

**UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE
COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF MEDICAL LABORATORY SCIENCES**

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION, TENURE AND REVIEW

I. INTRODUCTION

Procedure for promotion, tenure and review of faculty in the Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences is governed by the Faculty Handbook, <http://facultyhandbook.udel.edu/handbook/44-promotion-and-tenure>. In the Department, it is the expectation that at the rank of associate professor and above, all tenure-track faculty demonstrate excellence in teaching and scholarship and make high-quality contributions in service, commensurate with assigned workload. For Continuing Track faculty, excellence must be demonstrated in the primary area of workload and high quality in the other area(s). Unsatisfactory performance in any of these areas will preclude progression or promotion. This document specifies Departmental procedures for evaluating candidates and additional requirements for promotion.

II. EVALUATION CATEGORIES

A. Teaching

A major goal of the Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences is to encourage all faculty to strive for excellence in teaching. Hence, faculty members with teaching responsibilities must demonstrate excellent teaching performance, commensurate with the workload assignment. Indicators of teaching performance may include faculty peer evaluation, student evaluations, course materials, learning outcome measures, teaching awards, new course development, and development of new curricula and programs. It is understood that teaching evidential materials include activities both inside and outside the classroom, such as advising undergraduates and mentoring honors and/or graduate students.

B. Scholarship

Scholarship includes all endeavors and activities that contribute to the generation and/or advancement of knowledge. As scholars, faculty members must demonstrate independence and leadership in scholarly endeavors, activities and accomplishments as well as collaboration as appropriate to meet scientific goals. Findings of research endeavors are disseminated to appropriate audiences through a variety of media including peer-reviewed professional publications and scientific presentations. The evidential materials must clearly show excellence commensurate to workload.

C. Service

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

III. PRINCIPLES FOR THE PEER REVIEW OF FACULTY

A. Overview

1. All continuing-track, tenure-track and tenured faculty will be reviewed annually by the department chairperson. Additionally, faculty members at all ranks will be subjected to periodic dossier reviews as stated in the Faculty Handbook Section 4.3.5. For continuing track (CT)

faculty, reviews will occur at year 2, 4, 6, 8 and 13 then will occur every 5 years. For tenure-track (TT) faculty, reviews will occur at year 2, 4 and 6 at which they will apply for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Tenured Associate Professors are reviewed every five years and Tenured Professors are reviewed every seven-years.

- a) The department chairperson will coordinate and organize all faculty reviews.
- b) Reviews are performed by the department promotion and tenure committee and the membership of this committee will be as stated in Section VI.A.2a of this Promotion and Tenure document.
- c) Poor performance for continuing-track instructors and tenure-track assistant professors may result in contract non-renewal.

IV. STANDARDS OF PROMOTION

A. Criteria for Promotion of Tenure-track (TT) Faculty for appointment or promotion to:

1. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR. The candidate must have an earned doctoral degree, and must demonstrate ability and desire to make high quality contributions in all areas; scholarship, teaching and service.

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

2. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE. The candidate must demonstrate excellent achievement in teaching and scholarship, commensurate with workload, and high quality performance in service, with clear indication, based on documented evidence and outside peer evaluations, that the candidate has in fact attained appropriate levels of accomplishment for promotion to this rank.

- a. **Excellent achievement in scholarship** is demonstrated by a clearly focused program of research with dissemination of research findings in peer-reviewed professional journals, national meeting paper presentations, and reasonable efforts made to obtain external funding. Quality in this sense denotes original research of significance in the basic or clinical scientific areas or scholarship of teaching. All scholarly work conducted at rank will be considered. A research program may be related to previous doctoral or postdoctoral research but must show an independent approach. Publications or grants accomplished in the doctoral degree program or in the postdoctorate will not be considered as evidential material for promotion. There must be a clear indication that the scholarship program of the candidate has continued since hire. The primary indicator of the quality of the candidate's scholarly activity is publication in refereed journals, of books and/or of refereed conference proceedings. Excellence is evidenced by the quality of the journals and also by the evaluation of published works by the external reviewers. The quantity of publication per se is less important than quality, and will be considered in the light of the field, the scholarship workload, and the number of research coworkers (postdocs, graduate students and undergraduates). Non-refereed publications will be judged less important than refereed publications unless external reviews clearly establish their significance. Information derived from online citation indexes

such as h-index and total number of citations may be used to evaluate the candidate's overall research productivity and impact to the field. It is expected that the candidate will actively seek and obtain external funding to support his/her research program when relevant funding is available. Evidence must show continuing efforts to obtain funding within the period of the evaluation. Acceptable external funding sources can be federal, state, foundation or industrial. Note that the amount of the funding will not be a criterion. If a person jointly authors a publication, grant application, etc., the individual contributions of each collaborator must be documented.

- b. **Excellent achievement in teaching** will be documented through peer and student teaching evaluations. The candidate is expected to arrange for an internal peer evaluation during the evaluation period. Ideally, repeated evaluations over time may demonstrate an increasing level of teaching expertise. The peer evaluations can be shared with the candidate and must be included in teaching evidentiary materials. The candidate should have made contributions in curriculum development to the Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences and contributions in the advisement of students. Recognition as a teacher/mentor as documented by teaching awards will make for a stronger case for promotion to this rank. All teaching activity conducted at rank will be considered. Typically, candidates must provide a clear sense of organization by preparation of syllabi, assignments and exams; provide clear expectations of student responsibilities; demonstrate knowledge of course content; and be available to students outside of class. Teaching evidence should document rigor, quality, depth, and applicability of course material to the level of the students. Further evidence of excellence may include journal publications or textbooks related to teaching or the candidate's area of expertise, new course development and use of teaching innovations. In evaluating teaching, the Committee considers all pertinent evidence of a candidate's contribution to the Department's teaching mission.
- c. **High quality service** contributions should include participation in appropriate professional organizations, service on department and college committees, and when possible, contributions to civic or government organizations or boards. It is expected that candidates will have served on at least one committee (University, College or Department) each year of the evaluation period and will maintain membership in their appropriate professional societies. Having served in leadership positions in service activities makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.

3. PROFESSOR. This rank is reserved for individuals who have established national and/or international reputations in their academic or research disciplines and whose contributions to their profession and the University's mission are outstanding. There should be unmistakable, clearly documented evidence and concurring external evaluations of sustained excellent achievement in teaching, scholarship and service, commensurate with workload, since the last promotion.

- a) **Excellent achievements in scholarship** must demonstrate a clearly focused and sustained program of research since the last promotion. Taking into account the candidate's area of expertise, the quantity of publication will be considered in light of the scholarship load and the number of research coworkers (postdoctoral research assistants, graduate and undergraduate students). Candidates are expected to prepare and deliver refereed podium presentations of research findings at national and international professional meetings and submit research proposals for funding. Acceptable external funding sources can be federal,

state, foundation or industrial. Funding where the candidate is listed as principal investigator (PI) or Co-PI will be accepted as demonstration of strong progress. Success in acquiring external grant support for research makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.

- c) **Excellent achievement in teaching** should be documented through peer and student teaching evaluations, contributions to student advisement, and a leadership role in curriculum development in the Department, College, and/or University. The candidate is expected to arrange for an internal peer evaluation during the evaluation period. Ideally, repeated evaluations over time may demonstrate an increasing level of teaching expertise. National recognition as a teacher/mentor makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank. There should be documentation of rigor, quality, depth, and applicability of course material to the level of the students. Further evidence of excellence in graduate and undergraduate teaching may include publications or textbooks related to teaching or candidates' area of expertise, new course development, evidence of use of teaching innovations, and receipt of teaching awards.
- d) **Excellent achievement in service** should include leadership roles in appropriate national and/or international professional organizations and on department, college, or University committees. Participation on civic or government organizations or boards strengthens the case for promotion. Service that enhances the reputation and visibility of the Department and the University such as appointments on national committees, service on editorial boards of journals, the organization of conferences or workshops, serving on funding agency panels, and significant outreach activities will be considered favorably in the promotion process.

4. GRANTING OF TENURE TO AN INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERED FOR HIRE AT THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OR PROFESSOR (TENURE-TRACK). It is expected that faculty members considered for hire at the rank of tenure-track Associate Professor or Professor will have an evaluation similar to that described above, using previous work in rank at another institution as the content of the dossier. It is expected that a Professor will have a research program already established. The evaluation will involve the Department Promotion & Tenure Committee, Chair, Dean and Provost.

B. Criteria for Progression of Continuing-Track (CT) Faculty for INSTRUCTOR.

1. INSTRUCTOR/ASSOCIATE INSTRUCTOR/SENIOR INSTRUCTOR:

The candidate must have an earned master's degree; a terminal degree is not required. The candidate must demonstrate positive contributions in the areas where workload is assigned. The candidate is expected to arrange for an internal peer evaluation during the evaluation period. Ideally, repeated evaluations over time may demonstrate an increasing level of teaching expertise. Contributions to teaching should be documented through positive peer and student teaching evaluations. The candidate is expected to arrange for an internal peer evaluation during the evaluation period. Ideally, repeated evaluations over time may demonstrate an increasing level of teaching expertise. The peer evaluations can be shared with the candidate and must be included in teaching evidentiary materials. Additional positive contributions may include innovations in teaching or the curriculum, mentorship of students, or program development.

- a) Scholarship broadly defined includes the scholarship of teaching and service. The plan for the scholarship of teaching may include giving professional presentations, publishing articles in journals including those of pedagogy of the field, contributing to writing of textbooks, developing innovative ways of teaching, introducing new technology in

- teaching, etc. The scholarship of service could include creative and innovative advisement, scholarly articles on service, or developing innovation in service.
- b) Documented service contributions should include participation in appropriate professional organizations. Additional examples of service contributions include service on department, college or University committees, involvement in accreditation of academic programs, creative or innovative advisement, scholarly articles on service, or developing innovation in service. Note that such articles cannot count here for service if it counted for scholarship. Having served in leadership positions in service activities provides additional support for a successful peer review.

C. Criteria for Promotion of Continuing-Track (CT) Faculty for appointment to:

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

- a) Teaching achievement may be documented through positive peer and student teaching evaluations, evidence for activities to improve instruction, learning outcome measures, or other materials demonstrating student learning. The candidate is expected to arrange for an internal peer evaluation during the evaluation period. Ideally, repeated evaluations over time may demonstrate an increasing level of teaching expertise. The peer evaluations can be shared with the candidate and must be included in teaching evidentiary materials.
- b) Scholarship should be presented in a well-articulated plan. Scholarship broadly defined includes the scholarship of teaching and service. Scholarship of teaching may include giving professional presentations, publishing articles in journals including those of pedagogy of the field, contributing to writing of textbooks, developing innovative ways of teaching, introducing of new technology in teaching, etc. Scholarship of service could include creative and innovative advisement, scholarly articles on service, or developing innovation in service.
- c) Documented service contributions should include participation in appropriate professional organizations. Additional examples of service contributions include service on department, college or University committees, involvement in accreditation of academic programs, creative or innovative advisement, scholarly articles on service, or developing innovation in service. Note that such articles cannot count here for service if it counted for scholarship. Having served in leadership positions in service activities provides additional support for a successful peer review.

2. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR. The candidate must demonstrate excellence in one role aligned with preponderance of assigned workload and high quality performance in the other two areas. There must be clear indication, based on documented evidence and peer evaluations, that the candidate has in fact attained appropriate levels of accomplishment for promotion to this rank. A minimum of five external review letters are required for promotion to Associate Professor. When the predominant role in the workload is teaching or service, appropriate *external* evaluations can be performed locally, but

should be *external* to the academic unit. When scholarship is the predominant role in the workload, the *external* evaluation should be performed by individuals outside the University community.

- a) **High quality achievement in teaching** may be documented through peer and student teaching evaluations. Additional indicators of high quality teaching include positive learning outcome measures or other materials demonstrating student learning. Mentorship of students and/or course/curriculum/program development makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank. The candidate is expected to arrange for an internal peer evaluation during the evaluation period. Ideally, repeated evaluations over time may demonstrate an increasing level of teaching expertise. The peer evaluations can be shared with the candidate and must be included in teaching evidentiary materials.
- b) **Excellent achievement in teaching** should be documented by peer reviews of a candidate's teaching that attest to the rigor, quality, depth, and applicability of course material. Further evidence of excellence may include; writing textbooks related to teaching or candidates' area of expertise, publishing articles in journals including those of pedagogy of the field, supervision of honors and master's theses and doctoral dissertations, samples of student work, and/or receipt of teaching awards. In evaluating teaching, the Committee considers all pertinent evidence of a candidate's contribution to the departments' teaching objectives.
- c) **High quality achievement in scholarship** may include giving professional presentations at the local or regional level, contributing to writing of textbooks, publishing articles in journals including those of pedagogy of the field, developing innovative ways of teaching, introducing new technology in teaching, etc.
- d) **Excellent achievement in scholarship** is demonstrated by the candidate meeting requirements for high achievement in scholarship in addition to giving professional presentations at the national level or publishing articles in peer-reviewed professional journals. Note that any publications included in this category cannot also be included as evidence in "service".
- e) **High quality service** contributions should include regular participation in appropriate professional organizations, service on department, college or University committees, and when possible, contributions to civic or government organizations or boards. Having served in leadership positions in service activities makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.
- f) **Excellent service** contributions are demonstrated by the candidate meeting high quality service criteria in addition to submitting letters of support from individuals able to evaluate the quality of the candidate's service. Evidence of excellence may include creative and innovative advisement, scholarly articles on service, or developing innovation in service. Note that any publications included in this category cannot also be included as evidence in "scholarship".

3. PROFESSOR. This rank is reserved for individuals who have established professional reputations in their fields, and whose contributions to their profession and the University's mission are excellent. There should be unmistakable, clear documented evidence and outside peer evaluations of significant development and achievement consistent with workload assigned since the

last promotion. The candidate must demonstrate high quality performance in all areas with leadership and excellent achievement commensurate with major assigned workload. A minimum of five external review letters are required for promotion to this rank. When the predominant role in the workload is teaching or service, appropriate *external* evaluations can be performed locally, but should be *external* to the academic unit. When scholarship is the predominant role in the workload, the *external* evaluation should be performed by individuals outside the University community.

- a) **High quality achievement in teaching** may be documented through peer and student teaching evaluations. Additional indicators of high quality teaching include positive learning outcome measures or other materials demonstrating student learning. Mentorship of students and/or course/curriculum/program development makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank. The candidate is expected to arrange for an internal peer evaluation during the evaluation period. Ideally, repeated evaluations over time may demonstrate an increasing level of teaching expertise. The peer evaluations can be shared with the candidate and must be included in teaching evidentiary materials. There must be a demonstration of continued achievement since the last promotion.
- b) **Excellent achievement in teaching** should be documented by peer reviews of a candidate's teaching that attest to the rigor, quality, depth, and applicability of course material to the level of the students. Further evidence of excellence may include publications or textbooks related to teaching or candidates' area of expertise, and a portfolio documenting new course/curriculum/program development, use of teaching innovations, samples of student work, and/or receipt of teaching awards. In evaluating teaching, the Committee considers all pertinent evidence of a candidate's contribution to the departments' teaching objectives. Mentorship of students and/or course/curriculum/program development makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.
- c) **High quality achievement in scholarship** must demonstrate a clearly focused and sustained program of research. There must be dissemination of research findings in peer-reviewed professional journals and national meeting paper presentations. Further high quality achievement in scholarship may include preparing and delivering presentations of research findings, and/or innovations in teaching, advisement or service at national and international professional meetings.
- d) **Excellent achievement in scholarship**, a candidate must have met all of the guidelines for high quality achievement in scholarship and also have been successful in obtaining external funding support for scholarly activities. Success in acquiring external support (e.g., grants, contracts, etc.) for research including innovations in teaching or service makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.
- e) **High quality service** contributions should include leadership in appropriate professional organizations and on department, college, or University committees. Participation in government organizations or boards strengthens the case for promotion. Having served in leadership positions in service activities makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.
- f) **Excellent service** contributions are demonstrated by the candidate meeting high quality service criteria in addition to submitting letters of support from individuals able to evaluate the quality of the candidate's service. Evidence of excellence may include creative and innovative advisement or developing innovation in service since last promotion. Participating in national or international professional organizations makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.

V. MATERIALS REQUIRED IN CANDIDATE DOSSIERS

A. Dossier Preparation and Presentation

1. The candidate is strongly encouraged to consult with their assigned mentor and members of the Department P&T Committee regarding the content and preparation of the dossier.
2. The candidate should organize the dossier based upon electronic dossier submission program.
3. The dossier must include the following introductory materials and those evidentiary material chosen by the candidate for inclusion.

B. Introductory Material

1. Contents and Guidelines
 - a) Recommendation for Promotion Form
 - b) A table of contents
 - c) Copies of the University's, College's and Department's P&T criteria (must be the one chosen by the candidate if the P&T policies for the Department have changed since the time of hire. If promotion from Associate Professor to Professor is sought, the criteria in place at the time of the application must be used.)
2. **Application for Promotion**
 - a) Candidate's letter requesting promotion
 - b) A curriculum vitae
 - c) A letter from the department specifying the average workload(s) for the period under review. The percentages in this letter must correspond to the percentages in the letter to the external reviewers.
 - d) Candidate's summary statement, limited to two (2) pages, addressing teaching, scholarship and service
3. **Two- & Four-Year Reviews - Faculty Seeking Promotion to Associate Professor**
 - a) Reviews conducted by the Department P&T committee
 - b) Reviews conducted by the Department Chairperson
4. **Internal Recommendations**
 - a) The Department committee's recommendation
 - b) The Department Chairperson's recommendation
 - c) College committee's recommendation
 - d) Dean's recommendation
 - e) University committee's recommendation
 - f) Any appeal materials (appeals and rebuttals)
5. **External Recommendations**
 - a) A copy of the letter soliciting feedback from the external evaluators, which includes a breakdown of the faculty member's workload for the period under review, and a copy of the departmental P&T guidelines provided for use in providing the evaluation, must be included in the front of this section.
 - b) The list of the external reviewers who were nominated by the candidate versus those nominated by the department committee, and the criteria used to request from specific reviewers
 - c) Letters of evaluation from external reviewers together with supporting material; these letters will be numbered sequentially for reference.

- C. Evidential Materials.** The nature of supporting materials is largely the choice and responsibility

of the candidate. The list below is a non-exhaustive, suggested set of evidentiary material; none specifically is required, and they are placed in no order of priority.

1. Teaching

- a) Statement of teaching philosophy
- b) Peer evaluations that attest to the candidate's classroom and laboratory competence, knowledge of subject matter, organization and preparation, ability to stimulate intellectual curiosity and creativity in the classroom and laboratory setting. Evaluators may share their evaluations with the candidate who must include them in the dossier.
- c) Data from student evaluations (of the instructor and of the course), including class size, number returned, means/standard deviations or frequencies, should be presented in a tabulated format. The procedures used in administering the evaluations should also be described. These may not serve as the only basis for the evaluation.
- d) Verbatim copies of student comments from student evaluations. Note that all comments should be included.
- e) Solicited evaluations from former students; procedures for drawing the sample should be clearly described.
- f) Course portfolio: One course is selected for which the candidate supplies copies of typical course materials: syllabus, objectives, handouts, assignments and exams; demonstrating coordination of material in lecture and laboratory courses is expected; honors section materials should be included, if applicable. The course material submitted for evaluation should be a reflection of the candidate's own skill in the development of the required teaching materials. Any materials obtained from another faculty member, and not revised by the candidate, must be identified as such and will not be considered in the evaluation of the candidate's teaching skills.
- g) Student performance on national standardized examinations in the candidate's teaching area; this information needs to clearly define the candidate's role in the teaching process
- h) Teaching awards
- i) Teaching grants
- j) Program/project grants. Note that if included here, cannot also be in "scholarship".
- k) Contributions to curriculum by demonstration of new course development, design or significant course revision.
- l) Requests for/acknowledgment of consultation in teaching, curriculum/program development, etc.
- m) Continuing professional development in teaching pedagogy, or teaching topics related to the candidate's expertise.
- n) Listing of directed undergraduate studies (e.g., degree with distinction advisement, independent study, honors sections); directed graduate studies (e.g., thesis and research supervision, thesis/dissertation committees)
- o) Listing of the number of non-research academic advisees per academic advisement
- p) Publication in journals, book chapters, textbooks, poster presentations, and talks at meetings as they pertain to the candidate's area of expertise and courses taught. Note that an activity included here cannot be included in another level.

2. Scholarship

- a) Statement summarizing candidate's scholarly activity program, including previous, current and projected focus

- b)** Publication of refereed research articles, educational articles, review articles, books, book chapters, technical reports, clinical papers, abstracts, computer software, and computer assisted instruction materials. A listing of either acceptance rates or impact factors for each journal is required to provide evidence of journal quality. Notation should be provided about the significance, if any, of the placement of the candidate's name in a co-authored manuscript (first author, last author, etc).
- c)** Manuscripts accepted or in-press for publication. A statement of work documenting candidate contribution to each publication should be included; also should include where work was performed. Notation should be provided about the significance, if any, of the placement of the candidate's name in a co-authored manuscript (first author, last author, etc).
- d)** All research grants funded/non-funded/submitted for review, to include grant reviews. In those grants where the candidate is a Co-PI, the actual amount of funds received by the candidate must be indicated. In addition, in any award, internally or externally funded, the candidate should state his/her exact role and percent effort, supported by the appropriate documentation.
- e)** Presentations (clearly identified as refereed, invited, keynote, podium or poster) given at scientific meetings.
- f)** Awards (local, regional, national or international) received in recognition of scholarship.
- g)** Professional consultation in scholarly or clinical projects; examples of professional consultation may include but are not limited to review of manuscripts, review of grant proposals, book reviews, practice innovations, etc. (Note that if an activity is included here, it cannot also be included in "Service".)
- h)** Non-refereed publications.
- i)** Colloquia, seminars, conferences, lectures, etc. that involve non-research data but that contribute to the advancement of the candidate's field of study.
- j)** Elected membership in professional honor societies or fellowship in professional organizations.

3. Service

- a)** Statement summarizing candidate's service activities.
- b)** Evaluation letters from the Committee Chairperson or from those affected by the candidate's work and having knowledge of it may be sought in the case of especially significant or demanding activities.
- c)** University Service
 - i.** Departmental committees, recruiting activities, and special assignments
 - ii.** Non-academic advisement of students (career, professional, or personal)
 - iii.** Participation in affairs related to student activities
 - iv.** College committees and special assignments
 - v.** University Faculty Senate, University committees, and special assignments/elected activities
 - vi.** Administrative appointments
- d)** Professional Service
 - i.** Chairing sessions at colloquia, seminars, and/or conferences

- ii. Serving as an officer or committee member of a professional organization
 - iii. Editorial duties
 - iv. Review of abstracts or manuscripts (Note that if an activity is included here, it cannot also be included in “Scholarship”.)
 - v. Presentation of continuing education offerings
- e) Community Service
 - i. Community service (local, state, regional, national, international), such as election or appointment to boards, commissions, committees, and other positions of leadership
 - ii. Invited lectures to community groups
- f) Awards or recognition for service
- g) Requests for/acknowledgment of professional consultation in service activities.

VI. POLICIES & PROCEDURES

A. Policies

1. Department Responsibilities.

- a) The Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences assumes the major responsibility in defining criteria, specifying procedures, and evaluating each application for promotion and tenure.
- b) By the end of a faculty member’s first month at the University, the Chairperson of the Department will initiate a mentoring arrangement for the TT/CT individual. Mentors should make the faculty member aware of procedures relating to advancement appearing in the Faculty handbook and this Departmental document; advise on the collection of evidential material; and routinely provide the new faculty member with informal advice about his/her progress.

2. Department Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee

- a) The Chairperson of the Department shall see that the Department P&T Committee is assembled in a timely manner. The Committee will have a minimum of three members at a rank higher than the current rank of the candidate, with at least two members being tenured. In order to operate within these guidelines, it may be necessary to select members from units outside of the Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences from kindred disciplines such as Nursing, Physical Therapy, Biological Sciences, etc. In cases where more than three faculty members are eligible to serve, the P&T Committee will be comprised of all tenured-track faculty and continuing-track faculty who hold faculty rank at or above the rank being sought. This committee will evaluate both tenure- and continuing track candidates being considered for promotion/tenure. In the event a continuing-track faculty member is being considered for promotion, at least one P&T Committee member will also be continuing-track at a rank higher than the current rank of the candidate.
- b) The Chairperson of the Committee, as appointed by the Department Chairperson, shall be a tenured faculty member in the Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences at or above the rank for which the candidate has applied. In the event that a tenured faculty member in the Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences is not available to serve in this capacity, the Chairperson will be selected, by the Department Chairperson with the

approval of the candidate, from a kindred department.

- c) The function of the Department P&T Committee will be to advise the candidate in the preparation of evidential material, to solicit letters of evaluation from external reviewers, to review the candidate's dossier and to prepare an objective written evaluation of the candidate's evidential material in light of the department criteria for transmission of results of the formal committee vote to the Department Chairperson and the candidate.
- d) The Department Chairperson and the candidate will confirm in writing to the Chair of the Department P&T Committee the quantitative distribution of the candidate's workload during the period under review, and this workload distribution will appear in the dossier (V.B.2.c) and be shared with the external reviewers. These workload percentages will determine the major area of assigned responsibility.

3. Candidate's Rights and Responsibilities

- a) The candidate is responsible for knowing all Department and University P&T criteria, policies, and procedures. The candidate should plan his/her academic development and activities with the guidelines in mind. Candidates for P&T should familiarize themselves with the University Guidelines for promotion and tenure and this Departmental document within the first month of arrival in the Department.
- b) The candidate is responsible for initiating the P&T review process. He/she has the right to apply for promotion/tenure at any time, subject to the provisions pertaining to tenure as outlined in the University Guidelines for Faculty Promotion and Tenure. However, tenure-track faculty in their terminal year may not apply for promotion.
- c) When the Departmental P&T policies have been changed during the period of review, the candidate may choose to be evaluated under the policy and procedure in force at the time of hiring, rather than under any revised policy or procedure subsequently adopted (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-11-changes.html>). The decision should be explicit in the letter of intent and in the dossier. Faculty who are candidates for a promotion subsequent to the granting of tenure and/or promotion during the probationary period shall be reviewed under the policy and procedure in force at the time they declare such candidacy for promotion.
- d) Candidates must compile a record sufficient to warrant promotion prior to starting this process.
- e) The candidate has the responsibility to prepare the dossier. The dossier should contain evidence that supports a decision for promotion and/or tenure. This decision is based primarily on evidence about the candidate's performance after appointment or promotion and/or to his/her current rank. All work in rank, even if conducted at other institutions of higher education, shall be considered for promotion and tenure. It shall be the candidate's responsibility to include evidence of this work in his/her dossier and to clearly identify when and where this work was performed.
- f) The candidate submits the completed dossier to the Chairperson of the Department P&T Committee in accordance with the established Department schedule.
- g) The candidate has the right to withdraw his/her dossier at any step of the P&T process.
- h) The candidate must be informed in writing of decisions made at each step of the review process.
- i) 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. The candidate must provide a

dated document indicating knowledge of and permission for such an addition.

B. Procedures

1. Review Procedures

- a)** Candidate submits completed dossier to the Chairperson of the Department P&T Committee, according to the calendar established by the Department (section VII). This calendar will be rigorously enforced; the candidate will be withdrawn from the process if he/she does not meet deadlines.
- b)** Solicitation of peer evaluations will follow University guidelines as described in the University Guidelines for Faculty Promotion and Tenure section 4.4.9.
 - i.** A minimum of five (5) solicited peer evaluations are required for promotion. External reviewers should represent senior and distinguished or leading scholars in comparable roles or fields to that of the candidate. These reviewers should analyze and evaluate critically the candidate's work and accomplishments. They also should comment on the candidate's potential for future development. The solicitation of these evaluations must follow certain guidelines.
 - ii.** Tenure-track candidates will submit two lists of names and contact information (address/e-mail/phone) of potential reviewers, with one including those with expertise in teaching and one with expertise in the research focus of the candidate. Continuing-track candidates will submit a list of names and contact information (address/e-mail/phone) of potential reviewers with expertise in their major area of workload commitment. The Department P&T Committee will suggest additional names for all submitted lists. Only reviewers without personal ties to the candidate should be selected. It is the candidate's responsibility to assure that none of the suggested reviewers has functioned as his/her current or former instructor, mentor or research collaborator. 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 will have an opportunity to comment on them, the Department P&T Committee and not the candidate makes the final selection of at least five (5) names. The final list of names will not be given to the candidate so as to preserve confidentiality of the reviewers.
 - iii.** Candidates must not contact potential reviewers about the promotion process at any time.
 - iv.** Letters of evaluation must be confidential and external reviewers will not be mentioned by name or affiliation in any recommendations or evaluations. Reviewers may be referred to by number.
 - v.** The Chairperson of the Department P&T Committee solicits letters of evaluation. The letter to the external reviewers must include the faculty member's average workload(s) for the period under review. Further, the letter must specify which area(s) the reviewer is being asked to evaluate, and provide a written summary of the evidential materials being sent upon which to base his/her review. In addition, the external reviewers must be provided copies of the department's

P&T criteria. Copies of the letter(s) sent to the reviewers must be included in the dossier (V.B.5). Letters sent to reviewers, soliciting external review of a candidate, should also request a biographical statement describing the reviewer's credentials and relationship to the candidate. External reviewers should be individuals who can objectively evaluate the candidate's scholarly activity and/or teaching ability and should not include individuals who have directly mentored, collaborated, and/or co-authored scientific studies with the candidate. If a candidate has collaborative works, it must be clear to the peer evaluator what the candidate's contributions were to the finished work. For faculty whose major workload is research, reviewers must be able to determine whether an individual can execute research in his or her own right. The department committee shall insert a separate document in the external letters section of the dossier (V.B.5), identifying the specific reviewers who were nominated by the candidate versus those nominated by the department, and the criteria used to request letters from specific reviewers.

- vi. The Department P&T Committee conducts a critical evaluation of the completed dossier based on the criteria set forth in the P&T guidelines of the Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences. It votes to recommend for or against promotion and/or tenure. Its written report, addressed to the Department Chairperson and signed by all committee members, will include the result of the vote and a summary of the reasons for the recommendation, providing in concise and clear terms how the candidate has performed relative to the department requirements, including how the candidate's workload was related to the committee's application of criteria for promotion. Copies of this report are forwarded to the Department Chairperson and the candidate. Signed minority opinions will be forwarded as appendices.
- vii. The Chairperson of the Department will review the dossier and will either endorse or recommend against the promotion and/or tenure in a written notification to the candidate. The evaluation letter will provide in clear terms how the candidate has performed relative to the department requirements. The Chairperson's recommendation is transmitted in full and in writing to the candidate and also inserted into the dossier. The Chairperson's letter should include a description of the candidate's workload distribution during the time in rank, and how that workload relates to his or her recommendation concerning tenure and/or promotion. The dossier and statements of action are forwarded to the College P&T Committee and the Dean with a copy to the Department Committee.

VII. REVIEW SCHEDULE

- April 30 - Candidate notifies the Chairperson of the Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences of his/her intention to apply for promotion and/or tenure in writing. It must include specifics of which guidelines will be used, if applicable. The request is forwarded to the Chairperson of the Department P&T Committee which begins the process of soliciting external evaluations.
- May 1 - Candidate submits names and addresses of persons who are potential reviewers to the Chairperson of the Department P&T Committee.
- July 1 - Candidate submits full Curriculum Vitae and external review materials to the Chairperson of the Department P&T Committee.
- Sept. 1 - Candidate submits completed dossier to the Chairperson of the Department P&T Committee and the Department Chairperson.
- Sept. 15 - The recommendation of the Department P&T Committee is forwarded to the candidate.
- Oct. 1 - The dossier and the recommendation of the Department P&T Committee is forwarded to the Chairperson of the Medical Laboratory Sciences Department.
- Oct. 15 - The Department Chairperson forwards the dossier and recommendation to the College P&T Committee with a copy of his/her recommendation to the candidate and the Department Committee.
- Dec. 1 - The College P&T Committee forwards the dossier and recommendation to the Dean with a copy to the candidate, the Department Committee, and the Department Chairperson.
- Jan. 2 - The Dean forwards dossier and recommendation to the University Faculty Senate Committee on Promotions and Tenure with a copy of his/her recommendation to the candidate, the Department Committee, the Department Chairperson, and the College Committee.
- Feb. 15 - The University Promotions and Tenure Committee forwards the dossier and recommendation to the Provost with a copy of its recommendation to the candidate, the Department Committee, the Department Chairperson, the College Committee, and the Dean.
- March 15 - The Provost forwards dossier and approved recommendation to the President for approval by the Board of Trustees with a copy of his/her recommendation to the candidate. Should the Provost fail to support an application for promotion and/or tenure, the reasons for the decision will be given to the candidate, the Department Committee, the Department Chairperson, the College Committee, the Dean and the University Committee on Promotions and Tenure

VIII. APPEALS. An intention to appeal must be given to the appropriate body within five working days of notification of the decision. Appeals are possible at each level of dossier review. Each appeal must be handled within two weeks, except under extenuating circumstances. The University Faculty Senate Committee on Promotion and Tenure will hear no appeals beyond March 1, and the Provost's Office will hear no appeals beyond April 15. Any appeals not heard by these dates must be carried over to the following academic year.

Approved by Faculty	November 1, 1994
Revisions Approved by Faculty	May 2, 1995
Approved by Faculty Senate Committee	May 5, 1995
Revisions Approved by Faculty	April 30, 1998
Approved by Faculty Senate Committee	May 19, 1998
Approved by Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Planning	February 5, 1999
Revisions Approved by Faculty	January 7, 2000
Approved by Faculty Senate Committee	April 13, 2000
Revisions Approved by Faculty	May 11, 2000
Approved by University Provost	May 22, 2000
Revisions Approved by Faculty	November 10, 2016
Revisions approved by College P&T Committee	January 11, 2017
Revisions approved by College Dean	January 13, 2017
Revisions approved by Faculty Senate Committee	March 13, 2017
Revision approved by Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs (with some required changes)	March 21, 2017
Revision approved by Faculty	May 5, 2017
Revisions approved by University Provost	June 9, 2017