

PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES:
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

April 14, 2017

PREAMBLE

The following has been developed to guide the candidate through the process of promotion and tenure. Although promotion and tenure go hand in hand for tenure-track candidates, one should note that each is distinct and separate. Tenure is determined as part of the promotion process for tenure-track candidates. Faculty candidates for promotion only will also be evaluated based on the criteria set forth in this document.

All tenure-track and continuing track faculty are eligible for promotion. The objectives of promotion policies set forth in this document are to ensure faculty excellence and procedural fairness within the Department of Business Administration (BUAD). In order to preserve and enhance BUAD's reputation, the department has sought to establish and maintain high standards of teaching, scholarship, and service. These procedures are intended to align with the University's aim to "promote the individual's welfare and professional development while at the same time fostering the University's growth toward excellence" as set forth in the UD Faculty Handbook.

Only tenure-track faculty are eligible for tenure. Tenure is granted to faculty by the University to safeguard academic freedom and promote the free and open discussion of issues on campus. Tenure is a formal assurance that a faculty member's professional security and academic freedom will not be placed in question without the observance of full academic due process. It should not be confused with promotion, which is based on performance and continued growth in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

This document outlines the qualifications, procedures, and evidentiary materials required for promotion and tenure in the Department of Business Administration. It is divided into four sections: procedures for *all* candidates, information for Tenure Track candidates (TT), information for terminal degree Continuing Track candidates (CT), and information for non-terminal degree Continuing Track candidates (instructors).

Table of Contents

Procedures for All Candidates	3
Candidate's Responsibilities	3
Department Responsibilities	3
Constitution of the P&T Committee	3
Committee Chairperson	4
Quorum	4
Preparation and Discussion	4
Vote	4
Reporting of Recommendation	4
Confidentiality	5
Appeal Procedures	5
Soliciting Internal and External Reviews	5
Scholarship	5
Teaching	5
Recommendations for Tenure without Promotion	6
Tenure Track (TT) Promotion and Tenure	7
Qualifications for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure	7
Scholarship	8
Teaching	9
Service	10
Terminal Degree Continuing Track (CT)	12
Qualifications for Appointment and Promotion	12
Teaching	12
Scholarship	14
Service	15
Non-Terminal Degree Continuing Track (Instructors)	17
Qualifications for Appointment and Advancement	17
Appendix 1	18
Appendix 2	20
Appendix 3	22
Appendix 4	23
Appendix 5	24
Appendix 6	25

I. PROCEDURES

A. Candidate's Responsibilities

1. Faculty members have the right and the responsibility to know all relevant Departmental, College, and University promotion criteria, policies, and practices. They should exercise this right at the earliest possible time.
2. A faculty member has the right to apply for promotion at any time (subject to provisions pertaining to promotion and tenure specified in the [UD Faculty Handbook](#)) and has the sole right to advance or withdraw his/her Dossier from the promotion process.
3. It is the responsibility of each faculty member who desires to be considered for promotion or tenure in a given year to initiate the process by notifying the Chair by April 30.
4. Candidates' materials to be sent to external reviewers must be submitted to the Department Chair by June 1.
5. Candidates' Dossiers must be submitted to the Promotion & Tenure (P&T) Committee no later than September 1.
6. Candidates for the rank of Associate Professor must include all previous contract renewal letters. Dossiers that do not include these reviews will be considered incomplete.
7. The candidate may add evidentiary material to the Dossier after the submission deadline. This material must be clearly marked as *supplemental*. Materials should include the date on which the supplemental material was added. Supplemental materials should be placed in a separate section. The candidate may not otherwise alter the information that has been previously included in the Dossier and considered in the evaluation process.
8. A candidate has the responsibility to consult the Faculty Handbook, the Department Chair, the P&T Committee, and other appropriate persons regarding the content and preparation of the Dossier. Incomplete dossiers may not provide adequate evidence for a positive review.
9. The candidate is responsible for soliciting co-authors letters that document their contributions to multi-authored works.

B. Department Responsibilities

1. Constitution of the P&T Committee
When considering promotion and tenure for a tenure-track candidate, the P&T Committee will consist of all tenured faculty members at or above the rank to which the candidate is applying for promotion. When considering promotion for a continuing-track candidate, the P&T Committee will consist of all tenured and continuing track faculty members at or above the rank to which the candidate is applying for promotion. In the event that there are fewer than three faculty members of qualifying rank, the committee will appoint a faculty member from another department at the appropriate rank (e.g., full professor to review promotion to professor).

2. **Committee Chairperson**

A full professor, if available, will chair the Committee. A Chair for the new academic year will be elected at a spring meeting of the previous academic year. In the event that no full professor is available, an associate professor may be elected to serve as Chair.
3. **Quorum**

To conduct business, a quorum is necessary. A quorum is defined as 80 percent of those qualified faculty members in the department as specified in I.B.1 who are not on sabbatical or leave of absence. If a qualified faculty member on sabbatical or leave elects to attend the meeting, he/she will be added to the list of eligible faculty members in determining the 80 percent quorum requirement.
4. **Preparation and Discussion**

All Committee members should be fully prepared prior to the Committee meetings. The discussion will begin with an *objective* review of the candidate's case by a faculty member from the candidate's area – usually the Area Head. Committee members are encouraged to express their views candidly. Each member of the P&T Committee makes a decision dictated by his/her own conscience, based on his/her own independent evaluation of the evidence presented in the Dossier and on discussions during the meeting. For purposes of clarification, the Committee may seek additional information about a candidate's qualifications.
5. **Vote**

Following open discussion, any member of the Committee may make a motion to open the vote. The motion must be seconded to open the vote, and three quarters of those present must agree before a vote is taken. A secret paper ballot vote will be taken. The options are:

 - a. Yes. A "yes" vote means to promote. In the case of a TT candidate going up for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, it includes the granting of tenure.
 - b. No. A "no" vote means to not promote. In the case of a TT candidate going up for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, it means that tenure is not being granted. In the case of a TT Assistant Professor in his/her sixth year, a "no" vote will result in a one-year terminal contract.
 - c. Abstain
6. **Reporting of Recommendation**

The P&T Committee will provide a written statement of its evaluations and recommendations to the candidate by October 1. This statement will indicate the numerical vote, describe the Committee's composition, and explain the reasons for the decision based on the candidate's performance relative to the department requirements. It will be transmitted in writing to the candidate and to the Department Chair, and be placed in the candidate's Dossier. The letter will not include mention of the identity of the external reviewers. Signed minority opinions will be forwarded as appendices to the Committee's recommendations. A simple majority vote is required for a positive recommendation. The recommendations of the P&T Committee will be added to the candidate's Dossier and forwarded to the Department Chair, who will review the evidence submitted by the candidate, the report of the Committee, and the stated criteria, and will make a recommendation supporting or rejecting the candidacy. The Chair will explain, in writing, his/her recommendation to the candidate and to the Department P&T Committee Chair by October 15. The Chair's letter will be placed in the candidate's Dossier.

7. Confidentiality

Meetings of the P&T Committee are open only to members of the Committee. All deliberations are confidential. There will be no communication other than the written recommendation(s), with the following exceptions:

- a. A member of the Committee, generally a tenured faculty member in the candidate's academic area, may be authorized and instructed to convey information orally to the candidate.
- b. The Committee Chair, or a Committee member designated by the Committee Chair, is permitted to communicate the vote orally to the Department Chair.

8. Appeal Procedures

Appeals will be conducted in accordance with University Guidelines.

9. Soliciting External and Internal Reviews

a. Scholarship

As one means of evaluating scholarship, external reviews need to be solicited for all tenure track faculty seeking promotion to associate or full professor. Consistent with University policy, a minimum of five (5) external letters is required. For those seeking promotion to full professor, whenever possible, reviewers who evaluated a candidate for promotion to associate professor should not be used to evaluate that candidate for promotion to full professor. However, it is acknowledged that in some research areas, reselection of reviewers is unavoidable and occasionally desirable. Appendix 1 specifies the procedure used to obtain external reviews. Because continuing track faculty are promoted based on excellence in teaching, these external letters evaluating their scholarship are not required.

b. Teaching

1. For Continuing Track Faculty

As one means of evaluating teaching, external reviews need to be solicited for all continuing track faculty seeking promotion to associate or full professor. A minimum of five (5) external review letters is required. For this purpose, "external" includes internal to UD but external to the faculty member's primary academic unit, and also external to UD. Appendix 2 specifies the procedure used to obtain external reviews. Because tenure track faculty are promoted based on excellence in scholarship, these external letters evaluating their teaching are not required.

2. For Tenure and Continuing Track Faculty

The Department of Business Administration solicits comments from past students for all faculty. The department will place the student letters under a separate tab in the Dossier. Appendix 3 specifies the procedure used to obtain student letters.

After consultation with the faculty member, the candidate's Area Head, as a representative of the P&T Committee, will solicit two faculty peer reviews of the candidate's teaching. The reviewers may include faculty within the candidate's area, as well as faculty from other disciplines. The peer review normally includes an evaluation of the candidate's course portfolio (e.g., objectives, requirements, and materials), and a classroom visitation.

c. Recommendation for Tenure without Promotion

Whenever a person has been hired at the rank of associate professor or full professor *without tenure*, the procedures for evaluating that individual for tenured status will be identical to the procedures used when an assistant professor is being considered for associate professor or when an associate professor is being considered for full professor depending upon the rank of the person applying for tenure.

TENURE TRACK (TT) PROMOTION AND TENURE

A. Qualifications for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

Assistant Professor

To be eligible for departmental recommendation for appointment or promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor in the Department of Business Administration, a faculty member must have been awarded a terminal degree in their field (Ph.D. or its equivalent) and show the potential for future growth and accomplishment in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service.

Associate Professor

To be eligible for departmental recommendation for appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in the Department of Business Administration, the candidate's record must be evaluated as "excellent" in scholarship and at least "high quality" in teaching and service.

Full Professor

To be eligible for departmental recommendation for appointment or promotion to the rank of Professor in the Department of Business Administration requires sustained high-level performance in scholarship, teaching, and service. All documentation of performance at the Associate Professor rank will be reviewed, but the most recent examples of scholarship, teaching, and service will be weighed more and should be fully documented accordingly. If the candidate has been in rank longer than six years, it is up to the candidate to decide how much documentation to include beyond the previous six years, but certainly the candidate must explain any and all gaps in performance. In short, documentation is not required for *all* years from when the candidate became an associate professor to when he/she applies for full professor; however, the previous six years must be thoroughly documented and any gaps in performance at any time must be explained. In evaluating a candidate for this rank, the committee employs demanding standards, and requires continued achievement beyond that necessary for promotion to Associate Professor.

Promotion and Tenure

To be promoted from the rank of Assistant Professor to **Associate Professor** in the Department of Business Administration, a faculty member's contributions in three major areas are assessed: scholarship, teaching, and service. For a favorable decision for the promotion of faculty from Assistant to Associate Professor, a rating of "**excellent**" in scholarship and at least "**high quality**" in teaching and service is required.

To be promoted from the rank of Associate Professor to **Professor** in the Department of Business Administration, a faculty member is considered for promotion based on an assessment of his/her contributions in three major areas: scholarship, teaching, and service. To be promoted to Professor, the candidate's record must be considered "**excellent**" in scholarship and at least "**high quality**" in the other two categories.

B. Scholarship

1. Evidence at the Associate and Professor Level

In judging the value of a candidate's scholarly contribution, the quality of work is most important and must be rated as "**excellent**".

Although single-authored publications are not required, candidates who present a record largely composed of multi-authored publications *must carefully document* their contribution to this work. For this purpose the candidate is required to solicit co-author letters, to be sent to the department chairperson, from at least one co-author from each publication who can speak best to the candidate's contribution. This is particularly important for those candidates who have no single-authored pieces.

Quality Ratings

a. For a rating of "**Excellent**" in scholarship, a candidate:

- must have established and maintained a significant research program, which is normally evidenced by publication in leading journals in the candidate's field, as part of a continuing flow of numerous publications in recognized refereed journals;
- should have received strong support from external reviewers; and
- should have provided evidence that the high flow of quality scholarly contributions will continue beyond promotion
- Candidates for Full professor must have an established reputation in their field.

b. Recommended Evidentiary Materials

A candidate may develop his/her application by including additional evidence. Appendix 4 identifies indicators that a candidate may include in his/her Dossier as evidence of scholarship. The Committee regards these indicators as neither definitive nor exhaustive. The Committee considers all pertinent evidence of a candidate's contribution to the department's research mission.

2. Clarification of Evidence for a Rating of "**Excellent**" in Scholarship

There are a number of activities that do **not** receive credit. These include:

- giving presentations to departmental colleagues and graduate students;
- organizing sessions at professional meetings;
- serving on editorial boards of professional journals;
- writing conference papers and proceedings; and
- writing non-refereed publications.

While these activities often do provide evidence helpful in judging the quality of a faculty member's work and do offer additional evidence of a faculty member's reputation and standing in the profession, candidates will receive no credit in the scholarship category for these items alone. They may, however, be included for reputational purposes.

3. Professional Activity Prior to University Employment

a. Promotion to Associate Professor:

The [UD Faculty Handbook](#) stipulates that, "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.” Therefore, promotion considers evidence of scholarship subsequent to obtaining a degree. Publications that arise from a dissertation following the appointment to assistant professor may be considered if the candidate offers clear evidence of substantial scholarly achievement made upon employment and thereafter. Also work done at rank at another institution may be considered as part of the candidate’s total scholarly productivity provided the productivity since the date of appointment has been at a level commensurate with the promotion guidelines specified in this document.

b. Promotion to Full Professor:

Scholarly productivity for promotion to the rank of full professor, even if conducted at other institutions of higher education, will be considered. It will be the faculty’s responsibility to include evidence of this work in his/her Dossier and to clearly identify when and where this work was performed. Work conducted at other institutions should be documented and evaluated in the context of the department and institutional standards of excellence at the University of Delaware.

C. Teaching

1. Required Evidence

To be promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, or from Associate Professor to Full Professor in the Department of Business Administration, the candidate’s record must be evaluated as at least “**high quality**” in teaching.

Teaching takes many forms in the department, including teaching undergraduate and graduate students, as well as delivering classes in a face-to-face setting or online. Additionally, teaching takes place in the contexts of research mentorship, career and graduate school advising, and thesis supervision. Teaching activities might take place outside of the department if such activities are part of the negotiated workload.

Required evidentiary materials include:

a. Course Materials

- A narrative statement that contains a description of his/her primary teaching activities and primary teaching and learning goals.
- A sample of syllabi, examinations, and/or other teaching materials (e.g., activities, assignments, assessments, workflow, slide presentations) that demonstrate the rigor and appropriateness of his/her teaching.
- Quantitative or qualitative evidence that courses are designed to meet and assess significant stated learning goals. These might include evidence of significant student learning, such as completed exams, final projects, and/or presentations.
- Final grade distributions of courses taught. The candidate is encouraged, if needed, to document moderators of final grade distributions.

b. Course Evaluations

Candidates must present a chronological summary of course evaluation data, both qualitative and quantitative, for each course taught. In presenting course evaluations, candidates may submit any comparative information they deem appropriate. If the candidate has taught one or more undergraduate or graduate core courses, ratings of each of these core courses should be compared to the ratings received by other tenure-track faculty

teaching the same core course. Because individual course evaluations are confidential, the Department Chair will provide to the candidate comparative data for inclusion in the Dossier. The candidate is strongly encouraged to explain lower than average course evaluations.

c. Peer Evaluations

Peer evaluations are required that assess how the candidate approaches his/her teaching, goals of the course, and skill with which materials are presented, including at least one visit to his/her classroom. The purpose of the peer evaluation is to assess such factors as pedagogical skill, knowledge of the subject matter, organization and preparation, ability to communicate course material to students and to stimulate intellectual curiosity, effort devoted to teaching, and contributions to the curriculum (e.g., through the development of new courses). The candidate must have at least two (2) peer evaluations from the University and can include supplemental observations from external reviewers. The department will insert these reviews in the Dossier under a separate tab. This section of the Dossier will be held confidential, and will be removed prior to returning the Dossier to the candidate.

2. Recommended Evidence

A candidate may develop his/her application by including additional evidence. Appendix 5 identifies indicators that a candidate may include in or her Dossier as evidence for a teaching case. The Committee regards these indicators as neither definitive nor exhaustive. The Committee considers all pertinent evidence of a candidate's contribution to the department's teaching mission.

3. Quality Ratings

For a rating of "**High Quality**" in teaching, a candidate:

- must have demonstrated a commitment to, and demonstration of, teaching effectiveness and leadership;
- should have received positive reviews; and
- should have provided evidence that the commitment to teaching effectiveness and leadership will continue following a positive promotion decision.

D. Service

1. To be promoted to Associate or Full Professor in the Department of Business Administration, the candidate's record must be evaluated as at least "**high quality**" in service. Service includes service to the department and to the programs within it, service to the university, service to the profession, and service to the public more generally.
2. Service includes innumerable types of activities rendered for the benefit of the department, college, university, profession, or community. Regardless of its demanding nature, service is not a substitute for scholarship or teaching, and generally does not weigh heavily on promotion and tenure decisions. Nevertheless, the avoidance or disregard of service commitments may be cause for not being recommended for promotion and tenure. A candidate must document that he/she has consistently and effectively administered his/her service responsibilities.

3. Evidence

- a. A candidate may develop his/her application by including additional evidence. Appendix 6 identifies indicators that a candidate may include in his or her Dossier as evidence of service. The Committee regards these indicators as neither definitive nor exhaustive. The Committee considers all pertinent evidence of a candidate's contribution to the department's service mission.
- b. The variety of service types presented in Appendix 6 is listed in no predetermined order of importance. The department does not expect a faculty member to carry out activities in all categories. Some faculty will specialize in certain types of service efforts to the exclusion of others. In evaluating service activities, the Committee values most highly those efforts that are active, successful, and important, and that demonstrate leadership and initiative.
- c. To receive a rating of "**high quality**" in service, a candidate must have demonstrated initiative and commitment in the performance of assigned service responsibilities.

CONTINUING TRACK (CT) PROMOTION – Terminal Degree

A. Qualifications for Appointment and Promotion

Assistant Professor

To be eligible for departmental recommendation for appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor in the Department of Business Administration, a faculty member must hold a terminal degree (Ph.D. or its equivalent) and show the potential for future growth and accomplishment in teaching, scholarship, and service.

Associate Professor

To be eligible for departmental recommendation for appointment to the rank of Associate Professor in the Department of Business Administration, the candidate must at a minimum have a level of distinction warranting the appointment. Furthermore, there should be clear indications that the candidate will continue to perform consistent with his/her workload. This rank does *not* carry tenure.

Full Professor

To be eligible for departmental recommendation for appointment or promotion to the rank of Professor in the Department of Business Administration, the candidate will be expected to have sustained a level of accomplishment sufficient to be judged as demonstrating excellence in teaching and high quality performance in the other areas. This rank denotes exemplary performance in instruction and demonstrated continued scholarship and service. In evaluating a candidate for this rank, the committee employs demanding standards, and requires continued achievement beyond that necessary for promotion to Associate Professor. This rank does *not* carry tenure.

Promotion

When a faculty member is considered for promotion, his/her contributions in three major areas are assessed: teaching, scholarship, and service. For a favorable decision for the promotion of faculty from Assistant to Associate Professor, and Associate to Full Professor, a rating of “**excellent**” in teaching and at least “**high quality**” in scholarship and service is required.

B. Teaching

Teaching takes many forms in the department, including teaching undergraduate and graduate students, as well as delivering classes in a face-to-face setting or online. Additionally, teaching takes place in the contexts of research mentorship, career and graduate school advising, and thesis supervision. Teaching activities might take place outside of the department if such activities are part of the negotiated workload.

1. Required Evidence

A case for an “**excellent**” rating in teaching must be documented and supported with quantitative and qualitative evidence. Evidentiary materials include both required and recommended data.

Required evidentiary materials include:

a. Course Materials

- A narrative statement that contains a description of his/her primary teaching activities and primary teaching and learning goals.
- A sample of syllabi, examinations, and/or other teaching materials (e.g., activities, assignments, assessments, workflow, slide presentations) that demonstrate the rigor and appropriateness of his/her teaching.
- Quantitative or qualitative evidence that courses are designed to meet and assess significant stated learning goals. These might include evidence of significant student learning, such as completed exams, final projects, and/or presentations.
- Final grade distributions of courses taught. The candidate is encouraged, if needed, to document moderators of final grade distributions.

b. Course Evaluations

Candidates must present a chronological summary of course evaluation data, both qualitative and quantitative, for each course taught. In presenting course evaluations, candidates may submit any comparative information they deem appropriate. If the candidate has taught one or more undergraduate or graduate core courses, ratings of each of these core courses should be compared to the ratings received by faculty teaching the same core course. Because individual course evaluations are confidential, the Department Chair will provide to the candidate comparative data for inclusion in the Dossier.

c. Peer Evaluations

Peer evaluations are required that assess how the candidate approaches his/her teaching, goals of the course, and skill with which materials are presented, including at least one visit to his/her classroom. The purpose of the peer evaluation is to assess such factors as pedagogical skill, knowledge of the subject matter, organization and preparation, ability to communicate course material to students and to stimulate intellectual curiosity, effort devoted to teaching, and contributions to the curriculum (e.g., through the development of new courses). The candidate must have at least two (2) peer evaluations from the University and can include supplemental observations from external reviewers. The department will insert these reviews in the Dossier under a separate tab. This section of the Dossier will be held confidential, and will be removed prior to returning the Dossier to the candidate.

d. External Reviews

The Dossier will include, at minimum, five (5) external reviews completed by individuals, some or all of whom may be inside the university but external to the department, with established reputations in teaching. Appendix 2 specifies the procedure used to obtain external reviews for teaching

2. Recommended Evidence

A candidate may develop his/her application by including additional evidence. Appendix 5 identifies indicators that a candidate may include in his/her Dossier as evidence of excellent teaching. The Committee regards these indicators as neither definitive nor exhaustive. The Committee considers all pertinent evidence of a candidate's contribution to the department's teaching mission.

3. Quality Ratings

For a rating of “**Excellent**” in teaching, a candidate:

- must have achieved a consistent and continuing record of outstanding teaching effectiveness and leadership;
- should have received strong support from reviewers;
- should have shown continuing support to the success of the department’s teaching mission;
- should have provided compelling evidence of teaching initiatives and accomplishments; and
- Candidates for Full Professor should have an established university-wide and/or regional/national/international reputation in teaching as demonstrated with ancillary evidence.

4. Professional Activity Prior to University Employment

As stipulated in the [UD Faculty Handbook](#), “Any prior teaching or service plays its role in the hiring contract, the level of monies involved, and the responsibilities attached to it. Prior activity plays little or no role in the promotion except to form a meaningful context against which later development and accomplishments can be judged.” However, unless otherwise noted in the faculty appointment letter, all work in rank, even if conducted at other institutions of higher education, shall be considered for promotion provided the productivity since the date of appointment has been at a level commensurate with the promotion guidelines specified in this document. It shall be the faculty’s responsibility to include evidence of this work in his/her dossier and to clearly identify when and where this work was performed.

C. Scholarship

To be promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor in the Department of Business Administration, the candidate’s record must be evaluated as at least “**high quality**” in scholarship.

1. Evidence

In judging the value of a candidate’s scholarly contribution, the quality of work is most important.

Although single-authored publications are not required, candidates who present a record largely composed of multi-authored publications *must carefully document* their contribution to this work. The candidate is required to solicit co-author letters, to be sent to the department chairperson, from at least one co-author from each publication who can speak best to the candidate’s contribution. This is particularly important for those candidates who have no single-authored pieces.

2. Professional Activity Prior to University Employment

a. Promotion to Associate Professor:

The [UD Faculty Handbook](#), stipulates that, “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.” Therefore, promotion considers evidence of scholarship subsequent to obtaining a degree. Publications that arise from a dissertation following the appointment to assistant

professor may be considered if the candidate offers clear evidence of substantial scholarly achievement made upon employment and thereafter. Unless otherwise noted in the faculty appointment letter, all work in rank, even if conducted at other institutions of higher education, shall be considered for promotion provided the productivity since the date of appointment has been at a level commensurate with the promotion guidelines specified in this document. It shall be the faculty's responsibility to include evidence of this work in his/her dossier and to clearly identify when and where this work was performed.

b. Promotion to Full Professor:

Scholarly productivity for promotion to the rank of full professor, even if conducted at other institutions of higher education, will be considered. It will be the faculty's responsibility to include evidence of this work in his/her Dossier and to clearly identify when and where this work was performed. Work conducted at other institutions should be documented and evaluated in the context of the department and institutional standards of excellence at the University of Delaware.

3. Quality Ratings

a. For a rating of "**High Quality**" in scholarship, a candidate:

- must have demonstrated a commitment to scholarly research as evidenced by publications in recognized refereed journals; and
- should have provided clear indications that scholarly research will continue following a positive promotion decision.
- Scholarly activities, typically evidenced with publications in recognized, referred journals, must be substantively greater than that required for contract renewal

b. Recommended Evidentiary Materials

A candidate may develop his/her application by including additional evidence. Appendix 4 identifies indicators that a candidate may include in his/her Dossier as evidence of scholarship. The Committee regards these indicators as neither definitive nor exhaustive. The Committee considers all pertinent evidence of a candidate's contribution to the department's research mission.

D. Service

1. To be promoted to Associate Professor or Full Professor in the Department of Business Administration, the candidate's record must be evaluated as at least "**high quality**" in service. Service includes service to the Department and to the programs within it, service to the University, service to the profession, and service to the public more generally.
2. Service includes innumerable types of activities rendered for the benefit of the department, college, university, profession, or community. Regardless of its demanding nature, service is not a substitute for teaching and scholarship, and generally does not weigh heavily on promotion decisions. Nevertheless, the avoidance or disregard of service commitments may be cause for not being recommended for promotion. A candidate must document that he/she has consistently and effectively administered his/her service responsibilities.

3. Evidence

- a. A candidate may develop his/her application by including additional evidence. Appendix 6 identifies indicators that a candidate may include in his/her Dossier as evidence of service. The Committee regards these indicators as neither definitive nor exhaustive. The Committee considers all pertinent evidence of a candidate's contribution to the department's service mission.
- b. The variety of service types presented in Appendix 6 is listed in no predetermined order of importance. The department does not expect a faculty member to carry out activities in all categories. Some faculty will specialize in certain types of service efforts to the exclusion of others. In evaluating service activities, the Committee values most highly those efforts that are active, successful, and important, and that demonstrate leadership and initiative.
- c. To receive a rating of **"high quality"** in service, a candidate must have demonstrated initiative and commitment in the performance of assigned service responsibilities.

E. CONTINUING TRACK (CT) ADVANCEMENT – Without Terminal Degree

A. Qualifications for Appointment and Advancement without Terminal Degrees

Instructor

To be eligible for departmental recommendation for appointment to the rank of Instructor, a faculty must show the potential for future growth and accomplishment in teaching and/or advising. Instructors do not need a terminal degree and usually have minimal or no scholarship responsibility.

Senior Instructor

As specified by University Policy, successful peer review at the end of the sixth year results in advancement from Instructor to the title of Senior Instructor.

Master Instructor

As specified by University Policy, successful peer review at the end of the 13th year results in advancement from Senior Instructor to the title of Master Instructor.

B. Performance Reviews

A full peer-review will be conducted at years 2, 4, 6 and 13. Upon a successful review, a continuing contract of length specified by University Policy will be awarded; otherwise, the candidate will receive a terminal year appointment.

Appendix 1

Solicitation of External Research Reviews, Procedures

Following the procedures specified in evidentiary materials for promotion materials specified in the [UD Faculty Handbook](#), the department implements the following procedure to solicit external research reviews:

1. A candidate will submit a list of potential reviewers, some of whom will be approached for recommendations. External reviewers should represent senior and distinguished or leading scholars in comparable fields to that of the P&T candidate. This list cannot contain anyone with whom the candidate has previously worked, graduate advisors, or individuals with whom the candidate has had a close personal relationship.
2. Faculty in the candidate's area provide a list of additional potential reviewers.
3. The candidate has an opportunity to comment on any of the potential reviewers.
4. The total list of names will be greater than the total number of letters solicited. Although the candidate must be informed of all potential reviewers and have an opportunity to comment on them, it is the Committee, and not the candidate, that makes the final selection. The final list of names will not be given to the candidate so as to preserve confidentiality of the reviewers.
5. A department representative, usually the Area Head for the candidate's area,¹ then attempts to contact and obtain commitments from five (5) potential reviewers (whenever possible, approximately half from the candidate's list, and half from the department list).
6. Candidates must not contact potential reviewers about the promotion process at any time.
7. Letters of evaluation will be confidential and peer reviewers will not be mentioned by name or affiliation in any recommendations or evaluations. Reviewers may be referred to by number.
8. The Department Chair sends each peer reviewer a letter requesting the evaluation and a curriculum vita or biographical statement describing the reviewer's credentials, a representative portfolio of work provided by the candidate, and a statement of relationship to the candidate. Insofar as reasonable and possible, only reviewers without personal ties to the candidate should be selected.
9. If a candidate has collaborative works, it must be clear to the peer evaluator what the candidate's contributions were to the finished work. Reviewers must be able to determine whether an individual can execute research in his/her own right. The candidate can clarify contribution by providing a statement for reviewers that discusses his/her contribution to each co-authored work or by annotating the vita.

¹ Because the Department of Business Administration is multidisciplinary, it is organized into areas based on discipline. Each discipline has an Area Head, who is in the best position to assist with the preparation of a candidate's Dossier. Department procedures rely on the candidate's Area Head (or other representatives from the candidate's area appointed by the P&T Committee in the case of the Area Head's absence) to facilitate preparation of the Dossier.

The department will place the external review letters in the appropriate section of the candidate's Dossier organized as follows:

A. Introductory Materials

- a. Final list of potential reviewers, noting which names were suggested by the candidate.
- b. A memo from the candidate, with any comments he/she has about the potential reviewers.
- c. A copy of the cover letter sent to reviewers.
- d. An annotated curriculum vita or statement that documents his/her contribution to each co-authored piece of work.

B. External Review Letters (5), each separated with a tab and numbered sequentially for reference.

- a. Letter
- b. Reviewer's CV/Biographical statement

This section of the Dossier is to be held in confidence, and will be removed prior to returning the Dossier to the candidate.

Appendix 2

Solicitation of External Teaching Reviews, Procedures

Following the procedures specified in evidentiary materials for promotion materials specified in the [UD Faculty Handbook](#), the department implements the following procedure to solicit external teaching reviews:

1. A candidate will submit a list of potential reviewers, some of whom will be approached for recommendations. External reviewers should be those with a reputation for teaching and can 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 such.
2. Reviewers may be from outside the department or the university.
3. Reviewers should be able to evaluate the candidate's impact on the field in the area of teaching and speak to his/her influence university-wide and/or regionally/nationally/internationally.
4. Faculty in the candidate's area provide a list of additional potential reviewers.
5. The candidate has an opportunity to comment on any of the potential reviewers.
6. The total list of names will be greater than the total number of letters solicited. Although the candidate must be informed of all potential reviewers and have an opportunity to comment on them, it is the Committee, and not the candidate, that makes the final selection. The final list of names will not be given to the candidate so as to preserve confidentiality of the reviewers.
7. The Department Chair then attempts to contact and obtain commitments from five (5) potential reviewers (whenever possible, approximately half from the candidate's list, and half from the department list).
8. Candidates must not contact potential reviewers about the promotion process at any time.
9. Letters of evaluation will be confidential and peer reviewers will not be mentioned by name or affiliation in any recommendations or evaluations. Reviewers may be referred to by number.
10. The Department Chair sends each peer reviewer a letter requesting the evaluation and a curriculum vita or biographical statement describing the reviewer's credentials, a representative teaching portfolio of work provided by the candidate, and a statement of relationship to the candidate. Insofar as reasonable and possible, only reviewers without personal ties to the candidate should be selected.

The department will place the external review letters in the appropriate section of the candidate's Dossier organized as follows:

1. Introductory Materials
 - a. Final list of potential reviewers, noting which names were suggested by the candidate.
 - b. A memo from the candidate, with any comments he/she has about the potential reviewers.

- c. A copy of the cover letter sent to reviewers.
2. External Review Letters (5), each separated with a tab and numbered sequentially for reference.
 - a. Letter
 - b. Reviewer's CV/Biographical statement

This section of the Dossier is to be held in confidence, and will be removed prior to returning the Dossier to the candidate.

Appendix 3

Solicitation of Student Letters, Procedures

The department implements the following procedure to solicit feedback from students. Testimonials from a selection of former and current undergraduate and graduate students will be used to assess the impact of teaching on students. The procedures for drawing the sample will be as follows:

1. Check Student Information Services (UDSIS) for courses taught by the candidate during the past five years.
2. Give the list to the candidate to verify that all courses have been listed.
3. Randomly pick three students from each course taught by the professor, making sure there is no duplication.
4. Send a letter to each student requesting input.
5. If a letter is returned due to a bad address, another student from that course will be selected and a letter sent.
6. If the response rate is not adequate, reminder letters will be sent out to students that have not responded.

The department will place the student review letters in the appropriate section of the candidate's Dossier organized as follows:

1. Introductory Materials
 - a. Final list of potential student reviewers.
 - b. A copy of the cover letter sent to student reviewers.
2. Student Letters, each separated with a tab and numbered sequentially for reference.
 - a. Letter

This section of the Dossier is to be held in confidence, and will be removed prior to returning the Dossier to the candidate.

Appendix 4
Scholarship Performance
Recommended Evidentiary Materials²

The candidate may include any of the following accomplishments in his/her Dossier as evidence of scholarship:

- Articles citing the individual's work and the reasons for its importance
- Books (e.g., textbooks, professional/practice/trade, and/or scholarly books)
- Chapters in books (e.g., textbooks, professional/practice/trade, and/or scholarly books)
- Data (such as h-index) from the Science and the Social Science Citation Index relevant to the impact of an individual's work
- Faculty Research Seminar/Presentations
- Internal and external research grants
- Invitations to contribute chapters to books edited by established scholars
- Invitations to participate in other peer-review processes such as program or departmental evaluations
- Invited presentations to national or international organizations
- Leadership positions in professional societies
- Papers published in the proceedings of professional meetings³
- Peer reviewed cases with instructional materials, technical reports related to funded projects, and/or publicly available research working papers
- Peer reviewed journal articles (e.g., learning and pedagogical research, contributions to practice, and/or discipline-based scholarship)
- Peer reviewed paper presentations at professional or academic meetings
- Receipt of fellowships and/or research awards
- Reprinting of articles or parts of books in collections of distinguished contributions to a subject
- Research Monographs (e.g., teaching/pedagogical, practice/applied and/or discipline-based research)
- Reviews of books, particularly when the reviews are in depth
- Significant editorial responsibilities (e.g., editorships) for respected scholarly publications
- Substantial involvement in national grant review processes (e.g., permanent member of review panels, etc.)

² Indicators are listed alphabetically, and not in order of importance.

³ Generally, presentations and proceeding papers should eventually lead to scholarly publications. Hence, while important, they are seen as secondary indicators of research performance and do not factor directly into the P&T process.

Appendix 5

Teaching Performance

Recommended Evidentiary Materials⁴

The candidate may include any of the following accomplishments in his/her Dossier as evidence of teaching performance:

- Articles citing the individual's teaching work and the reasons for its importance
- Awards or similar recognition for outstanding teaching
- Creation of online teaching resources
- Creation of new courses and curricula, particularly in response to departmental learning goals
- Data (such as h-index) from the Science and the Social Science Citation index relevant to the impact of an individual's teaching work
- Development of classroom technology or problem-based learning courses that support the teaching goals of the department, college, and/or university
- Direction of graduate research and undergraduate honors theses
- Documentation of teaching improvement/development work (e.g., use of UD's [Center for Teaching and Assessment of Learning](#) to develop and apply instruments to collect performance and outcome data beyond that provided by standard course evaluations)
- Engagement in mentoring relationships with other faculty for the improvement of teaching
- External peer review by faculty outside the College or from other universities – this may include evaluation of syllabi and course materials, and/or classroom visits; external peer review may be suggested by the candidate, or other faculty in the candidate's discipline, but, ultimately, the department selects and invites external faculty for a peer review
- Invitations to contribute chapters to books
- Invitations to contribute chapters to books edited in one's field
- Invitations to speak at meetings and conferences
- Leadership positions in professional teaching societies
- Leadership role in teaching- or training-related organizations on or beyond campus
- Leading workshops or other forms of instruction for faculty, staff, and teaching assistants at UD
- Organizing or participating in panels at national or regional teaching conferences
- Participation in peer-review processes such as program or departmental evaluations
- Participation in program/curriculum review outside the department
- Participation in teaching activities beyond normal classroom courses, e.g., service learning teaching
- Improvement activities, study abroad, outcomes assessment, or instructional grants
- Publication of, or contribution to, textbooks
- Publication of original teaching materials such as study guides, problem sets, business cases, or training manuals
- Publication of scholarship of teaching and learning in peer-reviewed journals
- Reprinting of articles or parts of books in collections of distinguished contributions to a subject
- Research grants related to teaching
- Reviews of books, particularly when the reviews are in depth
- Sample rubrics scoring performance-based assessments of students' achievement of learning goals; whenever possible, the candidate should annotate these materials, indicating the learning goals they were designed to develop or assess
- Significant editorial responsibilities (e.g., editorships) for respected teaching-related publications
- Student advisement, especially when it contributes to students' professional or career development
- Written comments from the student course evaluations; candidates should include all written comments for a given course section

⁴ Indicators are listed alphabetically, and not in order of importance.

Appendix 6

Service Performance, Recommended Evidentiary Materials^s

Service to the University

- Active engagement as a faculty advisor for a student organization or club
- Seminar presentations or lectures to members of the university community
- Administrative assignments within the university
- Directing an academic program (e.g., director of a minor program)
- Extraordinary service of a demanding nature to the Department, College, or University will enter into the evaluation of faculty; examples of this include election as College or University Faculty Senate president, chairing important Department, College, or University committees, etc.
- Participating actively on multiple committees
- Taking responsibility for a major function, such as running graduate examinations or serving as a faculty sponsor for a student organization or publication
- Work on department, college, and university committees

Service to the Profession

- Descriptive book reviews published
- Organizing professional meetings or conferences
- Reviewing candidates for promotion at other institutions
- Service as a journal or book editor, membership on editorial boards, or work as a referee for professional journals, reviewer of grant proposals, scholarly research monographs, or textbooks
- Serving as a chairperson or discussant at sessions of professional meetings or conferences
- Serving as an officer of a professional organization in one's field
- Substantive contributions to colleagues' research efforts

Service to the Business Community and Government

- Organizing symposia or lecture series directed to the community
- Participation on boards, commissions, or societies at the local, state, or national level
- Presentations or lectures on management issues
- Professional services provided to community groups, businesses, or government agencies on behalf of the University

Service to the General Community

- Community service is commendable, but, except as it reflects on an individual's professional competence or is a significant part of the negotiated workload, it will not be considered as supportive of promotion or tenure decisions.

^s Indicators are listed alphabetically, and not in order of importance.