ways of teaching, introducing of new technology in teaching, etc. The scholarship of service could include creative and innovative advisement, scholarly articles on service, or developing innovation in service.
- **Excellent achievement in scholarship** is demonstrated by the candidate meeting requirements for high achievement in scholarship in addition to giving professional presentations at the national level or publishing articles in peer-reviewed professional journals.
- **High quality service** contributions should include regular participation in appropriate professional organizations, service on department, college or university committees, and when possible, contributions to civic or government organizations or boards. Having served in leadership positions in service activities makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.
- **Excellent service** contributions are demonstrated by the candidate meeting high quality service criteria in addition to submitting letters of support from individuals able to evaluate the quality of the candidate's service. Evidence of excellence may include creative and innovative advisement, scholarly articles on service, or developing innovation in service.

**PROFESSOR.** This rank is reserved for individuals who have established professional reputations in their fields, and whose contributions to their profession and the University's mission are excellent. There should be unmistakable, clear documented evidence and outside peer evaluations of significant development and achievement consistent with workload assigned since the last promotion. The candidate must demonstrate high quality performance in all areas with leadership and excellent achievement commensurate with major assigned workload. A minimum of five external review letters are required for promotion to this rank. When the predominant role in the workload is teaching or service, appropriate *external* evaluations can be performed locally, but should be *external* to the academic unit. When scholarship is the predominant role in the workload, the *external* evaluation should be performed by individuals outside the University community.

- **High quality** teaching performance may be documented through positive student and peer evaluations. The quantitative student evaluation scores will be compared to the departmental average and student qualitative responses will also be considered, with the understanding that innovative pedagogy may initially result in lower student evaluation scores. Mentorship of students and/or course/curriculum/program development makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.
- **Excellent** achievement in teaching should be documented by peer reviews of a candidate's teaching that attest to the rigor, quality, depth, and applicability of course material to the level of the students. Student evaluations should similarly document excellence in teaching, with the understanding that innovative pedagogy may initially result in lower student evaluation scores. Further evidence of excellence may include publications or textbooks related to teaching, and a portfolio documenting new course/curriculum/program development, use of teaching innovations, samples of student work, and/or receipt of teaching awards. In evaluating teaching, the Committee considers all pertinent evidence of a candidate's contribution to the departments' teaching objectives.
- **High quality achievements in scholarship** must demonstrate a clearly focused and sustained program of research. As a guide it is suggested that for each 25% workload assigned per year to scholarship, one refereed publication in a high-quality journal within the candidate's area of study is the suggested minimum requirement for promotion with the understanding that additional publications would make a stronger case for promotion. Further high quality achievement in scholarship may include preparing and delivering presentations of research findings, and/or innovations in teaching, advisement or service at national and international professional meetings. Success in acquiring external support (e.g., grants, contracts, etc.) for research including innovations in teaching or service makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.
- To be rated as **excellent in scholarship**, a candidate must have met all of the guidelines for high quality achievement in scholarship and also 1) have been successful in obtaining external funding support for scholarly activities, and 2) have a publication rate exceeding that required for high quality achievement in scholarship.
- **High quality service** contributions should include leadership in appropriate professional organizations and on department, college, or university committees. Participation in government organizations or boards strengthens the case for promotion.
- **Excellent service** contributions are demonstrated by the candidate meeting high quality service criteria in addition to submitting letters of support from individuals able to evaluate the quality of the candidate's service. Evidence of excellence may include creative and innovative advisement, scholarly articles on service, or developing innovation in service since last promotion. Participating in national or international professional organizations makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.

## **IV. Materials Required in Candidate Electronic Dossiers**

### **A. Introductory Materials Folder**

1. Contents and Guidelines
  1. Recommendation for Promotion Form [[www.udel.edu/facsen/forms/RecPromo.html](http://www.udel.edu/facsen/forms/RecPromo.html)]
  2. A table of contents
  3. A copy of the University, college, and department promotion and tenure criteria
2. Application for Promotion
  1. Candidate's letter requesting promotion
  2. A curriculum vitae
  3. Candidate's statement (optional)
3. Two and Four Year Reviews for Faculty Seeking Promotion to Associate Professor
  1. Reviews conducted by the corresponding department committee
  2. Reviews or evaluations conducted by the department chair
4. Internal Recommendations
  1. The department committee's recommendation
  2. The chairperson's recommendation
  3. College committee's recommendation (if any)
  4. Dean or director's recommendation or endorsement
  5. University committee's recommendation
  6. Any appeal materials (appeals and rebuttals)
5. External Recommendations
  1. Letters of evaluation from peer reviewers together with supporting material. These letters will be numbered sequentially for reference.
  2. Procedure for choosing external reviewers.

## **B. Evidential Materials Folder**

### **Teaching Folder**

1. Statement of teaching philosophy
2. Data from student evaluations in all courses taught as part of assigned faculty workload during spring and fall semesters, including class size, number returned, and course/instructor means, presented and summarized in a tabular format for each academic year for comparison
3. Representative peer evaluations that include the date, title of the class observed, number of students present, and a narrative evaluating the candidate's knowledge of subject matter, preparation and organization, delivery style, student interactions, etc. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide the information to be included in the narrative to the peer evaluator. Peer Evaluation of Teaching forms may be substituted for narrative reviews.
4. Letters of evaluation from former students or advisees solicited by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, with the manner in which letters were solicited clearly indicated
5. Verbatim copies of student comments from course evaluations, with the method of sample selection described
6. Any proposals for grants received in support of university instructional projects or instructional development
7. Documentation supporting the development of any new instructional methods or content, courses, curricula, or programs
8. A list of mentorship, supervision or committee service for any independent study/research, honors theses, master's theses, and/or doctoral dissertations
9. Documentation of any involvement with external accreditation of an academic program
10. Documentation of any consultation related to teaching, training, and curriculum development provided to health related professionals
11. A descriptive list of any invited guest lectures in university courses or at university student recruitment events
12. A description of any teaching or advising nominations or awards received
13. Documentation of attendance at internal or external professional conferences, seminars or institutes to improve teaching effectiveness

## Scholarship Folder

1. \*A reference list of all professional publications, with a notation following each citation that indicates:
  - a. the type of publication, (data-based research, review, book, chapter, etc.)
  - b. whether the publication was refereed, invited, or non-refereed
  - c. the quality of the journal (acceptance rate and/or impact factor) or publisher
  - d. if co-authored, a detailed description of the candidate's contribution to the work
  - e. if available, the number of citations of the work\*(Includes manuscripts accepted for publication accompanied by letters of acceptance.)
2. Copies of all professional publications.
3. Manuscripts submitted and under review but not yet accepted for publication (accompanied by reviews from the journal or from the external reviewers, if available)
4. A reference list of all grant proposals submitted, with a notation following each citation that indicates:
  - a. whether the proposal was funded, and if so, the amount
  - b. whether the proposal project is research or service
  - c. the funding rate for proposals during that cycle (if available)
  - d. if co-authored, a detailed description of the candidate's contribution to the work
  - e. if co-authored, a disclosure of the amount of funding of direct costs the candidate received
5. Abstracts and letters of acceptance for all funded grant proposals
6. Copies of all non-funded proposals are optional. If included, these must be accompanied by reviewer comments.
7. A reference list of all professional presentations, with a notation following each citation that indicates:
  - a. the type of presentation, (podium, poster, thematic poster)
  - b. whether the presentation was refereed, invited, or non-refereed
  - c. the type of setting (state, regional, national or international conference; external agency; another institution; etc.)
  - d. if co-authored, a detailed description of the candidate's contribution to the work
8. A reference list of all publications, presentations, and grant proposals generated by students directly supervised by the candidate with relevant details given, as listed above.

9. A reference list of other scholarly contributions, with the candidate demonstrating the quality of effort involved. Examples are:
  - a. Curricula, courses, standards, or policies for external agencies or organizations
  - b. Development of choreography used in performances
  - c. Development of professionally related software
  - d. Achievement of professionally related certifications
  - e. Development of professional continuing education activities
  - f. Development of textbook ancillary materials
10. A description of any professional awards received, including elected memberships or fellowships in professional organizations

**Service Folder** (Must be related to the candidate's professional expertise)

1. Within the University
  - a. Description of any administrative responsibilities
  - b. List of committee memberships, including any leadership roles, along with a description of time spent per committee and relevant tasks
  - c. Description of any participation in student recruitment or student affairs related activities
  - d. Description of any service as an external reviewer for an academic program
  - e. Description of any service in maintaining laboratory equipment
  - f. Directing Global Studies programs
2. Within Academe
  - a. List detailing membership, committee service, and leadership roles in professional organizations
  - b. List of service as editor, editorial board member, or reviewer for a professional journal, publishing company, professional conference, or granting agency
3. Within the Community
  - a. List of memberships, including any leadership roles, in professionally-related organizations, boards, commissions, or task forces
  - b. Description of any consultation to civic, private business, or government boards or agencies
  - c. List of any supervision of community groups
  - d. Reference list of any presentations, speeches, or workshops delivered to community or local professional groups
4. A description of any awards received in recognition of service

## V. PROCEDURES

### A. Review Procedures

1. Candidate submits the dossier to the Chairperson and members of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee according to the calendar established by the university; see section D below. Guidelines for organizing the dossier are clearly delineated in the University of Delaware Faculty Handbook (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/>).
2. Solicitation of outside peer evaluations for tenure track faculty follows the University guidelines. Solicited outside peer evaluations are always required for promotion. Every dossier must include outside peer reviews, written by individuals with established reputations in the candidate's field. These statements should analyze and evaluate critically the candidate's work and accomplishments. They also should comment on the candidate's potential for future development.
  - a. A candidate submits a list of names and email addresses of potential outside reviewers but the Department committee will suggest additional names. Consistent with the Faculty Handbook, the candidate will have an opportunity to comment on the departmentally generated list. Since a minimum of five (5) outside reviews of a candidate's record are required it is suggested that seven reviews be requested. The list of external reviewers is approved by the committee.
  - b. The candidate should provide an updated curriculum vita and written statements to the chairperson of the committee. The written statements are submitted before the dossier is completed (see timeline below) and should highlight accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The Chairperson of the Committee will send these materials along with a copy of the department's approved Promotion and Tenure document to the external reviewers.
  - c. The Chairperson of the Committee solicits letters of evaluation. Letters soliciting outside peer review of a candidate should request a current, truncated curriculum vitae (e.g., NIH biosketch) and a statement describing the reviewer's relationship to the candidate. Only outside peer reviewers *without* personal/professional conflicts of interest to the candidate should be selected. External reviewers that come from 'comparable' departments and/or institutions are required.
3. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of three (3) tenured faculty of the Department
4. Department promotion and tenure procedures must be democratic. Certain rules must be observed. The department's promotion and tenure committee should be constituted and operated in such a fashion that due respect is given to the opinions and advice of the members, and that all deliberations are to be strictly confidential.
5. The Chairperson of the Committee shall draft a comprehensive written report that reflects accurately the proceedings of the committee meeting, including the numerical vote, recommendations and the reasons for the decision. The report will be made available for all committee members to read, edit and sign.

6. The signed letter, outside faculty reviews, vita of external reviewers, and solicited student/alumni letters for inclusion in the electronic dossier will be transmitted according to the calendar established by the University. When they arise, signed minority opinions will be forwarded as appendices. The Chairperson of the Committee will provide a copy of the signed letter and any appendices to the Department Chair. A copy of the signed letter and any appendices shall be given to the candidate.

## **B. Appeals**

Appeals are possible at every level, but must be made to the committee or administrator whose decision is being appealed. An intention to appeal must be given to the appropriate body within five working days of notification of the decision. An appeal includes: 1) a letter documenting the basis of the appeal, usually written by the candidate; and 2) a scheduled meeting with the appropriate person or committee. It is strongly recommended that the candidate attend the appeal meeting. Representatives of the candidate can also attend and participate in the appeal meeting. Appeals must be handled within two weeks, except under extenuating circumstances. The University Faculty Senate Committee on Promotions and Tenure will hear no appeals beyond March 1, and the Provost's Office will hear no appeals beyond April 15. Any appeals not heard by these dates must be carried over to the following academic year. (Rev. Fac Sen 2/98)

## **C. Dossier Preparation and Presentation**

1. The candidate is strongly encouraged to consult with members of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee at the time of each periodic review prior to application for promotion regarding the content and preparation of the dossier.
2. The candidate should organize the dossier according to the pattern outlined in the University of Delaware Faculty Handbook (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/>). The Application for Tenure and/or Promotion form is available from the Provost's website.
3. The candidate must include a chart documenting the percentage of workload assigned to teaching, scholarship, and service. This information must be verified by the Department Chair.

## D. Timetable

### Promotion Process Schedule

The time schedule for the promotion process is shown below. Whenever possible, these deadlines should be anticipated and dossiers forwarded (with recommendations) at an earlier date. Although dossiers are due to the Department Committee on September 1<sup>st</sup>, the candidate may request the addition of other information to the dossier at any time during the dossier evaluation period.

30 April	Candidate notifies Department Chair of intention to apply for promotion in writing. Department Promotion and Tenure Committee begins the process of soliciting peer evaluations.
1 May	Candidate submits CV, selected publications, written statements highlighting accomplishments (in scholarship, teaching, and service), and a list of suggested outside peer reviewers to the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee
1 June	Cover letter, CV, selected publications, written statements, and average workload during the evaluation period are provided to outside peer reviewers
1 September	Electronic Dossier to Department Committee and Department Chair.
1 October	Department Committee's recommendation to the Department Chair.
15 October	Department Chair's recommendation to the College Committee and Dean.
1 December	College Committee's recommendation to the Dean.
2 January	Dean's recommendation to the University Promotions and Tenure Committee.
15 February	University Promotions and Tenure Committee recommendations to Provost.
15 March	Provost's recommendations.

Approved by faculty vote on October 21, 2016  
Final Approval February, 2017