

PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA
Department of Economics
University of Delaware

I. Promotion Procedures

Promotion and tenure of faculty in the Department of Economics are governed by Section 4 of the Faculty Handbook. Candidates for promotion and tenure should familiarize themselves with that document. Additional guidance and requirements specific to the Department of Economics follow.

The Department Promotion and Tenure Committees are responsible for making recommendations on 1) promotion in rank and 2) the granting of tenure. For tenure-track faculty, the Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of all tenured members of the department who are senior in rank to the candidate for promotion or tenure. If the number of faculty eligible to serve as voting members of a Promotion and Tenure Committee is less than four, the committee will invite appropriate faculty from related academic departments to serve as temporary voting members. Faculty members holding administrative positions that have subsequent standing in the process (i.e., Department Chairperson, Dean) are not eligible for membership on the Committee. The chairperson of all Promotion and Tenure Committees must be a tenured professor, elected by the full-time faculty. Election of the chairperson shall be conducted annually by the end of the fall semester.

For promotion of continuing-track faculty to higher professorial ranks, the Promotion Committee shall consist of those tenure-track and continuing-track faculty members of the department who are senior in rank to the particular faculty member applying. The chairperson of the Committee shall be the same as defined immediately above.

II. Periodic Faculty Evaluation Procedures

In addition to its responsibility for making recommendations on promotion and tenure, the Department Promotion and Tenure Committees are responsible for conducting periodic evaluations of the scholarly research, teaching, and service activities of the faculty. The evaluations are based upon the criteria and evidence described in sections III and IV below. An evaluation will lead to a written report, which is provided to the department chairperson and the faculty member. For tenure-track faculty, the Committee shall be as defined above for tenure-track faculty and shall be as defined above for continuing-track faculty members.

II.A Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty

The performance of untenured faculty members must be evaluated at least every two years. In addition, the scholarly research of untenured assistant professors must be evaluated during their third year in rank. Evaluations should be conducted for tenured associate professors at least once every five years, and for professors at least once every seven years. A faculty member may request more frequent evaluations, but not more than one per year. A request for an evaluation must be made in writing to the chairperson of the Promotion and Tenure Committees by October

1. The Promotion and Tenure Committees determine their evaluation procedures each year, and may create subcommittees of their members to perform the periodic evaluations.

II.B Evaluation of Continuing-Track Faculty

Newly-appointed continuing-track faculty shall be evaluated during appointment years two, four and six, or as specified by the Faculty Handbook. Thereafter evaluations shall be conducted as specified by the Faculty Handbook. A faculty member may request more frequent evaluations, but not more than one a year. A request for an evaluation must be made in writing to the chairperson of the Promotion and Tenure Committees by October 1. The Promotion and Tenure Committees determine their evaluation procedures each year, and may create subcommittees of their members to perform the periodic evaluations.

III. Promotion and Tenure Criteria for Tenure-Track Faculty

The Promotion and Tenure Committee evaluates candidates in the areas of scholarly research, teaching, and service. The evaluation of a candidate's contributions in the three areas must be made with reference to the fundamental departmental missions of adding to the body of economic knowledge and raising the general level of understanding about economic issues. In general, these missions can best be accomplished through: 1) scholarly research directed at important economic problems; 2) strong undergraduate and graduate teaching; 3) dissemination of economic knowledge to a wide audience; and 4) professional and/or public service.

The evaluation of a candidate's record and standards for excellence and high quality in research, teaching, and service will be made taking into account the candidate's assigned workload over the relevant time period. Minimum standards for promotion are given in Section 4.4.2 of the Faculty Handbook. Additional criteria used by the Department of Economics are described below.

IIIA. Promotion to Associate Professor

To be eligible for a positive departmental recommendation, a candidate for promotion to associate professor must receive a rating of "Excellent" in research and a minimum of "High Quality" ratings in all other assigned workload areas. There should be unmistakable evidence that the individual has progressed professionally and will continue to do so.

III.A.1 Research

To receive a rating of excellent in research, a candidate will have 1) established a successful research program; 2) received strong support from external reviewers; and 3) provided clear evidence that significant contributions to the research mission of the department will continue beyond promotion.

A successful research program will include articles published or accepted for publication

in highly-regarded refereed economics journals, including leading field and/or general economics journals or their equivalent. Articles currently in the review process may be considered if they have received positive referee reports and a request for resubmission from the journal editor.

A successful research program may also include some items from the list below; none are necessary components of a successful research program.

- External grants;
- Scholarly books;
- Articles included in conference volumes and edited books;
- Conference presentations;
- Favorable citations in other published research and/or record in citation indices;
- Other evidence of professional recognition for scholarly work;
- All other items listed in Section IV of the Faculty Handbook (see discussion of Promotion Dossiers, Evidence of Scholarly Attainment).

In evaluating the candidate's research, the promotion and tenure committee will weigh the tradeoffs among the types of evidence provided. Both the quality and quantity of the body of scholarly work and the candidate's contribution to that work will be considered, along with other indicators of the candidate's ability to successfully conduct research over an extended time period. There is no threshold number of publications necessary for promotion nor is there any number that guarantees promotion.

The Department of Economics maintains a rating of journals that will be used in assessing the quality of scholarly research and in identifying leading field and/or general economics journals.

III.A.2 Teaching

To receive a rating of excellent in teaching, a candidate must make substantial broad contributions to the department's teaching mission and must demonstrate significant initiative in supporting this mission. A case for excellence in teaching must be thoroughly documented with substantial evidence that includes many of the items listed below. This documentation may include external reviews of the candidate's teaching record comparable to the external reviews that are solicited for candidates seeking promotion on a research track. Evidence of teaching quality includes:

- Peer evaluations submitted by a subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The assessment of the subcommittee will follow the procedures outlined in Section IV below.
- Results on student teaching evaluations;
- Teaching awards or other external recognition;
- Contributions to the Ph.D. program, such as direction of dissertation research and

- membership on dissertation committees;
- Direction of Masters and undergraduate honors theses and research papers;
- Grants providing financial support for graduate students;
- New course development;
- Publication of textbooks, supplementary readings, and other teaching aides;
- Publication of pedagogical articles in refereed journals;
- All other items listed in Section 4 of the Faculty Handbook (see discussion of Promotion Dossiers).

In evaluating teaching evidence, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will consider all aspects of the candidate's contribution to the department's teaching mission, no one piece of evidence will be considered either necessary or sufficient for a rating of Excellent.

To meet the minimum standard for high-quality teaching, the candidate must have demonstrated competence and commitment in the performance of teaching responsibilities. The minimum standard for "High Quality" will vary with the candidate's assigned workload; for example, for a faculty member with a relatively low assigned teaching workload, the standard will be adjusted accordingly.

III.A.3 Service

To receive a rating of excellent in service, a candidate must make substantial broad contributions to the department's service mission and must demonstrate significant initiative in supporting this mission. A case for excellence in service must be thoroughly documented with substantial evidence that includes many of the items listed below. This documentation may include external reviews of the candidate's service record comparable to the external reviews that are solicited for candidates seeking promotion on a research track.

- Publication of articles in refereed journals, textbooks, and other publication outlets focusing on the scholarship of service.
- Recognized leadership at the national level in professional organizations;
- Administrative responsibility in the person's service capacity;
- Participation in and/or organization of national and international conferences;
- Success in obtaining external grants and/or contracts;
- Building partnerships with corresponding organizations at the local, state and national level;
- Service to boards of local non-profits, local and national task forces;
- Service on local, regional, and national committees and boards;
- Professional activities including journal and grant refereeing;
- Strongly favorable reviews from prominent external reviewers.

In evaluating service evidence, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will consider all aspects of the candidate's contribution to the department's service mission. No one piece of evidence will be considered either necessary or sufficient for a rating of Excellent.

To meet the minimum standard for high-quality service, the candidate must have constructively participated in the service responsibilities assigned by the department chair or in other appropriate professional activities.

III.B Promotion to Full Professor

To be eligible for a positive departmental recommendation, a candidate for promotion to full professor must receive a rating of “Excellent” in research and a minimum of “High Quality” ratings in all other assigned workload areas. Faculty with a reduced research load must also receive a rating of “Excellent” in the candidate’s area of predominant workload. A rating of “Excellent” in teaching or service must be supported by evaluations external to the candidate’s primary academic unit. In evaluating a candidate for this rank, the committee applies demanding standards that require continued achievement and sustained performance in rank beyond that necessary for promotion to associate professor.

III.B.1 Research

To be rated as excellent in research a candidate typically will have 1) established a successful research program, evidenced by a substantial body of work accepted for publication in highly-regarded, refereed journals (or their equivalent); 2) received strong support from external reviewers; and 3) provided evidence that significant contributions to the research mission of the department will continue beyond promotion.

A case for an excellent rating in research must be thoroughly documented with substantial evidence from the items listed in Section III.A.1 above. In evaluating this evidence, the promotion and tenure committee will follow the procedures described in section III.A.1. Evaluation of the quality and quantity of the candidate’s research will be based primarily on published work conducted during the candidate’s tenure as an Associate Professor; articles in the review process will typically receive much less consideration. In evaluating the candidate’s research, the promotion and tenure committee will carefully consider all aspects of the candidate’s research program and weigh the tradeoffs among the types of evidence provided. There is no threshold number of publications necessary for promotion; both quality and quantity of the body of scholarly work will be considered. Success in obtaining external funding strengthens a candidate’s case for promotion to professor; however, such success is neither necessary nor sufficient for attaining a rating of excellent in research.

III.B.2 Teaching

To receive a rating of excellent in teaching, the candidate must make substantial broad contributions to the department’s teaching mission and the candidate must demonstrate significant initiative in supporting this mission. A case for an excellent rating in teaching must be thoroughly documented with substantial evidence from the items listed in Section III.A.2 above. This documentation may include external reviews of the candidate’s teaching record comparable to the external reviews that are solicited for candidates seeking promotion on a

research track.

To meet the minimum standard for high-quality teaching, the candidate must have demonstrated competence and commitment in the performance of teaching responsibilities. The minimum standard for “High Quality” will vary with the candidate’s assigned workload; for example, for a faculty member with a relatively low assigned teaching workload, the standard will be adjusted accordingly.

III.B.3 Service

To receive a rating of excellent in service, the candidate must make substantial broad contributions to the department’s service mission and must demonstrate significant initiative in supporting this mission. All activities must be fully documented with substantial evidence from the items listed in Section III.A.3 above. This documentation may include external reviews of the candidate’s service record comparable to the external reviews that are solicited for candidates seeking promotion on a research track.

To meet the minimum standard for high-quality service, the candidate must have constructively participated in the service responsibilities assigned by the department chair or in other appropriate professional activities.

IV. Promotion Criteria for Continuing-Track Faculty

The promotion criteria for continuing-track shall be in agreement with those criteria stipulated in the Faculty Handbook.

IV.A Promotion to Associate Professor

The minimum criterion for promotion of continuing-track faculty to the rank of Associate Professor is excellence in teaching or service, depending upon the nature of the appointment and the assigned workload during the review period. A candidate for promotion must have a rating of “High Quality” in all other assigned workload areas. There should be unmistakable evidence that the individual has progressed professionally and will continue to do so.

IV.A.1 Teaching

The criteria for evaluations of “Excellent” and “High Quality” are the same as those specified in section III.A.2 above. In addition, for an evaluation of “Excellent” in Teaching, a candidate must have five “external” evaluations of teaching. “External” can mean external to the candidate’s primary academic unit but internal to the University.

IV.A.2 Service

The criteria for evaluations of “Excellent” and “High Quality” are the same as those

specified in section III.A.3 above. In addition, for an evaluation of “Excellent” in Service, a candidate must have five “external” evaluations of service. “External” can mean external to the candidate’s primary academic unit but internal to the University.

IV.A.3 Research

For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, an evaluation of “High Quality” in research is required. For continuing track faculty with a teaching or service appointment, research will be broadly defined to include the research of teaching or the research of service. The evaluation of a candidate’s record will be made taking into account his or her assigned workload over the relevant time period.

IV.B Promotion to Full Professor

The minimum criterion for promotion of continuing-track faculty to the rank of full professor is excellence in teaching or service, depending upon the nature of the appointment and the assigned workload during the review period. A candidate for promotion must have a rating of “High Quality” in all other assigned workload areas. In evaluating a candidate for this rank, the committee applies demanding standards that require continued achievement and sustained performance in rank beyond that necessary for promotion to associate professor.

IV.B.1 Teaching

The criteria for evaluations of “Excellent” and “High Quality” are the same as those specified in section III.B.2 above. In addition, for an evaluation of “Excellent” in Teaching, a candidate must have five “external” evaluations of teaching. “External” can mean external to the candidate’s primary academic unit but internal to the University.

IV.B.2 Service

The criteria for evaluations of “Excellent” and “High Quality” are the same as those specified in section III.B.3 above. In addition, for an evaluation of “Excellent” in Service, a candidate must have five “external” evaluations of service. “External” can mean external to the candidate’s primary academic unit but internal to the University.

IV.B.3 Research

For promotion to the rank of Full Professor, an evaluation of “High Quality” in research is required. For continuing track faculty with a teaching or service appointment, research will be broadly defined to include the research of teaching or the research of service. The evaluation of a candidate’s record will be made taking into account his or her assigned workload over the relevant time period.

IV.C Promotion of Continuing-Track Faculty at the Instructor Ranks

Consistent with the policy as specified by the Faculty Handbook, a recommendation of reappointment in year six is also a recommendation for promotion from the rank of Instructor to the rank of Associate Instructor. A recommendation of reappointment in year thirteen is also a recommendation for promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor.

V. Procedures for Peer Evaluation of Teaching Performance

A subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will be appointed by the Chair of the Committee to evaluate a faculty member's teaching. This subcommittee will consist of two or three members with expertise in the candidate's areas of teaching specialization. The subcommittee will:

- Meet with the faculty member under review and discuss teaching objectives and any other matters that the faculty member feels are relevant to the evaluation of her or his teaching performance.
- Review course syllabi, tests, and other course materials compiled by the faculty member for the evaluation.
- Conduct class visitations. The subcommittee and faculty member will identify a three-week period within which class visitations will occur. Each member of the subcommittee will attend at least one class. Where possible, two members of the subcommittee will attend at least one class together. The subcommittee members will write a report describing the visitations. The report will be a joint statement coming from the subcommittee unless agreement cannot be reached. In that case, separate reports will be submitted.
- Review student course evaluations and any other documentation provided in the dossier.

Based on all the above, the subcommittee will prepare a report to the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

VI. General Procedures for All Cases

The procedures below apply to all Promotion and Tenure decisions:

- All work in rank, even if conducted at other institutions, shall be considered in promotion and tenure decisions. It is the candidate's responsibility to include evidence of this work in his/her dossier, to clearly identify when and where this work was performed, and to provide any other information that may be relevant to evaluating that work.
- The primary workload assignment is the area with the highest percentage of assigned effort based on an average over the years in rank associated with a promotion.
- A minimum of five external reviews of the primary workload area should be obtained for all promotions. External reviewers should represent senior and distinguished scholars. External reviews are confidential and will not be made available to the candidate. The

selection of reviewers follows the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook, Section 4.4.9. The Committee shall submit a list of selected reviewers, along with a rank-ordered list of alternate reviewers, to the department chair by May 1.

- If the Department changes its promotion and tenure policies, the applicable policy shall be as defined in section 4.4.11 of the Faculty Handbook.
- For candidates that have funded joint appointments in more than one unit, the P&T Committee from the primary unit will solicit information from the other units regarding the candidate's performance (e.g., teaching, scholarship, service) during the P&T review process.
- In addition to the right to appeal at each stage of the P&T process, candidates have the right to add additional information to their dossier, including clarifying or elaborating on any issues or concerns that emerge throughout this process.

VI. Amendment Procedures

Amendments to this document pertaining to tenure-track faculty must be approved by a majority of the tenure-track faculty. Amendments to this document pertaining to continuing-track faculty must be approved by a majority of the tenure-track and continuing-track faculty. Proposed amendments must be made available to the faculty at least one week before taking a vote.