

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

POLICY ON PROMOTION AND TENURE

Approved by Faculty Vote, April 27, 2016

Approved March 2017

This policy statement defines the standards and procedures for promotion and tenure in the Department of English. It does not repeat material that appears in the [Faculty Handbook](#) or in the College of Arts and Sciences [Policy on Promotion and Tenure](#). Candidates must refer to those documents for information regarding dossier preparation, deadlines for the promotion process above the department level, and university-wide or college-wide promotion and tenure policies. In the event of a conflict, the university policy takes precedence, followed by the college policy and then the department policy.

These policies govern the review of both tenure-track and continuing-track faculty. The promotion of continuing-track faculty to the rank of associate or full professor without tenure is based on the principle that the weights assigned to teaching, scholarship, and service must be directly related to the candidate's workload assignment. The standards for the quality of work are the same for all faculty, both tenure-track and continuing tracks. These standards are described in the 2015 English Department Review Rubric (EDRR). All that varies is the weight placed on each category.

Appointment to Assistant Professor

The rank of assistant professor does not carry tenure. A candidate for this rank must have attained the Ph.D. (or the appropriate terminal degree in a given field) or present an impressive body of work that represents the functional equivalent of a terminal degree. In addition, the candidate must show strong potential to perform excellent work in scholarship (if tenure track) or teaching (if continuing track).

Promotion to Associate Professor

In the years since appointment to the rank of assistant professor, the candidate must have demonstrated excellence in scholarship (if tenure-track) or in teaching (if continuing-track), as well as high-quality performance in the other areas specified by his or her workload assignment. Unsatisfactory performance in any area will preclude promotion. A candidate must earn a score of 7 or higher on the English Department Review Rubric (EDRR) to be rated as performing excellent work. He or she must earn a score of 5 or higher on the EDRR to be rated as performing high-quality work. Letters solicited from scholars in the candidate's field must also confirm excellence in scholarship (if tenure-track) or teaching (if continuing-track).

Promotion to Full Professor

In the years since appointment to the rank of associate professor, the candidate must have demonstrated excellence in scholarship (if tenure-track) or in teaching (if continuing-track), as well as high-quality performance in the other areas specified by his or her workload assignment. Unsatisfactory performance in any area will preclude promotion. A candidate for full professor must earn a score of 8 or higher on EDRR to be rated as performing excellent work. He or she must earn a score of 6 or higher on the EDRR to be rated as performing high-quality work. Letters from outside evaluators must confirm the established reputation of the candidate in his or her field of scholarship (if tenure-track) or teaching (if continuing-track).

Granting of Tenure Only

In order to be recommended for tenure, faculty appointed at the rank of associate professor without tenure must present convincing evidence of ongoing productivity in scholarship, teaching, and service at the University of Delaware. The standards, procedures, and timetables used for promotion to associate professor will apply to the tenure process except that the quantity of scholarly work will be assessed in accord with the length of time that has elapsed since the candidate's initial appointment. The quality of ongoing scholarship must meet the standards for excellent performance required for promotion to associate professor.

Review Process

All cases for promotion go through two stages of deliberation, conducted by two different departmental committees.

Stage One

THE FACULTY REVIEW COMMITTEE (FRC) conducts regularly scheduled reviews of all tenure-track and continuing-track faculty. The membership and protocols of this committee are specified in the Department Bylaws. The standards for evaluation used by the committee are described in the 2015 English Department Review Rubric (EDRR).

The FRC conducts the first stage of review. If research is a part of the candidate's workload, or if research is directly relevant to the candidate's teaching or service, then any materials not yet accepted for publication must be included in the dossier with their status (submitted, resubmitted, in press) clearly identified. Based on the FRC's review of the required materials in his or her online dossier, the committee assigns a candidate a numerical score in each of the three categories of scholarship, teaching, and service. It also provides a written rationale for each numerical score. In that report, the FRC will comment on whether and how materials still in progress would affect the candidate's rating. This report is given to the candidate, who then

reaffirms (or not) his or her intention to be considered for promotion or for promotion and tenure. If the candidate decides to move forward, then the FRC provides its report to the Chair of the Promotion & Tenure Committee and to the department chair.

Stage Two

THE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE (P&T) then conducts the second stage of review. The materials for this review include the candidate's complete dossier (updated to account for materials newly accepted for publication, additional service, and teaching evaluations from the previous semester), the report of the FRC, and letters solicited from scholars in the candidate's field and from former students. All of these materials must be made available to members of the committee at least two weeks before they meet to review a case for promotion and tenure.

Composition of the P&T Committee

All continuing-track and tenure-track faculty holding the rank of associate or full professor are members of the P&T committee. For reviews of continuing-track faculty seeking promotion to associate professor, the committee is made up of all associate and full professors. For reviews of tenure-track faculty seeking promotion to associate professor, the committee is made up of all tenured associate and full professors. For reviews of continuing-track associate professors seeking promotion to full professor, the committee is made up of all full professors. For reviews of tenured associate professors seeking promotion to full professor, the committee is made up of all tenured full professors.

The Chair of the P&T Committee must be a tenured full professor. He or she is appointed by the Department Chair for a three-year term.

Quorums and Voting

A quorum consists of one-half plus one of all P&T committee members not on leave. Members of the committee do not need to be present to vote, but must be familiar with the candidate's dossier, the FRC report, and outside letters in order to do so. Absentee ballots and proxies are permitted, but should be used only when absolutely necessary, as they do not count in the quorum.

Role of the Department Chair

The Department Chair does not vote or participate in the discussions of either the FRC or P&T committees. However, the Department Chair does present a written report to the FRC summarizing the candidate's annual reviews for the period under consideration. In addition, the FRC Chair provides the Department Chair with its report on the candidate, and the P&T Chair provides the Department Chair with a copy of the formal letter to the Dean, signed by the members of the P&T committee, summarizing their recommendations for or against promotion and, when appropriate, tenure.

Timetable for Departmental Promotion Procedures

- 1 October: Deadline for written notification to the department chair, the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the chair of the Faculty Review Committee of the candidate's intent to apply for promotion the following academic year. E-mail communication is sufficient for this purpose. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee begins the process, outlined in this document, for identifying potential external reviewers and for identifying students to approach for letters concerning the candidate's teaching.
- 15 February: Deadline for the candidate to complete an electronic dossier for consideration by the Faculty Review Committee. The dossier should follow the format described in the Faculty Handbook except that no letters attesting to scholarship, teaching, or service are required. It is strongly recommended that the candidate include a statement summarizing his or her case for promotion in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. Deadline for the Department Chair to submit a written report to the FRC summarizing the candidate's annual reviews.
- 1 May: The Faculty Review Committee Chair presents its assessment of the dossier to the candidate. Based on this appraisal, candidate reaffirms, or not, her or his intent to apply for promotion. If the candidate decides to move forward, the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee begins the process of soliciting external reviews and student letters.
- 1 June: Deadline for the candidate to supply six copies of the curriculum vitae and of all scholarly work to be sent to external reviewers. These materials should also be made available to members of the P&T Committee.
- 1 September: Deadline for the candidate to make any needed updates to her or his electronic dossier.
- 1 October: Deadline for a final vote by the department Promotion and Tenure Committee. The committee chair is to report the vote orally to the candidate as soon as possible after the meeting. If the candidate wishes to appeal, he or she must do so within five working days after being informed of the committee's decision.
- 10 October: Deadline for a second vote following the candidate's appeal, if any.

Letters From Outside Evaluators and Students

Immediately following the preliminary review in the spring, the candidate will be asked to supply the names of approximately ten highly regarded scholars in his or her field. Names will also be solicited from the department at large. The candidate will be given an opportunity to comment on the names on the department's list, and the P&T chair will give weight to the candidate's assessment of their suitability. The candidate will also be asked to specify his or her relationship (if any) with all potential reviewers. The P&T chair, in consultation with faculty in or close to the candidate's field, will then select five outside evaluators. These evaluators, and the template for the letter they will be sent, must then be approved by the CAS Dean before potential reviewers are contacted.

The candidate will be asked to submit the names of fifteen former students from whom the committee may solicit letters attesting to the quality of the candidate's teaching, advisement, sponsorship of student activities, and other student-related work. The P&T chair will also select students at random from the candidate's class rosters, and the candidate will not be informed of their names. Letters will be solicited from an equal number of students from the candidate's list and from the department's random list.

The candidate may submit to the Promotion and Tenure Committee the names of anyone who can document service to the university or any of its units, to professional organizations, to community service groups, or to any other organizations with which the candidate is associated. The committee will solicit letters from everyone named by the candidate. All letters from outside evaluators and from former students are confidential.

Conduct of Committee Meetings

If the committee is reviewing more than one candidate for promotion, all continuing-track candidates will be considered before all tenure-track candidates. Within each of the two tracks, candidates for associate professor will be considered before candidates for full professor.

The order of business for each candidate is as follows:

1. The P&T Chair leads the discussion of each case for promotion and tenure.
2. The FRC Chair may be asked to provide background information as needed.
3. To be eligible to vote, members of the P&T committee must be familiar with the candidate's dossier, the FRC report, and outside letters.
4. Vote is by paper ballot.

If more than one candidate is being considered for promotion to a given rank, this procedure will be completed for all candidates.

Reports

As soon as possible after the meeting, the P&T Chair will orally inform both the candidate and the Department Chair of the numerical vote and the committee's reasoning. The candidate may also request a formal meeting with the P&T Chair, the FRC Chair, and the Department Chair.

Within a week after the vote, the P&T chair will deliver a letter summarizing the committee's decision to the department office, where it will be available to all committee members. Those who participated in the meeting will be given at least three working days in which to sign it; those who are unable to do so may authorize signatures by proxy. When this process is complete, the P&T chair will deliver the signed letter to the department chair, with a copy to the candidate.

Confidentiality

Confidentiality is of the essence in carrying out promotion and tenure evaluations, and information is to be conveyed to the candidate only by the committee chair and other faculty appointed by the committee for this purpose. Although it may sometimes be necessary for committee members to discuss promotion and tenure questions in venues other than official meetings, the times and places for such discussions must be selected with due regard for the privacy of the candidates and of fellow committee members. The committee may temporarily exclude members who persistently or grossly violate the confidentiality of its proceedings.

UD English Department Review Rubric

This rubric provides consistent standards for the annual appraisals conducted by the Department Chair, the periodic reviews conducted by the Faculty Review Committee (FRC), and the evaluation performed by the FRC for the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Since the period under review can range from one to six years or more, the rubric needs to be used with judgment and flexibility. For example, while the FRC should expect “clear evidence of a well-conceived ongoing scholarly or creative program” when conducting a two- or four-year review, the Department Chair might need to allow for fluctuations of progress on a project while conducting an Annual Appraisal. Still, the Chair could also use the occasion of the appraisal to mentor faculty if a single-year’s achievements might make it challenging to establish the longer-term records of ongoing performance required for other evaluative occasions. In this way, the rubric provides not only guidance for the annual appraisal but also context for reading the long-term implications of that year’s performance. The Chair should consider that context, in turn, when evaluating an unsuccessful year, and should temper her/his judgment with a consideration of the faculty member’s ongoing record. In short, each evaluative body should use the rubric to evaluate both the process towards and achievement of an ongoing record of accomplishments, with judicious attention to the period of review under consideration.

Faculty members under review may find that some of their achievements during the review period are difficult to characterize as falling purely under Teaching, Scholarship, or Service because the three categories inevitably overlap. Faculty members and evaluators are urged to make the best determination of whether a given activity counts as teaching, scholarship, or service without counting any activity under more than one heading.

Scores of 7–9 are considered evidence of excellence in teaching, scholarship, or service; scores of 5–6 are considered evidence of high quality. To earn a particular score, it is necessary to demonstrate achievement at the level indicated by the examples and alternatives. It is not necessary to do everything listed at that level. Throughout this document, examples are intended to clarify or illustrate the particular level of achievement being described, not to constitute an exhaustive list.

Teaching

“Teaching” encompasses all activities that aid student learning and professionalization. A faculty member’s performance in areas that might otherwise be considered Scholarship or

Service may be considered under the Teaching rubric if the faculty member can make the case that these activities ultimately serve students. The evaluation of teaching can thus encompass publication and professional development activities that maintain or advance the instructor's professional expertise in a given teaching area.

Descriptive Scale:

1. A persistent record of major deficiencies in teaching, such as exceptionally low student evaluations or lack of student evaluations, recurrent student complaints, inadequate syllabi and course materials, or failure to turn in final grades; unsatisfactory performance of such teaching obligations as meeting classes and returning student work.
2. A record of consistently low student evaluations, undeveloped syllabi and/or teaching materials, course goals and objectives poorly articulated, instruction provides very limited opportunities for challenging students intellectually, poor performance or substantial weakness in meeting routine teaching obligations such as meeting classes and returning student work
3. A record showing some evidence of below average student evaluations, syllabi, or teaching materials; subpar performance in providing intellectually challenging instruction or opportunities (consistent with the size and goals of the course) for students to improve their skills in writing and in the critical interpretation of texts; some evidence of weakness in carrying out such teaching obligations as meeting classes, returning student work in a timely manner, and turning in final grades on time.
4. A record characterized by average student evaluations, syllabi, and/or teaching materials, average peer evaluations, average performance in providing intellectually challenging instruction or opportunities for students to improve their skills in writing and the critical interpretations of texts; meets routine teaching obligations such as meeting classes, returning student work in a timely manner and turning in final grades on time.
5. A clear record characterized by good student evaluations; strong peer evaluations; well-developed syllabi and other teaching materials, including a clear explanation of course goals and policies (e.g., attendance and grading); evidence of intellectually challenging instruction; evidence of opportunities (consistent with the size and goals of the course) for students to improve their skills in writing and in the critical interpretation of texts; evidence of consistently conscientious performance of such teaching obligations as meeting classes, returning student work in a timely manner, and turning in final grades on time.

6. A consistent record characterized by student evaluations that range between good and very good; strong peer evaluations; well-developed syllabi and other teaching materials, including a clear explanation of course goals and policies (e.g., attendance and grading); consistent evidence of intellectually challenging instruction; consistent evidence of opportunities for students to improve their skills in writing and in the critical interpretation of texts; a consistent record of meeting routine teaching obligations such as meeting classes, returning student work in a timely manner, and turning in final grades on time.

7. A strong record characterized by very good student evaluations; very good peer evaluations; well-developed syllabi and other teaching materials that reflect creative, effective, or engaging ways of addressing the content and goals of the course; strong evidence of intellectually challenging instruction with documented learning outcomes; evidence of substantial opportunities (consistent with the size and goals of the course) for students to improve their skills in writing and in the critical interpretation of texts. Creation of new courses or curricula that respond to departmental needs and reflect the faculty member's talents and interests. Evidence of significant additional contributions to teaching beyond the candidate's own classroom, such as oversight of student theses, dissertations, undergraduate research, and independent study projects; creation of new courses and curricula, particularly in response to department needs; participation in interdisciplinary teaching; innovative uses of instructional technology; participation in teaching activities beyond normal classroom courses, such as service learning, teaching improvement activities, study abroad, outcomes assessment, or instructional grants; mentoring work beyond normal academic advisement of students; engagement in collegial or mentoring relationships with other faculty for the improvement of teaching.

8. A record of outstanding accomplishment on the measures outlined in Level 7; further evidence of contributions beyond the candidate's own classroom, such as contributing to professional journals on the teaching of one's discipline, creating online teaching resources, holding office in regional or national associations, organizing or participating in panels at national or regional conferences, publishing textbooks in one's field, publishing books or articles about teaching, serving on teams evaluating teaching in other institutions, receiving teaching grants or awards, leading workshops or other forms of instruction for faculty, staff, and teaching assistants at UD, and offering similar instruction in the public schools or in other institutions.

9. A compelling record of outstanding accomplishment on the measures outlined in Levels 7 and 8; teaching awards and similar indicators of achievement and recognition; other evidence of being a model teacher, a model citizen, and a leader in creating a strong teaching culture in and beyond the department.

Scholarship

Throughout this section, the term “scholarship” embraces the acquisition, production, and dissemination of new scholarly knowledge and skills. The goal of this rubric is to recognize that the production of scholarly output is often a process that takes several years. Therefore this rubric reflects the realities of the time lapse required for excellence in scholarship and rewards the quality and relevance of scholarly work rather than volume. Faculty members and reviewers should assess the impact of scholarship: Is the work reviewed, cited, and influential in shaping the field? Does the scholarship reach a wider public?

We understand that untenured faculty are best advised to establish mastery of a single field to advance their career. This rubric is not meant to encourage either concentration in a particular field or breadth across several fields because we recognize that this determination will depend upon the individual’s interests and career stage.

Books published with university and academic presses well-regarded in the field in which a given faculty member works or trade presses that have an impact on a broader public are also especially valued. Articles placed in influential, selective, peer-reviewed journals are more highly valued than articles published elsewhere. Although the primary gauge of scholarship is its impact in the faculty member’s field, public scholarship that extends the influence of English studies in the larger community is also highly valued.

“Editorial work” refers to such activities as serving as editor of a journal or of a special issue of a journal, or as a series editor for a series of books or monographs. Peer reviewing articles for publication in scholarly or professional journals, evaluating book manuscripts for university presses and other publishers, and serving as an outside reviewer for promotion and tenure cases at other institutions fall under the heading of Service rather than Scholarship.

As required by the department’s merit statement, progress made on ongoing projects must be documented by a narrative statement detailing precisely what work has been conducted since the previous appraisal or review. Notes on archival research or interviews, drafts of chapters or of creative works, and other materials may also be presented to demonstrate continuing productivity. Scores of 1–8 may be based solely or primarily on a demonstration of progress on an ongoing project commensurate with that score.

In order for a faculty member to receive due credit for Scholarship, Scholarship must be defined as some portion of workload. The Chair may assign a workload percentage to Scholarship even for a faculty member who is on a continuing track line if the candidate has either opted for the summer research option or made some other arrangements (e.g., by conducting funded research or having release time to serve as editor of a journal). In the absence of workload assigned to Scholarship, those on continuing track lines should identify the scholarship of teaching as part of the Teaching category.

Descriptive Scale:

1. No evidence of progress on any scholarly or creative projects since the last review. No acceptances, publications, paper presentations, or other activities associated with ongoing research.
2. Some activity related to the production of scholarly or creative work. No significant work completed, and no evidence of a broader research program. Very limited evidence of more ambitious work in progress. Acceptance or publication of very minor scholarly or creative work on the level of pieces in local newsletters or short notes in other publications.
3. Some activity related to the production of scholarly or creative work. No significant work completed, but some evidence of a developing research program marked by modest work in progress. Acceptance or publication of such minor scholarly or creative work as short pieces in local newsletters, short notes in other publications, and presentations attesting local recognition.
4. Some evidence of a developing scholarly or creative program and of the production of scholarly or creative work related to that broader program. A consistent pattern of minor scholarly or creative work in peer-reviewed journals or other highly regarded venues; creative works such as single poems or short stories, or comparable examples of scholarly productivity; and presentations attesting regional recognition.
5. Evidence of a well-conceived ongoing scholarly or creative program designed to result in the publication of a monograph or a series of interlocking essays, as indicated, for example, by substantial articles in peer-reviewed journals or other highly regarded venues; creative works such as single poems or short stories in highly regarded venues, or comparable examples of productivity; and presentations attesting regional recognition.
6. Clear evidence of a well-conceived ongoing scholarly or creative program designed to result in the publication of a monograph or a series of interlocking essays, as indicated,

for example, by the publication of substantial articles in peer-reviewed journals or other highly regarded venues; the publication of creative works such as single poems or short stories in highly regarded venues; comparable examples of scholarly or creative productivity; and presentations attesting regional recognition.

7. Evidence of a well-established ongoing scholarly or creative program that has already yielded a pattern of publication indicated, for example, by the acceptance or publication of a critical edition of a substantial text, an edited collection of essays, a monograph, a significant article published in a competitive venue, or multiple articles or other pieces since the last review period; substantial progress on one or more ongoing projects; evidence of significant scholarly achievement or recognition in such forms as editorial work; the submission of completed proposals for competitive grants, fellowships, and other awards; the receipt of modest, moderately competitive, or local grants or awards; reviews indicating the impact of current or previous scholarly or creative work; reprints or reissues of earlier publications; some citations in the work of other scholars; invited presentations to national or international organizations; and presentations at national or international conferences.

8. Strong evidence of a well-developed scholarly or creative program that has yielded a pattern of significant ongoing publication as indicated, for example, by the acceptance or publication of a single-author book or comparable scholarly or creative work; the culmination of a major project embodied in a series of related short pieces (e.g., a series of journalistic feature articles that span more than one assessment period or the completion of a series of books or monographs edited over a period of years); the receipt of significant fellowships, grants, or awards; strong evidence of additional scholarly achievement or recognition in such forms as editorial work, reviews indicating the substantial impact of current or previous publications, reprints or reissues of earlier works, frequent citations in the work of other scholars, invited presentations to national or international organizations, and presentations at national or international conferences.

9. Compelling evidence of a well-developed scholarly or creative program that has yielded an extensive pattern of significant publications recognized for their excellence in reviews, scholarly citations, and other venues that signal importance in the field. Major national or international awards or recognition; highly competitive fellowships or grants.

Service

Ratings for service represent both time devoted to an activity (such as serving on a committee that meets often and at length) and the actual contribution made by the faculty member in the form of achievement or outcome (e.g., playing a major role in revising the

college breadth requirements, successfully leading an initiative to improve the advisement of students in the department).

To earn credit for service work, faculty must provide a narrative statement including clear and specific information about both time commitments and accomplishments. Candidates are encouraged to provide evidence illustrating the impact or results of their service.

Regular attendance at department meetings and events or other evidence of an active presence in the department contributes to service scores.

Descriptive Scale:

1. No evidence of service to the department, college, university, profession, or community, or evidence consisting primarily of records of attendance at departmental meetings and events.
2. A record of membership on one or two committees annually involving little work; little or no evidence of contributions to the department, college, university, profession, or community.
3. A record of service limited to attending meetings of one or two active committees or the equivalent annually; little evidence of additional contributions to the department, college, university, profession, or community.
4. A pattern that involves such activities as playing an active role annually on more than two committees within the department, college, or university; holding office in a professional organization over a period of several years; other low-impact service commitments to the department, college, university, profession, or community.
5. A pattern that involves such activities as chairing moderately demanding committees within the department, college, or university, or chairing one such committee over a period of several years; playing an active role on multiple committees; holding a moderately demanding office or performing comparable work for a professional organization; carrying out other specific tasks of benefit to the department, college, university, profession, or community.

6. A clear pattern that involves such activities as continued, active service on multiple committees within the department, college, or university; initiating and leading a department or college initiative; active engagement/ membership in professional organizations; holding an office with the university system; holding a position of responsibility on a committee or organization outside the university; peer reviewing articles for scholarly journals or book proposals of manuscripts for scholarly presses.

7. A consistent pattern that frequently involves such activities as chairing a very active committee within the department, college, or university; leading a challenging initiative; holding office in the college or university senate; taking responsibility for a major function, such as running graduate examinations or serving as a faculty sponsor for a student organization or publication; directing a program; participating actively on multiple committees; chairing or serving on several thesis or dissertation committees; reviewing candidates for promotion at other institutions; evaluating scholarly books.

8. A strong pattern that routinely involves such activities as engaging energetically in several active committees within the department, college, or university; holding a national position in a professional organization; initiating and leading a conference, special event, or presentation; achieving recognition as a leader in the university or in a professional organization; serving as an editorial participant for scholarship and reviews; leading initiatives that produce significant outcomes; engaging in a range of activities that consistently demonstrate skill and leadership; frequently chairing or serving on thesis or dissertation committees; active engagement as a faculty advisor for a student organization or club.

9. An outstanding pattern of service to the department, college, university, and larger professional communities that involves successfully engaging in the kinds of activities described in Levels 7 and 8 in an exceptionally high quantity or at an exceptionally high level of responsibility and achievement.