

**DEPARTMENT OF ENTOMOLOGY AND WILDLIFE
ECOLOGY STATEMENT OF POLICY FOR
EVALUATION AND PROMOTION OF FACULTY**

9/28/2016

Approved March 2017

GENERAL POLICY STATEMENT

The Department of Entomology and Wildlife Ecology (hereafter known as "this Department") seeks to retain faculty members who (1) are regarded as highly competent researchers as exemplified by scientific publications in accepted channels or by successful development and application of problem-solving research; (2) effectively communicate ideas and direction to undergraduate and graduate students in the classroom and in research efforts resulting in theses or dissertations; and (3) are willing to share their time and skills in service both within and outside of the University of Delaware community.

ELECTION, STRUCTURE AND CHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Committee on Evaluation and Promotion (CEP)

Departmental promotion and tenure procedures must be democratic. Therefore, the CEP shall be constituted and operated in such a fashion that due respect is given to the opinions and advice of all faculty members. The CEP comprises all faculty of the Department (see Bylaws for definition of "Faculty"), except the Department Chair, who are Associate or Full Professors. Tenure track (TT) members of the CEP can vote on all candidates and continuing track (CT) faculty can vote on all CT candidates. A candidate whose case is under consideration by CEP is not eligible to serve on the committee. When sufficient numbers of faculty at the appropriate rank are not available, one or more persons meeting the same criteria external to the Department shall be elected by the faculty to serve on an ad hoc basis for a specific case. CEP shall elect its own chair from the tenured members of the faculty.

The charge of the CEP is to review, supplement (where appropriate), and evaluate dossiers presented to it and make recommendations for final action. The CEP or an ad hoc committee also may propose changes in the Statement of Policy, or in interpretations of it, to the faculty for approval or disapproval. Approval of changes shall consist of a majority of the faculty with academic rank, including Continuing-Track and Tenure-Track faculty members. Such changes should first be sent to the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee on Promotion and Tenure and the Dean of the College. If approved, they should then be submitted to the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure and Provost by March 1 to become effective by September 1.

CEP PROCEDURE

General

The faculty member under review should assemble a dossier of materials that he or she regards as appropriate and convincing evidence of his/her abilities. Faculty members should consult the University Faculty Handbook (Promotion and Tenure section) for more information.

The Department Chair organizes and initiates the steps for the CEP evaluation of a faculty member, conducts an independent evaluation, inserts his/her recommendation into the candidate's dossier, and forwards the dossier to the Dean of the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources along with the CEP's report summarizing the reasons for or against a favorable judgment.

Evaluation for Promotion

A. Initiation and Preparation of the Dossier

Any faculty member intending to apply for promotion during a given academic year must so inform the Department Chair in writing by April 30 of the previous academic year. The Department Chair must assure that the CEP is called into service and that the department elects a chair of the CEP. The CEP Chair should receive from the candidate, by June 15, a list of peers external to the University with established reputations in the candidate's field. CEP will add additional names to the list and ask the candidate for any comments. CEP will then choose reviewers from the combined list, who shall remain unknown to the candidate. In consultation with the CEP chair, the candidate will compile the materials to be sent to peer reviewers. Enough letters should be solicited to obtain a minimum of five letters from external peer reviewers for the candidate's dossier. CT faculty members must be externally evaluated for promotion to Associate or Full Professor. When the predominant role is teaching or service, appropriate external evaluations can be performed locally, but should be external to the academic unit. In general, candidates should submit for external review a position description signed by the department chair, a complete C.V., candidate statements, reprints of materials published since the last promotion or appointment, and a summary of teaching evaluations. The CEP may not omit or add materials without the consent of the candidate. The candidate shall receive a copy of the letter of transmittal to reviewers. The CEP members may not offer additional verbal or written information about candidates' background and materials to reviewers without the candidate's knowledge; however the CEP chair may communicate with reviewers to explain the promotion and tenure process and procedures as necessary. The Promotion and Tenure guidelines (this document) of the Department of Entomology and Wildlife Ecology will accompany the evidential material compiled by the candidate to each external reviewer. (See Section of Faculty Handbook on Solicited Peer Evaluations.) The dossier should be organized following the guidelines in the University Faculty Handbook. A dossier must be prepared by the candidate and submitted as application for promotion to CEP by September 1.

The position description, signed by the Department Chair, shall be presented

following the candidate's letter requesting promotion. The candidate should consult the Faculty Handbook and the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources' Promotion Policy Statement for details on Promotion Policy. Collection of the information for the dossier and its organization and presentation are the responsibility of the candidate. However, the CEP Chair, the Department Chair, the candidate's mentor, and other staff should provide advice or assistance willingly if asked. The CEP Chair has responsibility for sending the appropriate dossier materials to the external peer review panel, inserting their evaluations into the dossier, and ensuring their anonymity from the candidate. The candidate may add material to the dossier through the Chair of CEP throughout the review process but should be careful to date the added material and call attention to it by memoranda in the leading pages of the dossier.

B. Review

Each CEP member shall review the dossier and rate the candidate's performance in each of the categories of performance as evidenced by the dossier. The CEP shall discuss the ratings and the CEP Chair will write a formal letter with the assistance and input from the CEP summarizing the CEP's perspectives on scholarship, teaching, and service, including the numerical vote and an explanation of reasons for the decision. The CEP letter is signed by the members of CEP and inserted into the dossier. The dossier is forwarded to the Department Chair, and a copy of the letter is provided to the candidate.

The Department Chair shall conduct a review of the dossier and CEP recommendation, prepare a separate recommendation, insert it in the dossier, and send a copy to the candidate. The Department Chair then forwards the dossier to the Dean.

C. Appeal

A candidate who receives a negative decision at either the CEP or the Department Chair level may withdraw the dossier, submit it to the next level for consideration, or appeal. The candidate has five working days to request an appeal in writing. An appeal includes a letter documenting the basis of the appeal. A meeting will be scheduled with the candidate to discuss the appeal. A response to the appeal will be made within two working days. Upon the final decision, a recommendation for or against promotion will become a part of the candidate's dossier.

D. Schedule

April 30	Candidate informs Department Chair of his/her intent to apply for promotion by this date.
May 1	Election of Department CEP Chair and appointment of external members as necessary.
June 15	Candidate forwards a list of external peer reviewers to the CEP Chair.
July 1	Candidate provides CEP Chair with materials to be sent to external peer reviewers.
Sept. 1	Promotion dossier submitted by candidate to department committee. CEP Chair will add the peer review letters.
Oct.1	Department CEP recommendation and dossier are forwarded to the Department Chair.

Oct. 15	Chair's recommendation and dossier are forwarded to the College Committee.
Dec. 1	College Committee's recommendation to the Dean.
Jan. 2	Dean's recommendation to the University P & T Committee.
Feb. 15	University P & T Committee recommendation to the Provost.
March 15	Provost's recommendation

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING CANDIDATES

The Department recognizes that faculty members must strive for excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. Each faculty member is expected to actively participate in all of these categories. The individual faculty member should use both training and experience to excel in those categories that will best serve this Department's commitments and his/her position description.

Categories for evaluating candidates are presented below. For each category, several examples are listed. It is not intended that the examples shown are the only ones to be considered, nor is it intended that every candidate have some activity for every example. Material submitted for promotion and evaluation will be based on activity since the last promotion/evaluation or hiring. This Department recognizes that some faculty members will have more activity in some categories than others and that this will differ between individuals. The CEP must take care to avoid comparing the activities of one faculty member with another. Evaluation must be of the individual merits of each candidate. Length of service should not have any bearing on the committee's recommendation.

A. Teaching

Since an extremely important function of the University is to help educate students, each faculty member in this Department is expected to strive toward excellence in teaching. The major roles of the instructor are to train and develop the student's intellect and to transmit knowledge in the academic discipline. The excellent teacher also communicates the relationship between the subject matter and the quality of the student's own life. Instructors should have a strong commitment to the facilitation of the learning experience and to helping students obtain personal meaning and growth from these experiences. Educational programs in Cooperative Extension are viewed as a component of teaching.

A candidate should incorporate evidence into the dossier to document his/her competence in teaching. Some examples are:

1. Teaching Activities
 - a) Regularly scheduled courses
 - b) Independent study courses
 - c) Development and revision of courses
 - d) Team teaching and guest lecturing
 - e) Cooperative Extension Activities
2. Self-evaluation

3. Student evaluations on items related to the quality of the course and the instructor (tabulated and summarized)
4. Comments from student evaluations
5. Peer evaluations
6. Testimonials from former students
7. Course portfolio evaluations
8. Student advisement
9. Continuing professional development

B. Scholarship

All faculty members must pursue some form of scholarly activity. This may be in the form of research accomplishments and subsequent publication or other expressions of scholarship. Scholarly is defined as having or showing much knowledge, accuracy, and critical ability. How scholarly work is made available to others depends on one's specialty. In general, promotion requires evidence of significant achievements and in most cases should show strong potential for continued activity.

Because this Department has faculty members with appointments in the Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension, and since these organizations have the primary goals of assisting the rural/agricultural sector of the State of Delaware, this Department recognizes that some forms of scholarly activity include the communication of research results and other scholarly work to the public. It is the responsibility of the candidate to document his/her activities and scholarly contributions. Some examples are:

1. Research Activities
 - a) Research projects
2. Research Publications
 - a) Books, monographs, chapters, Experiment Station Bulletins, journal articles, and Cooperative Extension publications; indicate if refereed and status: in press, in review, in revision, submitted; if coauthored, indicate share of responsibility. Referee and editor comments can provide documentation of scholarly activity.
3. External Grants submitted and awarded.
4. Other accomplishments in research related to publication
 - a) Theses guided
 - b) Research reports
 - c) Extension publications/reports
 - d) Manuscripts in preparation
5. Review of manuscripts and grant proposals
6. Scholarly papers and talks presented at meetings and other departments; indicate whether invited or submitted.
7. Self-evaluation of scholarly achievements
8. Peer evaluation
9. Outside evaluation of non-refereed publications
10. Professional consulting
11. Continuing professional development

- a) Sabbatical
 - b) Professional organization membership and meetings
12. Cooperative Extension Activities

C. Service

Service to the Department, College, University, community and professional sectors is also an important part of the Department mission and must not be neglected. Some aspects of service and Cooperative Extension activities will overlap. Quality of service is not easy to document. Faculty members should maintain a file of letters and other items demonstrating one's involvement and achievements in service. Evidence of service might include a list of meetings at which information was presented and letters from individuals and groups served. Testimonials and peer evaluation of service may be useful. Some examples are:

1. Public community
 - a) Consultation with County Agents, farmers, and homeowners.
 - b) Presentations at public meetings and technical assistance to public agencies
 - c) Contributions to news articles, news releases, etc.
2. University community
 - a) Department
 - b) College
 - c) University
3. Scientific community
 - a) Professional organizations, committees, officer
 - b) Special assignments
4. Cooperative Extension Activities

RATINGS/REQUIREMENTS FOR THE VARIOUS RANKS

Criteria and evidence of performance to be considered for evaluating members at a given rank or for promoting faculty members to higher rank are listed below. For a positive evaluation the ratings to be met shall be those of the candidate's rank. For promotion the ratings to be met shall be those of the next highest rank sought by the candidate.

DEFINITIONS

Unsatisfactory - Less than adequate performance of his/her responsibilities.

Good - Adequate performance for his/her responsibilities.

Very Good - Performance at a level that is significantly above the normal of his/her responsibilities, with some additional activities.

Excellent - Superior performance of his/her responsibilities including additional activities and significant contributions to Departmental goals. As applied to scholarship, implies national recognition.

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION OF TENURE TRACK FACULTY

<u>CRITERION</u>	<u>RATING OR REQUIREMENT</u>
A. Teaching competence	Excellence if the major area of responsibility; Very Good if the secondary area of responsibility
B. Scholarly achievement	Excellence
C. Service	Good

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION TO CONTINUING TRACK FACULTY

<u>CRITERION</u>	<u>RATING OR REQUIREMENT</u>
A. Teaching competence	Excellent in the role aligned with the preponderance of workload during the period at current rank. More than adequate (Good) performance in the other two areas.
B. Scholarly achievement	
C. Service	