

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY

Preface

Stated below are (1) the criteria that serve as the basis for departmental recommendations for renewal of contracts, for promotions in rank, and for conferral of tenure on faculty members of the department, (2) the application of these criteria to faculty rank, and (3) the procedures by which recommendations are formulated. These criteria are in addition to those specified in Section 4 of the Faculty Handbook on Personnel Policies for Faculty.

1. Performance Criteria

Performance is measured by criteria such as:

A. Research and Scholarship

- i. Publications (quality, significance of contribution to the literature in the field, number, media of publication)
- ii. Completed unpublished research
- iii. Research in progress
- iv. Pursuit and receipt of grants, contracts, or other support for research
- v. Presentations in professional forums
- vi. Solicited external evaluations
- vii. Unsolicited peer evaluations (citations, reviews, etc.)

B. Teaching: Commitment to Quality Education

- i. New courses developed
- ii. Inclusion of recent research findings
- iii. Special problems courses offered
- iv. Theses/dissertations directed
- v. Extra classroom student contacts
- vi. Commitment to advisement
- vii. Instructional innovations
- viii. Bibliographies, syllabi, reading lists, exams
- ix. Computer software

C. Teaching (Effectiveness)

- i. Student evaluations
- ii. Fairness
- iii. Organization
- iv. Preparation
- v. Student learning
- vi. Commitment
- vii. Peer reviews

D. Assessment of Teaching Commitment and Effectiveness

- i. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness instrument used by faculty members every semester in all courses producing a cumulative picture of teaching effectiveness. Verbatim student comments from these instruments may be included, provided the method of selection is recorded.
- ii. Submission of documents (list of courses, instrumental innovations, theses and dissertations directed, bibliographies, syllabi, reading lists, and exams) to be evaluated by all department faculty members. Inclusion of other materials is left to the discretion of the candidate.
- iii. Selection and presentation of other evidence of teaching commitment and effectiveness shall rest with the candidate.

E. Service

- i. Service to department: committee and departmental assignments
- ii. Service to university: committee and university assignments
- iii. Service to profession: counseling, consultation, editorial services, offices held, services performed, etc.
- iv. Service to community: civic committees, boards, commissions, consultation services, appearances before community groups, state, national, and international organizations, etc.

2. Application of Performance Criteria at Each Rank

The Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice follows all of the specifications for appointment, renewal, promotion, and tenure as specified in the University of Delaware Faculty Handbook, Section 4: Personnel Policies for Faculty (UD copyright 2015). That section provides specific criteria required by the University for promotion, tenure, and contract renewal regardless of the faculty member's departmental affiliation. The text below is included to provide additional guidance to faculty in the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice as they prepare for promotion, tenure, or contract renewal processes.

Regarding promotion or appointment to Associate Professor, which generally carries tenure, candidates must show excellence in scholarship and excellent or high quality performance in teaching and service. Further, evidence of continued progress should be unmistakable. There must be very clear indication, based on hard evidence (see performance criteria for research, scholarship, and teaching on page 1) and outside peer evaluations, that the candidate met these criteria.

Promotion or appointment to the rank of Full Professor is reserved for individuals who have established reputations in their fields and whose contributions to their profession and the University's mission are excellent. There should be unmistakable evidence of significant development and excellence in scholarship and excellent or high quality performance in teaching and service since the last promotion (see performance criteria for research, scholarship, and teaching on page 1). Recognition is

given to the balance between the quantity and quality of a candidate's scholarly productivity. The candidate's claim to have met these requirements must be thoroughly and completely documented by outside peer evaluations and other supportive materials.

The Department recognizes multiple scholarly pathways to the successful fulfillment of promotion criteria regarding scholarship, teaching, and service. Intellectual diversity characterizes the department, with faculty members trained in a variety of disciplines. Accordingly, they bring different perspectives to their professional activities. Although all faculty conduct research, some support their scholarship through external funding, while others do not. Different faculty members write textbooks, scholarly monographs, trade books, articles in law reviews as well as scholarly, peer-reviewed journals in a range of disciplines beyond sociology, criminology and criminal justice, including but not limited to history, law, philosophy, psychology, and public health. Their teaching responsibilities range from large lecture courses for lower-division students to smaller upper-division offerings that feature more discussion to service-learning offerings, graduate seminars, and individual supervision of theses and dissertations. Service activities are also diverse, including on campus, various professional associations, and the community.

Given this diversity, no "one-size-fits-all" standard for evaluating excellence and high quality in research, teaching, and service is possible. Regardless, the faculty has demonstrated that a departmental consensus is attainable in determining excellence and high quality, in conjunction with professional standards used by outside peer evaluators.

A. Appointment to the Rank of Instructor

Initial appointment to the rank of instructor is based on the individual's potential with respect to research, teaching and service.

Research: Evidence of the capacity to conduct research. Normally, this shall mean progress toward the pursuit of a Ph.D. dissertation.

Teaching: Evidence of the potential capacity to teach effectively. Normally, this shall mean satisfactory teaching at whatever levels of opportunity have been provided the individual prior to this appointment and the presentation of scholarly material at a colloquium at the time of interview.

Service: Evidence that service will be a component of one's career. Normally, this shall mean an expressed willingness to assume the responsibilities of departmental, university, professional and community service.

B. Renewal of Contract at the Rank of Instructor

Where contract provisions permit the renewal of appointment, the following criteria shall be employed as a basis for evaluation and recommendation.

Research: Progress with respect to the Ph.D. dissertation. Normally, this shall

mean a written statement of progress from the dissertation committee and compliance with the terms, if any, of the original contract.

Teaching: Evidence of the capacity to teach effectively. Normally, this shall mean satisfactory teaching at whatever levels of opportunity have been provided the individual at the University of Delaware.

Service: Evidence that service will be a component of one's career. Normally, this shall mean an expressed willingness to assume the responsibilities of departmental, university, professional and community service.

C. Renewal of Contract at the Rank of Assistant Professor

Whereas the initial appointment to the rank of assistant professor is based upon completion of the Ph.D., research teaching and service potential, the renewal of the contract is based upon demonstrated accomplishment in research, teaching, and service.

Research: Evidence of the capacity to conduct research. Minimally, this shall include (a) completion of the Ph.D. dissertation and (b) evidence of ongoing research. The latter may be satisfied by preparation of dissertation findings and/or new research for presentation and/or publication.

Teaching: Evidence of the capacity to teach effectively. Normally, this shall mean high quality teaching at whatever levels of opportunity have been provided the individual at the University of Delaware. A formal review of teaching is conducted in accordance with Departmental policy, and such evidence is employed in the evaluation.

Service: Evidence of a commitment to service at whatever levels of opportunity has been provided the individual. Normally, this shall mean acceptance and fulfillment of service responsibilities to either elected or appointed positions.

D. Appointment or Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

Within the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice, criteria for promotion are as follows:

Research: Evidence of excellent scholarship. Scholarship must be demonstrated by (a) published contributions to the growth of knowledge, (b) evidence of and continued capacity for independent scholarship. Normally, this shall mean the accomplishment of scholarly research beyond research conducted under the supervision of others. (c) A commitment to the growth of knowledge through ongoing research projects.

Teaching: Evidence of the capacity to teach effectively. Normally, this shall mean excellent or high quality teaching at whatever levels of opportunity have been provided the individual at the University of Delaware. A formal review of teaching in accordance with Department policy is required. If the individual is externally appointed, evidence must be supplied of satisfactory teaching in the individual's prior positions.

Service: Evidence of commitment to service at whatever levels of opportunity have been provided the individual. Normally, this shall mean acceptance and fulfillment of service responsibilities consistent with elected or appointed positions. If the individual is externally appointed, evidence must be supplied of the individual's acceptance and performance of service responsibilities.

E. Appointment or Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

The criteria for appointment or promotion to the rank of full professor shall be similar to those of associate professor although expectations of performance are higher.

Research: Evidence of excellent scholarship. Scholarship must be demonstrated by (a) published contributions to the growth of knowledge. Normally this shall mean a substantial record of writing and scholarship in refereed journals and their equivalent or book-length manuscripts. Book length materials (i.e., research manuscripts, texts, and books of readings) will be evaluated primarily on their contribution to knowledge. (b) A commitment to the growth of knowledge through ongoing research projects as well as the nature, quality and quantity of published work since the last promotion. (c) securing external funding will be positively evaluated. Also taken into consideration is general scholarly reputation, as indicated by reviews of work or other measures deemed appropriate by the candidate. In the case of multiple authors, a candidate's contribution should be clearly specified.

Teaching: Evidence of excellent or high quality performance in teaching. Normally, this shall mean excellent or high quality teaching at whatever levels of opportunity have been provided the individual at the University of Delaware. A formal review of teaching in accordance with Departmental policy is required. If the individual is appointed from elsewhere, evidence must be supplied of satisfactory teaching in the individual's prior positions. Graduate education involvement, although not necessarily graduate teaching, is expected, which could include periodically directing master's theses and doctoral dissertations; grading graduate comprehensive exams; mentoring and publishing with graduate students; and serving on Master's theses and PhD committees.

Service: Evidence of commitment to service at whatever levels of opportunity has been provided the individual. Normally, this shall mean acceptance and fulfillment of those service responsibilities consistent with elected or appointed positions. If the individual is appointed from elsewhere, evidence must be supplied of the individual's prior acceptance and performance of service responsibilities.

F. Contract Renewal of Continuing Track (CT) Faculty

Individuals appointed as full-time CT faculty will have a six-year probationary period comprised of three successive two-year appointments, subject to recommendation for contract renewal by a peer review committee and the Department Chair in the second and fourth years.

A full peer review (see below) will be conducted in the sixth year, and on the basis of recommendations from the peer review committee and the Department Chair, and prior approval by the Provost, individuals will receive either:

1. a seventh year terminal appointment, or
2. a three year contract

In the second year of the three-year contract, the Department Chair will recommend whether the individual will be offered a four-year contract. Subject to satisfactory annual evaluations, a second full peer review (see below) will be conducted in the last year of the four-year contract (i.e., the 13th year). Subject to the recommendation of the peer review and the Department Chair, the individual will receive a five-year contract on a "rolling" basis, subject to annual evaluations. No individual will receive a three, four or five year "rolling" contract without a full peer review.

Contract renewal is subject to the provisions of the Faculty Handbook (4.1.15 Terminations and Non-renewals). This section also applies in the event of programmatic and/or budgetary reductions, where individuals serving on multiple year contracts will receive one full year's notice of contract termination in writing.

Peer reviews in the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice are conducted by the elected Promotion and Tenure Committee following the procedures and standards that apply to tenure track faculty, according to their rank, with the following two exceptions.

1. no external letters will be solicited
2. the Chair of the P&T Committee will summarize the faculty's recommendation and forward it to the Department Chair

G. Promotion of Continuing Track (CT) Faculty

CT faculty on contract can request promotion to Associate or Full Professor in the regular declaration and promotion cycle as established by the University. In the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice, the minimum criterion for promotion of continuing track faculty is excellence in teaching or service, depending upon the nature of the appointment and the assigned workload negotiated with the Department Chair during the review period. A minimum of five external review letters is required for promotion. "External" can mean internal to UD but external to the CT faculty member's primary academic unit.

3. Promotion Committee

A five-member Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be elected by faculty members eligible to vote upon promotion and tenure decisions. This committee shall be elected by the end of March and shall serve for one year. Election will conform to normal department election procedures (i.e., nominations by the Department Policy Committee, vote by written ballot). The Committee will consist of at least three Full Professors. The Department Policy Committee will nominate five Full Professors and three Associate Professors to stand for election to the five-member P&T Committee. Candidates receiving the greatest number of votes in each category will serve on the Committee, with the Full Professor receiving the greatest number of votes serving as Committee Chair. In the event that there are not enough Full Professors in the department to constitute the Committee, the department shall nominate and elect Full Professors from related disciplines willing to serve.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee, in consultation with the Department Chair, shall guide each candidate through all stages of the promotion process. The Promotion Committee Chair shall conduct all Department meetings concerning promotion and tenure decisions. Ultimately, the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall receive the recommendation of the faculty regarding each case and make an independent decision regarding promotion and/or tenure.

4. Eligibility to Vote on Promotion and Renewal

The Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice has a strong tradition of faculty participation in promotion and tenure decisions. Members of the faculty eligible to vote on promotion and tenure cases (see below for the definition of eligibility) shall make an advisory recommendation to the elected Promotion and Tenure Committee. Because the recommendation of the faculty shall have a significant influence on the decision of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the process of reaching a faculty recommendation shall include a series of faculty meetings at which information is examined, evaluations are discussed, and a vote is taken. This procedure is designed to be inclusive of the academic judgments of eligible faculty and to insure the integrity of the important decisions being made.

The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee calls and chairs all meetings. Faculty members of the same rank being considered at the same time for the same type of action (e.g., promotion) are excluded from voting but may participate in all discussions.

Faculty members eligible to vote in formulating a recommendation to the P&T Committee on promotion and tenure decisions shall include all full-time tenure track faculty members in the Department, except as specified below.

Faculty members specifically not eligible to vote in faculty meetings on promotion and tenure recommendations include:

- A. The Chair of the Department
- B. Elected members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee
- C. Faculty members holding joint appointments when the primary appointment (as defined by the source of funding) is in a unit other than the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice
- D. All tenure track faculty members below the rank of associate professor who have not completed three years of full time service in the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice.

On promotion to all ranks, eligible voting members unable to attend the meeting can provide a written vote to the Chair of the Promotion Committee prior to the vote. In order to maintain confidentiality of the vote, the faculty member will submit his/her vote inside a sealed envelope; no identifying information should be on that envelope. The envelope containing the ballot will then be put inside another envelope that will be signed by the faculty member. Only the inside envelope will be taken by the Chair into the faculty meeting where a vote is to be taken. That anonymous vote will be opened and counted as a part of the total vote at the meeting.

5. External Peer Reviews

The candidate shall submit a list of potential reviewers and the Promotion Committee must suggest additional names. Selection of the outside reviewers from among the names on these two lists is to be made by the Promotion and Tenure Committee after consultation with Department Chair. Outside reviewers must be selected from both lists. The candidate must be informed of all potential reviewers and have an opportunity to comment on them and, if necessary, eliminate names of reviewers. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall send requests for external reviewers. A minimum of five external review letters is required.

6. The Promotion Process

Step 1. The candidate should prepare a written statement providing all information that can be supplied by the candidate on the Performance Criteria listed above (#1). Supporting material should be presented relevant to the criteria outlined previously in this document. Bibliographic references must contain at minimum all information and distinctions required by the American Sociological Review.

Step 2. Informational Meeting. A meeting for the purpose of review and discussion of this information and the addition of any further evidence relative to the agreed upon criteria will be held with the candidate absent. This evidence may include student evaluations, faculty evaluations of research, teaching, and service activities, and any other information within the scope of the criteria being applied. The purpose of this meeting is to complete the record on the candidate as fully as possible. No additional material may be added to the candidate's dossier without the consent of the candidate. This meeting must be held at least one week before step three below.

Step 3. Voting Procedures.

- A. Promotion to Ranks Below Full Professor. All eligible members of the Department meet to discuss the candidate's record and anonymously vote on the nomination to promote, the candidate not being present. Votes are taken simultaneously (all in favor, all opposed, all abstaining) by secret ballot. To recommend for promotion, the number voting in favor of promotion must exceed the number opposed. Once the vote has been taken, each member voting may provide statements in support of or opposition to the vote. The faculty's decision is final upon adjournment of the meeting.
- B. Promotion to Full Professor only. Eligible Full Professors meet to consider the candidate's record and make a recommendation on promotion, the candidate being absent. Votes are taken simultaneously (all in favor, all opposed, all abstaining) by secret ballot. An oral statement of the reasons for each vote may support the vote of each senior member. A majority must agree to the recommendation adopted.

The recommendation of the Full Professors is then presented to all eligible voting members of the Department at another Departmental meeting to consider promotion, the candidate not being present. After discussion, a vote is taken by secret ballot, on the recommendation of the senior faculty. To reject the recommendation of the Full Professors, the number voting to overturn the decision must exceed by two the number voting to confirm. In the absence of an election to reject, the Department adopts the recommendation. Once the entire Department has voted to accept or reject the recommendations, each member voting may provide statements in support of or opposition to the outcome of the vote. The faculty's decision is final upon adjournment of the meeting.

Step 4. Once the faculty recommendation has been made, the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall meet and render an independent decision. While Committee members shall weight all evidence presented in the candidate's dossier in reaching a decision, particular attention shall be paid to the recommendation of the faculty. In the letter conveying its decision to appropriate administrators and committees, the Promotion and Tenure Committee must summarize the arguments made by the faculty, report the faculty's final recommendation, and report the department faculty vote count (for promotion to Full Professor, this includes votes of both the meeting of Full Professors and of the faculty as a whole). This letter should also state the reasons for the

Promotion and Tenure Committee's decision and its vote. This statement shall be made available to the faculty and to the candidate. In addition to providing the unsuccessful candidate with the rationale for the decision, it should also include, where appropriate, a statement of the specific levels and/or kinds of performance necessary for retention or promotion at some point in the future. All members of the department taking part in the decision process shall have the opportunity to sign this document prior to its being forwarded to the Chair.

Step 5. (At the Candidate's Discretion) Upon receiving a negative decision from the Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee, the candidate may add material to the dossier and request a reassessment. This request must be made within five working days after receiving the decision of the P&T Committee. The Promotion and Tenure Committee must respond to this request for a reassessment within two weeks.

Step 6. The Department Chair is required to make an independent evaluation of the candidate and submit a statement supporting or not supporting the recommendation of the department. The Department Chair must explain, in writing, his/her decision to both the candidate and to the Department. Upon receiving the Chair's decision, the candidate may add material to the dossier and request a reassessment. This request must be made within five working days after receiving the decision. The Chair must respond to this request for a reassessment within two weeks.

If the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chair agree in recommending promotion, or if either or both recommend against promotion but the candidate chooses not to withdraw it, the application goes forward to the college committee and the Dean, together with the P&T Committee's and the Department Chair's recommendations.

Adopted by the faculty: December 10, 1997
Revised version adopted: March 10, 1998
Edited 3/1/02
Edited 9/29/12
Edited 1/31/13
Edited October 2015
Edited September/2016