



Report of the
Provost's Commission on
Tenure-Track Faculty





Section 1

Introduction

In May 2016, Provost Grasso, with the support of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, announced the goal of forming the Provost's Commission on Tenure-Track Faculty. The idea for the commission came about as part of a conversation regarding the need for developing a new consensus concerning the role of tenured and tenure-track faculty at the University. As the University has developed a strong cohort of continuing-track faculty, largely focused on the teaching and service missions of the institution, the University's promotion & tenure policy needed to be amended to support their career progression. And as strategic goals have emphasized the development of research and graduate education, the need to reconsider the role of the tenure-track faculty, as distinguished from the continuing-track faculty, became apparent. Concerns about the University's continuing commitment to the spirit of shared governance and to its teaching, service, and engagement missions also contributed to the creation of this commission.

Martha Buell (President-Elect of the Faculty Senate) and Matt Kinservik (Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs) were named as co-chairs of the commission and tasked with developing the membership and charge for the commission in cooperation with the Provost and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. In September 2016, Provost Grasso announced to the Faculty Senate the membership and charge of the commission.

The members:

Martha Buell (Co-Chair, CEHD)
 Matt Kinservik (Co-Chair)
 CoE: Thomas Epps (Fall only)
 CoE: Nii Attoh-Okine (Spring only)
 CEOE: George Luther
 CANR: Chris Williams
 CHS: Stuart Binder-Macleod
 Lerner: Sheryl Kline
 CAS Humanities: Erica Armstrong-Dunbar (Fall only)
 CAS Humanities: Arwen Mohun (Spring only)
 CAS Arts: Lynnette Overby
 CAS Social Sciences: David Redlawsk
 CAS Natural Sciences: Joe Fox
 ADVANCE-IT grant: Pam Cook

The charge:

- To define more completely and explicitly the purposes and roles of tenure-track faculty members as an essential part of the mission of the University of Delaware to include, but not limited to, instruction, scholarship and service.
- To recommend guidelines for hiring and promotion of tenure-track faculty, with clear emphasis on the pursuit of excellence.
- To recommend guidelines for evaluation of excellence in scholarship, teaching, and service that accommodate academic disciplinary differences.

- To recommend guidelines for pre- and post-tenure mentoring and evaluation in order to create a sustained environment for continued excellence.
- To develop resolutions for consideration by the Faculty Senate for matters involving changes to the UD Faculty Handbook.

The process:

The members of the Commission held regular meetings from September 2016 to March 2017 in order to review UD's promotion & tenure policy in the Faculty Handbook, research and discuss issues of particular concern, review promotion & tenure guidelines at other research and land grant universities, consult the finding of the ADVANCE Climate Survey, and hold listening sessions with different constituencies on campus. The listening sessions included:

Faculty Senate Open Hearing
 Deans
 Department Chairs
 Full Professors
 Associate Professors
 Assistant Professors
 Faculty involved in efforts to promote inclusive excellence on campus
 Faculty involved in Agricultural Extension activities
 Faculty involved in Department, College, and University promotion & tenure committees
 The UD Council of Community Engagement and Public Service Centers
 The AAUP

Through this process of information-gathering, members of the Commission learned of important concerns of the faculty regarding the promotion & tenure process, found inconsistencies and problems in the Faculty Handbook, and benefited from reviewing promotion & tenure policies at other

universities. The Commission met from April to October 2017 to formulate the recommendations that follow, organizing them under the categories of Mission Statement, Faculty Development, Criteria, and Promotion Process.

We regard this report to be the start of a process of institutional improvement, not the end of it. The recommendations we offer are, we believe,

important steps to move the University of Delaware to new heights of excellence and achievement. They also strengthen our commitment to consistency, transparency, and fairness in our promotion & tenure process.

We offer this report to our colleagues for their consideration and with gratitude for their participation in this important work.



Section 2

Recommendations

Some of the recommendations that follow are actionable items that come in the form of resolutions for the Faculty Senate and the University administration to consider. Others are more general suggestions for future discussion and action. When the members of the Commission felt strongly about advocating for a specific change, we crafted an actionable item. When we felt that the issues were of a more general nature and would benefit from further discussion among the faculty and administrators, we made suggestions for further discussion.

The recommendations are grouped under four categories: Mission Statement, Faculty Development, Criteria, and Process.

Mission Statement

We begin our recommendations with a proposal for a modest revision of the University of Delaware's Mission Statement. Published as a "foreword" to the Faculty Handbook, the statement (with our proposed additions in italics) says:

The University of Delaware exists to cultivate learning, develop knowledge, and foster the free exchange of ideas. State-assisted, yet privately governed, the University has a strong tradition of distinguished scholarship, *which is manifested in research and other creative activities*, teaching, and service, *and* is grounded in a commitment to increasing and disseminating scientific, humanistic, *artistic*, and social knowledge for the benefit of the larger society. Founded in 1743 and chartered by the state in 1833, the University of Delaware today is a land-grant, sea-grant, space-grant, and urban-grant university.

The University of Delaware is a major research university with extensive graduate programs that is also dedicated to outstanding undergraduate and professional education. UD faculty members are committed to the intellectual, cultural, and ethical development of students as citizens, scholars and professionals. UD graduates are prepared to contribute to a global and diverse society that requires leaders with creativity, integrity and a dedication to service.

The University of Delaware promotes an environment in which all people are inspired to learn, and encourages intellectual curiosity, critical thinking, free inquiry, and respect for the views and values of an increasingly diverse population.

An institution engaged in addressing the critical needs of the state, nation, and global community, the University of Delaware carries out its mission with the support of alumni who span the globe and in partnership with public, private, and nonprofit institutions in Delaware and beyond.

Our commission recommends these small, but

meaningful, changes to this mission statement. We do not regard scholarship as a discreet part of a faculty member's workload; rather, we regard it as a broad category that informs the type of research, teaching, and service that tenured and tenure-track faculty at UD perform. Therefore, our commitment to scholarly excellence is evident in our research publications, in our classroom teaching, in the study abroad and other field experiences we supervise, in our artistic performances and exhibitions, and in the engaged service we provide on local, state, national, and global scales. Our scholarly work, in all its manifestations, is evidence-based, peer-reviewed, and disseminated to audiences beyond the university.

The strength of a university can be a function of the clarity of its mission and the extent to which it is understood and shared. Therefore, it is important to articulate how our tenure-track faculty can advance and contribute to the University's mission. This document attempts to open that discussion.

Additionally, our commission firmly believes that tenure-track faculty members should contribute to all mission areas appropriate to their position, in most cases, contributing to all three areas of research and other creative activities, teaching, and service. Because shared governance is essential to the functioning and perpetuation of the university's mission, all tenured and tenure-track faculty have an obligation to participate in meaningful university service. And the university has an obligation to recognize the essential value of this service.

Because so many of the questions and issues related to the role of tenured and tenure-track faculty are bound up with the promotion & tenure process, all the recommendations we are proposing relate to the section of the Faculty Handbook devoted to promotion & tenure. Although we propose a number of significant changes in the pages that follow, we want to declare at the outset that we value our promotion & tenure process at UD. Having reviewed the promotion & tenure documents from many other institutions, we have a new found appreciation for how open and transparent our

Faculty Development

process is compared to the others we reviewed. Even so, we have identified several areas for improvement that will add clarity, fairness, and quality to the promotion & tenure process at UD.

Finally, what we offer here is a consensus report. Our hope is that the discussion and policy changes it leads to will help our campus to build a new consensus about the vital roles that our tenured and tenure-track faculty play in the pursuit of UD's mission.

The University has an obligation to prepare faculty for success. This entails effective mentoring, equitable workload assignments, and promoting a healthy work/life balance. The recommendations in this section aim to promote these goals.

RECOMMENDATION #1: **WORKLOAD**

Workload is a central concern in assessing a candidate's performance during the review period. If reviewers are unaware of the workload allocated for a given area of performance, their assessment of the candidate's achievement could be unfair. Therefore, a clear accounting of workload performed during the review period is an essential part of the dossier.

Whereas the workload assigned to a faculty member can have a great impact on their levels of achievement and, hence, on their application for promotion & tenure; and

Whereas all faculty members should have workload assignments that allow them to meet the qualitative standards for promotion & tenure; and

Whereas all reviewers need to understand the assigned workload when assessing a faculty member's performance; and

Whereas the current statements on workload in the Faculty Handbook are insufficiently clear and located in separate sections (4.3.1 and 4.4.4);

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Handbook

should contain a "Statement on Workload" as a stand-alone section of the promotion & tenure document that says the following:

Workload shall be assigned with the expectation that the faculty member will have the opportunity to meet the criteria for satisfactory peer review, contract renewal, and promotion & tenure. An individual's assigned workload during the review period shall be considered in the promotion & tenure and peer review process in a manner consistent with the approved promotion & tenure and peer review criteria written by each department.

Candidates for promotion & tenure are required to report their assigned workload as part of their dossier so that all reviewers—including external reviewers—have a clear sense of their workload in the various areas of their effort and can judge their achievements fairly.

RECOMMENDATION#2: **STOP-THE-TENURE-CLOCK**

The current language in the Faculty Handbook (4.4.12) regarding a "Stop-the-Tenure-Clock" action is outdated. It limits that action to the birth or adoption of a child, whereas the Collective Bargaining Agreement allows for a "Stop-the-Tenure-Clock" action in response to illness and other circumstances. The Handbook and the CBA should be in alignment on this important issue.

Whereas, the language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement regarding "Stop-the-Tenure-Clock" was never incorporated into the Faculty Handbook; and

Whereas, the current language in the Faculty Handbook has led to misinterpretation by faculty and administrators regarding the "Stop-the-Tenure-Clock" policy;

Therefore, be it resolved that the "Stop-the-Tenure-Clock" policy statement in the Faculty Handbook (4.4.12) should be deleted and in

its place a separate section entitled “Stop-the-Tenure-Clock” should be added to the Handbook and should read as follows:

The pre-tenure probationary period shall be extended for one year upon a tenure-track faculty member submitting a “Stop-the-Tenure-Clock” electronic web form. This policy applies to tenure-track faculty members who become the parent of a newborn or newly adopted child and who are primary or coequal caregivers of the child or who is granted a leave of absence pursuant to the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 for a period of at least one semester. The faculty member will continue to perform faculty duties at full salary. The extension shall take effect upon submission of the “Stop-the-Tenure-Clock” electronic web form by the faculty member to the chair/director. Submission of the “Stop-the-Tenure-Clock” electronic web form must be made within one calendar year of the birth or adoption of the child or of the commencement of the FMLA leave. Apart from the birth or adoption of a child, a tenure-track faculty member may extend the probationary period for any reason approved by the appropriate chair/director and dean (for example illness of the faculty member or of his/her immediate family), but may do so only twice, resulting in no more than two one-year extensions of the probationary period.

A tenure candidate who makes use of the extra time under this provision shall be reviewed for promotion & tenure under the same academic standards as a candidate who has not extended the probationary period. The tenure candidate shall not be penalized in any way for receiving extensions of the probationary period, whether or not the additional time is used.

Extension of the probationary period does not affect the faculty member's right to apply for tenure prior to the terminal year, regardless of time in rank. Stopping the tenure clock for one year postpones any subsequent second-year review, fourth-year review, or eligibility for a junior faculty research leave for one year.

RECOMMENDATION#3: **PEER REVIEWS**

Peer reviews are an essential part of the promotion & tenure process. They should be conducted in a manner that is rigorous, fair, and aligned with the promotion & tenure document of the academic unit. For pre-tenure faculty, the two- and four-year peer reviews are critical opportunities for mentoring and mutual accountability between the candidate and the department. For post-tenure faculty, the peer review is meant to provide an honest assessment of the faculty member's progress toward future promotion and continued scholarly distinction. The current policy on peer reviews in the Faculty Handbook (4.3.5) is not part of the promotion & tenure policy and it does not clearly state the important relation between peer reviews and the promotion & tenure process.

Whereas peer reviews are an essential part of the promotion & tenure process; and

Whereas the current peer review policy is unclear as to the purposes and process for conducting peer reviews; and

Whereas the current peer review policy is not included in the promotion & tenure policy; therefore,

Be it resolved that the Faculty Handbook's policy on peer review should be removed from section 4.3.5 and incorporated into section 4.4 in a stand-alone section called “Peer Reviews” and should read as follows:

Principles Guiding the Peer Evaluation of

Faculty Members: Peer reviews are an essential part of the promotion & tenure process. They should be conducted in a manner that is rigorous, fair, and aligned with the promotion & tenure document of the academic unit. For pre-tenure faculty, the two- and four-year peer reviews are critical opportunities for mentoring and mutual accountability between the candidate and the department. For post-tenure faculty, the peer review is meant to provide an honest assessment of the faculty member's progress toward future promotion and continued scholarly distinction.



Therefore, faculty members at all ranks shall be subject to periodic reviews at reasonable intervals of time.

Reviews of individual faculty members will normally originate with the individual department. (Since the academic organization of the University varies, references to department should sometimes read division or college, and references to chairperson should sometimes read director or dean.) Departments must develop an approved peer-review policy document that clearly describes the purpose and process for peer reviews. This policy must be in alignment with the department's promotion & tenure document and must explicitly state that the goal of the peer review process is to provide evaluative mentoring. Such Peer review committees should involve a substantial number of faculty members, but not the chairperson.

Faculty members under review have the right to supply such evidence that they feel may be necessary to a fair evaluation of their merits. This should not preclude departments or others properly involved in the review process from soliciting and using other evidence, but in every such instance, the faculty member should be informed of the source of that evidence.

Appropriate administrative officers may make independent evaluations within the review process.

Immediately upon completion of the review, the faculty member will be apprised of the results in writing. Faculty members shall be required to include their contract renewal reviews as part of their dossier for promotion & tenure; this should include the evaluations or reviews conducted by the established committees of the faculty and by the corresponding administrative office (e.g., department chair). (Rev. 5.10.07)

Faculty members are fully entitled to the rights of appeal. Reviews of individual faculty would

not be a substitute for competency hearings of tenured faculty. They may serve, however, as a basis for instituting such hearings. In the event of a competency hearing, due process would be observed, with the burden of proof residing with those instituting the hearing.

Periods of Peer Evaluation: Peer reviews must be conducted in the fall semester, concluding no later than December 15th.

Instructors and assistant professors will be reviewed at least every two years but normally no more often than once a year. Not later than the sixth year of service, assistant professors on the tenure track must be reviewed for promotion.

Tenured associate professors will be reviewed in the fourth year after the award of tenure. Subsequently, they will ~~should~~ be reviewed at least once within every three- to five-year period of service but normally not more often than every two years. Non-tenured associate professors on the tenure track should be reviewed in the year prior to their eligibility for tenure.

Full professors will ~~should~~ be reviewed at least once every five to seven-year period of service, but normally not more often than every two years.

Department Responsibility: The department chairperson is responsible for ensuring that peer reviews have been conducted on time and according to this policy.

Reviews of instructors and assistant professors should be conducted with the participation of associate and full professors in the department. In no case should faculty members be reviewed without the participation of at least two members of their department, one of whom, if possible, must be a rank at least one step higher than the person under review.

Associate professors should be reviewed by professors in the department. In those

departments where fewer than two professors are available to conduct such a review, the chairperson of the department may request professors from other related departments to serve on the review body.

Full professors should be reviewed by a committee of at least three of their peers. In small departments, professors from other related departments may be asked to serve at the request of the chairperson.

These provisions specify minimum requirements. A department may choose to constitute the whole department, or any other designated authority, to serve as a review body. A department may choose to include in the review body faculty members at the same rank or lower rank of the person being evaluated so long as such persons do not constitute a majority of the body.

Submission and Evaluation of Documents and Other Evidence: The faculty member under review should assemble a dossier of materials that he or she regards as appropriate and convincing evidence of his or her abilities in the three major areas of evaluation (see below). The faculty member should be notified of the date that the dossier is required by the chairperson. This date should be in sufficient time before the review date, which should also be specified.

The review body or the chairperson of the department may request additional evidence from (a) the faculty member under review; (b) other sources within the University, such as experts in related fields, committee chairpersons, and colleagues; (c) similar sources outside the University. In all instances under (b) and (c), the faculty member should be informed that such evidence is being requested. If any evidence is requested in confidence, the faculty member must be told the source of such confidential information. He or she may then communicate to the review committee in writing his or her position as to the qualifications of that source.

The review body should evaluate the evidence and the faculty member's abilities in each of the three major areas. A report summarizing the reasons for or against a favorable judgment should then be forwarded to the dean of the college along with the chairperson's independent evaluation. A copy of the report of the review body, of the chairperson, and of any other administrator may must be delivered to the faculty member under review.

Administrative Evaluations: Appropriate administrative officers, such as chairpersons, deans, provost, vice-provost, and president, may review the dossier of each faculty member reviewed whenever a recommendation for sabbatical, promotion, and/or tenure is made by the department, or whenever there is a significant and substantial change in the status or conditions of employment of any faculty member. Further evidence may be solicited in accordance with the same procedures stipulated under "Submission and Evaluation of Documents and Other Evidence" above.

Reporting Results of Reviews: Each faculty member is entitled to a personal interview with the chairperson of the department and, upon request, a written report of his or her review. Wherever possible, the interview and report should carry specific indications where evidence has been satisfactory or, when it has not been, specific recommendations for improvement before the next review.

Appeals: A faculty member may appeal the decision of the review body by requesting another review within a semester of the first review, and he or she may request a new committee. This request may be rejected by the department, but is subject to appeal to the appropriate College and University committees.

SUGGESTION**RECOMMENDATION #4: MENTORING**

Mentoring practices vary widely across departments and colleges, and many faculty members have reported dissatisfaction with the quality of mentoring they have received. Section 4.4.10 of the Faculty Handbook, entitled, "Career Development of Assistant Professors," is the only statement on faculty mentoring in the handbook. It is brief and narrowly focused on newly-appointed assistant professors. Given the significance of effective mentoring in faculty success, the handbook needs an amplified statement on mentoring that makes clear that the University is committed to mentoring all faculty members to success.

Members of the faculty may well not be aware of all the opportunities and requirements of their position. It is important that we work to assure that information and resources are available to allow faculty members the opportunity to be successful at UD, to be promoted up through the ranks, and to move on toward leadership roles.

With this in mind, the Committee suggests the following changes be made to the Faculty Handbook, section 4.4.10:

1. This section be moved to an earlier section within 4.4 so that it comes before the timetable for promotion and before procedures.
2. This section be broken into two parts, one regarding mentoring for assistant professors, the other (a new section) regarding mentoring for associate professors.
3. A new statement on mentoring shall be included in the Faculty Handbook, specifying the following:

The entire commitment will be under the guidance of a formal/procedural mentor other than the chair. This should be a senior faculty member from within the department or unit, appointed by the department chair in consultation with the mentee. There will be regular formal meetings of the mentor with the mentee to review the policies and procedures of the institution as related to faculty development. The minimum standard is one procedural mentor, but additional mentoring may also be set up. Each department will create a specific formal mentoring policy and protocol, which will be regularly appraised for effectiveness.
4. Understanding that mentoring is an essential element of faculty success and shared governance; therefore, mentoring should figure into every department's Merit Metric document and the work of faculty mentors should be recognized by the chairperson during the mentor's annual appraisal.

Criteria

The criteria by which we judge our success should be clear, aspirational, and aligned with our mission. Our criteria should emphasize scholarly excellence by recognizing and rewarding research and creative activities, service and public engagement, and the promotion of student learning. This should result in a holistic sense of an individual faculty member's performance and promote continual improvement of the University.

RECOMMENDATION #1: **ANALYTICS**

The increasing availability of quantitative analytics to measure faculty performance has led to concerns by many members of the faculty. These concerns include the quality of the measures, the reliability of the data, the faculty members' access to the data, the contextualization of an individual's work—especially interdisciplinary work—in light of these analytics, and the proper use of such information in the promotion & tenure process.

Whereas, quantitative analytics are an increasingly common part of appraisals of faculty work; and

Whereas these measures are sometimes based upon information that is either faulty or incomplete; and

Whereas, these measures are sometimes invoked heedless of the proper contexts of an individual's work;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Handbook should contain a "Statement on Analytics" as a stand-alone section of the promotion & tenure document that says the following:

The use of analytics should be contextual, judicious, and subordinated to long-accepted standards of peer review. Reviewers should avoid over-reliance on third-party analytical data in tenure and promotion decisions. Data that candidates do not have access to over the course of the review period cannot be included in reviews of the dossier.

RECOMMENDATION #2:

EXPANSION OF THE TERM "SCHOLARSHIP"

Scholarship, often referred to as a synonym for research, should be acknowledged as an integral component of all aspects of faculty work. Scholarly activities occur in our teaching, research/creative activities, and service. Community engagement projects may occur as a part of teaching (service learning), research (community-based research/artistic projects), or service (policy documents for non-profit agencies).

Community engagement has become an integral component of scholarship at universities world-wide. Community engagement refers to the process by which university faculty, staff and students collaborate in a mutually beneficial manner with community partners to find solutions to challenges that exist in society. The community partners can be local, regional, national or global. The community engagement projects designed by the university and community partners may have teaching, research/creative activities, or service purposes. Many such projects are interdisciplinary and cross all aspects of faculty work.

Whereas, scholarship permeates all parts of faculty activity, encompassing research and creative activities, teaching, and service; and

Whereas, scholarship is not the exclusive purview of research and creative activities, but applies across the teaching and service missions; and

Whereas, creative activities are the scholarly production of many of the faculty; and

Whereas, the current language in the Faculty Handbook addressing categories of faculty activity does not adequately address the scholarly efforts of all the faculty; therefore

Be it resolved that the changes in the Faculty Handbook section 4.3.6 be made as stipulated as follows:

4.3.6 Categories of Faculty Activity

The three major areas of faculty scholarly activity are (1) teaching and instruction; (2) ~~Scholarship and Research~~ research and creative activities; and (3) public, professional, and University service. Precise demarcation between the three major areas is often difficult and sometimes impossible; in any case, all activities of a faculty member must be considered as an integrated whole. Scholarly community engagement may occur within teaching, research/creative activities or service. Scholarly community engagement is co-planned, co-implemented and co-assessed with a community partner. The results of engagement activities should be disseminated to a variety of appropriate audiences, both academic and otherwise. Faculty activity in each of the areas may vary from year to year, or even semester to semester, according to the interests and abilities of the faculty member, and according to the needs of his or her department, College, or the University as agreed to by the chairperson and dean.

Teaching: Under this category shall be included: ~~all scheduled classes (and academic advising involved therein), seminars, laboratories, thesis and research supervision, clinical and field activities, advisement and any other instructional activity:~~

1. Facilitating the acquisition of knowledge through course delivery
2. Community-engaged educational programs including extension presentations
3. Academic service learning
4. Clinical teaching
5. Study abroad programs
6. Distance education and off-campus institution
7. Continuing education
8. Contract courses or programs for specific audiences
9. Educational programs for alumni
10. Participatory curriculum development

11. Advisement of undergraduate students
12. Advisement of graduate students
13. Advisement of undergraduate researchers
14. Attendance at venues of teaching professional development
15. Assessments of course effectiveness
16. Dissemination of results in presentations and publications

Scholarship and Research Research and Creative Activities: Under this category shall be the following:

- Research, usually presented through publication of scholarly work or through appropriate colloquia;
 - Creative development in those fields in which the faculty member receives public recognition for his or her professional contributions to society or to the University. Included are such activities as plays (composition or production), music (composition or performance), art exhibitions, patents, etc.
 - Professional development involving the presentation of papers or chairing sessions at professional meetings, serving as an officer or committee member of a professional organization, editorial duties, professional consulting, and other similar activities. Alternatively these activities can be considered under the Service section for those units that specify such professional development activities under Service in their promotion & tenure document.
1. Publication of research (peer-reviewed, books, and book chapters) which includes basic and applied discovery, teaching pedagogy, and community-based, contractual, and patent discovery, etc.
 2. Creative activities such as plays (production and/or performance), music (composition and/or performance), art and dance exhibitions, etc.



3. Presentation of scholarly work at appropriate colloquia, seminars, conferences, and lectures
4. Grants and contracts awarded to conduct research
5. Translational and application of research for community engagement
6. Attendance at venues of research professional development
7. Extension and applied technical and popular press publications

Public, Professional and University Service:

Included in this category shall be:

- University service, such as nonacademic advisement of students (career, professional, or personal); activities such as living/ learning experiences, for which no academic credit is given; departmental committees and special assignments; College Senates, committees, and special assignments; University Senate, committees, and special assignments; service to the University of Delaware Chapter of the AAUP; administrative and quasi-administrative appointments; and participation in student

affairs related activities (Rev. 5/02)

- Public and Community service (local, state, regional, national, international); such as technical assistance or consultation for public or community organizations; election or appointment to boards, commissions, committees, legislative bodies, or the like outside the normal professional calling of the faculty member in the teaching or research function.
 - Professional service to the faculty members' discipline and its organizations such as service for professional associations.
 - Creative activities outside the normal professional calling of the faculty member; for example, participation in orchestras or ensembles, shows of paintings, musical or literary productions, and the like, which enhance or improve the University as a community of learning.
1. University service, such as a) nonacademic advisement of students (advising student groups or providing career, professional, or personal advisement), b) departmental committees and special assignments, c) college senates, committees, and special assignments, d) University Senate,

committees, and special assignments, e) service to the University of Delaware Chapter of the AAUP, f) administrative and quasi-administrative appointments, and g) participation in student affairs-related activities

2. Integrated scholarly service including chairing sessions at professional meetings, serving as an officer or committee member of a professional organization, editorial duties, grant-reviewing, professional consulting, and other similar activities
3. Consulting and expert testimony
4. Policy analysis
5. Service to community-based institutions
6. Contributions to managed systems
7. New business ventures
8. Dissemination of results in presentations and publications

RECOMMENDATION #3:

PROMOTION STANDARDS

As the University has taken steps to promote more research activity among the tenure-track faculty, there has been a great deal of discussion about changing promotion & tenure standards. These discussions have focused on the relative importance of research versus teaching and on the criteria for promotion & tenure in each unit's approved promotion & tenure document. These are issues of fundamental importance. We recommend a change to the Faculty Handbook language that affirms our aspiration to excellence in all areas of faculty activity; that clarifies expectations for candidates seeking promotion & tenure; and that places the primary responsibility of defining excellence in the academic units.

Whereas, teaching, research/creative activities, and service are all important to the mission of the University of Delaware; and



Whereas, the words used to designate the level of performance expected from faculty vary from department to department, as well as within and between colleges; and

Whereas, excellence can only be defined in the context of discipline and departmental specific criteria; and

Whereas, there is a need to recognize efforts in all areas of assigned workload; and

Whereas, faculty and reviewers alike need to have the standards that they are being judged by clearly delineated and defined; therefore,

Be it resolved that the changes in the Faculty Handbook section 4.4.1 be made as follows:

4.4.1 Minimum Standards for Promotion

The promotion & tenure procedure is a parallel structure allowing for faculty proposal, evaluation and appeal, as well as administrative evaluation at each level of organization of the University.

This document governs the University process of review at every level. Departments, units, and colleges may make additions to and clarifications of this document to address their special circumstances. These elaborations, which must be approved by the University Committee on Promotions and Tenure and by the Provost, will constitute the departmental document.

Departmental documents also should include the procedure for choosing the departmental promotion & tenure committee and should specify **what constitutes discipline and departmental specific excellence within all areas of teaching, research/creative activities, and service in the context of assigned workload required levels of achievement for each rank, such as excellence in research or teaching or in both.** Faculty candidates for promotion and/or tenure will be evaluated based on the criteria in their department's approved promotion & tenure guidelines **appropriately weighted for**

their workload for the period under review. (Rev. 3/4/08; Rv. 5/2016)

RECOMMENDATION #4:

PROMOTION STANDARDS

The University's mission statement calls upon the faculty to cultivate learning and foster the free exchange of ideas through teaching, research, and service. However, the current section of the Faculty Handbook on promotion standards for tenure-track faculty does not exhort faculty to the highest levels of achievement in each of these areas of effort. We believe that promotion and the award of tenure should be contingent upon a member of the faculty meeting discipline- and department-defined standards of achievement in all areas of effort, not just one or two. The current language also does not sufficiently address the importance of public engagement as a key feature of the University's mission as a land-, sea-, and space-grant institution.

Whereas, the mission statement of the University declares "The University of Delaware exists to cultivate learning, develop knowledge and foster the free exchange of ideas...the University has a strong tradition of distinguished scholarship, research/creative activities, teaching and service that is grounded in a commitment to increasing and disseminating scientific, humanistic and social knowledge for the benefit of the larger society. Tracing its origins to 1743 and chartered by the state in 1833, the University of Delaware today is a land-grant, sea-grant and space-grant university; and

Whereas, the mission statement of the University makes it clear that teaching, research/creative activities/creative activities and service are all important components of the work of the university; and

Whereas, the University has a responsibility to deploy its faculty across all components of the mission; and

Whereas, the integration of teaching, research/creative activities, and service create synergism that allows for greater productivity and utility of the work that faculty accomplish; and

Whereas, the terms “research and scholarship” and “research” do not adequately address the production discovery efforts of all the faculty; and

Whereas, faculty are expected to meet or exceed discipline- and department-specific standards in all areas of teaching, research/creative activities, and service considered in the context of the workload for the period under review;

Therefore, be it resolved that the changes in the Faculty Handbook section 4.4.2 be made as follows.

4.4.2 Minimum Standards for Promotion

~~Since the mission of the University encompasses teaching, scholarship and service, faculty members should strive for excellence in all three areas. Scholarship, whether in the form of research, publication, professional development, artistic creativity, or scholarship related to teaching or service is a significant part of each person's contribution to the academic community. Everyone must pursue some form of scholarly activity. How this work is made available to other scholars obviously depends upon the particular discipline, but promotion requires evidence that significant achievements have been and will continue to be made. (Rev. 3/4/08)~~

~~The University's obligation to scholarship notwithstanding, a major goal of any educational institution is to encourage and to demonstrate excellence in teaching. Hence, faculty members with teaching responsibilities must demonstrate high-quality teaching performance.~~

~~Service at all levels--department, college, University, community, profession, or nation--is also an integral part of the University's mission and must not be neglected on the grounds that~~

~~scholarship and teaching have higher priority.~~

~~These considerations suggest University expectations for promotion to various academic ranks. Although departments may write specific criteria to fit their particular circumstances and needs, they must conform to the spirit of these standards. Unsatisfactory performance in any of the three areas, for example, precludes promotion.~~

Scholarship encompasses teaching, discovery, engagement, and integration. These are broad inclusive activities that cross the traditional boundaries of teaching, research/creative activities, and service. Specifically, teaching includes oral and interpersonal transmission, transformation, and extension of knowledge. Research/creative activities includes quantitative, qualitative, and theorist research, as well as creative activities that expand and enrich the human experience and our understanding of the world. Teaching and research/creative activities can occur within and across disciplines. Service includes activities that advance the University, one's profession or discipline, and the community. As a land, sea, space and urban grant institution of higher education, engagement is highly valued. As a university that values and exemplifies shared faculty governance and the integrity that it provides to the core academic and scholarly mission, service is fundamental to achieving our aspirational goals. All tenure-track faculty's workload must devote sufficient time to engage in meaningful research/creative activities, teaching, and service. Likewise, all three areas are considered seriously in the tenure and promotion decisions of tenure-track faculty.

The University is committed to developing its faculty to meet and exceed expectations within their respective disciplines in all of the areas of teaching, research/creative activities, and service while considering the reasonable output that is possible from assigned workloads. Further, to advance society, it is expected that faculty be involved in engagement which extends and

integrates one's field of knowledge to broader audiences and communities.

To provide comparability across the University, then, the following minimum achievements should be met for promotion to each rank on each track:

4.4.2.1 Promotion on the Tenure-Track (Rev 5/2016)

Assistant Professor, tenure-track: Apart from earning the doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree, the primary requirement is the demonstrated ability and desire to meet discipline- and departmentally-defined standards in all areas of teaching, research/creative activities, and service appropriately weighted for their workload for the period under review **excellence in scholarship and teaching and to make positive contributions in all three areas**. For this rank, past achievements are not so important as evidence of future growth and accomplishment.

Associate Professor, tenure-track: Inasmuch as promotion within the University to this rank generally carries tenure—a binding commitment on the part of the University—the qualifications must be rigorous. The individual must meet discipline- and departmentally-defined standards in all areas of teaching, research/creative activities, and service appropriately weighted for their workload for the period under review **excellent achievement in scholarship or teaching and high quality performance in all areas**. Furthermore, there should be unmistakable evidence that the individual has progressed and will continue to do so. A mere satisfactory or adequate record as an assistant professor is not sufficient; there must be very clear indication, based on hard evidence and outside peer evaluations, that the candidate has, in fact, attained high levels of accomplishment.

Professor, with tenure: This rank 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 having met **discipline- and departmentally-defined standards in all areas of teaching, research/creative activities, and service appropriately weighted for their workload for the period under review, significant development and achievement in teaching, scholarship and service** since the last promotion. Once again, the candidate's claim to have met these requirements must be thoroughly and completely documented by outside peer evaluations and other materials.

RECOMMENDATION #5:

DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR RANK

Resolution to Add to the Faculty Handbook 4.4.2.1

Whereas, collegiate faculty in both the science and social sciences increase in productivity between assistant, associate, and full professor, their productivity tends to stabilize and then decrease in the years after achieving the full-professor rank (Rorstad and Aksnes 2015, Tien and Blackburn 2016). This has been linked to increasing years in service to the university with no hope for promotions and a stalled career plan (Tang and Chamberlain 2003).

Whereas, a solution to correct professors' reductions in productivity and stalling career plans is to increase promotion incentives via an increase in the number of academic ranks (Tuckman 1976).

Whereas, while some faculty (at all ranks) belong to departments with specific endowments to reward faculty with a defacto additional promotion via named professorships/chairs, this option is not available to all faculty.

Whereas, University of Delaware comparator universities such as Rutgers and the University of Massachusetts-Amherst have added a fourth promotion level of "distinguished professor" to increase productivity,

Whereas, this rank would be reserved for those faculty in the University who have already received the rank of full professor and who have achieved discipline and departmental specific excellence and eminence in teaching, research/creative activities, and service. The standard for promotion to distinguished professor would be significantly higher than that applied in promotion to professor. It would be expected distinguished professors should be exemplary members of the University faculty who consistently have demonstrated a high standard of achievement in all professorial roles. Additionally, it would be expected the distinguished professor has earned significant recognition and reputation at a national and international reputation. Again, the candidate's claim to have met these requirements would have to be thoroughly and completely documented by outside peer evaluations and other materials,

Therefore be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost shall designate a committee representing the faculty and administration no later than February 1, 2018 to investigate the academic, logistic, and budgetary

feasibility and value of the creation of this promotion rank. A final recommendation by the committee will be provided to President Assanis and his administration for further consideration.

References

- Tien, F. F., and R. T. Blackburn. 2016. *Faculty Rank System, Research Motivation, and Faculty Research Productivity: Measure Refinement and Theory Testing*. *The Journal of Higher Education* 67:2-22.
- Rorstad, K., and D. W. Aksnes. 2015. *Publication rate expressed by age, gender and academic position – A large-scale analysis of Norwegian academic staff*. *Journal of Informetrics* 9:317–333.
- Tang, T. L., and M. Chamberlain. 2003. *Effects of rank, tenure, length of service, and institution on faculty attitudes toward research and teaching: The case of regional state universities*. *Journal of Education for Business* 79:q103-110.
- Tuckman, H. P. 1976. *Publication, Teaching, and the Academic Reward Structure*. Lexington Books, Lexington, Massachusetts.

SUGGESTION

RECOMMENDATION #6:

STUDENT COURSE EVALUATIONS

Our current P&T guidelines privilege student course evaluations as a primary source of evidence of teaching quality. And departmental reviews typically place a very heavy emphasis on the numerical ratings of two common questions related to the overall quality of the instructor and the overall quality of the course. There are three problems with this. First, student course evaluations often measure student satisfaction, but do not necessarily address teaching quality. Second, there is a growing body of scholarship documenting the negative effect of bias

on student evaluations. Third, there is no common course evaluation instrument in use, campus-wide. Therefore, we offer the following recommendations:

We recommend that the University P&T document contain cautionary language about the utility and reliability of student course evaluations as a measure of teaching quality.

We recommend that the University consider establishing a common set of questions for all student course evaluations that are more focused on student learning opportunities than on student satisfaction.

Process

The University has a strong commitment to transparency and procedural fairness in its promotion & tenure process. Unlike at most other institutions, our faculty members undergo six levels of review; they receive a copy of the decision letter at every level of review; they can appeal decisions at any or every level; and they are allowed to add additional evidence at any point in the review process. Nevertheless, our review revealed that there are opportunities to improve our process and to clarify areas of ambiguity.

RECOMMENDATION #1:

EXPEDITED TENURE REVIEW

The award of tenure represents a significant institutional commitment; however, the University currently lacks a process for expediting tenure review when recruiting senior faculty members. In order to ensure that the award of tenure in such cases is made after careful review and in a manner that is consistent and fair across all departments, a clear policy on expedited tenure review should be established.

Whereas award of tenure represents a significant institutional commitment; and

Whereas the University currently lacks a process for expediting tenure review when recruiting senior faculty members; and

Whereas all tenure decisions should be made consistently and fairly;

Therefore be it resolved that section 4.1.1 of the Faculty Handbook be eliminated and a new “Expedited Tenure Review” policy be included in section 4.4, reading:

When a faculty hiring action includes the award of tenure, an expedited tenure review process is required. This expedited review process involves a minimum of three external review letters from distinguished scholars, selected by the departmental promotion & tenure Committee, in consultation with the department chair. The candidate must

provide a dossier of work for review by the department and the external reviewers. This can be an abbreviated dossier, but it must include evidence of the quality of the candidate’s teaching, research, and service. After review by the department promotion & tenure committee, the dossier—including the external review letters—will be sent for review to the department chair, the dean, and the provost. No appointment with tenure will be final until the candidate provides a letter of resignation from their prior institution.

RECOMMENDATION #2: APPEALS

A distinguishing feature of UD’s promotion & tenure process is the candidate’s right to appeal a decision at any (or every) level of review. However, this important feature is included at the end of the Handbook section called “Promotion Process Schedule,” so it is easily overlooked. It belongs in a stand-alone section of the promotion & tenure document and some guidance should be given regarding the typical grounds for appeal.

Whereas a candidate’s right to appeal a promotion & tenure decision is an important feature of UD’s promotion & tenure policy; and

Whereas the information on appeals is well-hidden at the end of the promotion & tenure document section 4.4.8, entitled “Promotion Process Schedule;” and

Whereas the current language does not indicate the grounds for an appeal;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Handbook should contain a statement on “Appeals” as a stand-alone section of the promotion & tenure document that says the following:

Appeals are possible at every level, but must be made to the committee or administrator whose decision is being appealed. **Appeals are typically made on the grounds of procedural irregularities, the interpretation of evidence in the dossier, or the introduction of new evidence.**

An intention to appeal must be given to the appropriate body within five working days of notification of the decision. An appeal includes: (1) a letter documenting the basis of the appeal, usually written by the candidate; and (2) a scheduled meeting with the appropriate person or committee. It is strongly recommended that the candidate attend the appeal meeting. Representatives of the candidate also can attend and participate in the appeal meeting. Appeals must be handled within two weeks, except under extenuating circumstances. The University Faculty Senate Committee on Promotions 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. (Rev. Fac. Sen 2/98; 5/2016)

RECOMMENDATION #3:

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

External review of a candidate's achievements is a key feature of the promotion & tenure process. Candid, confidential reviews by experts in the candidate's field serve to validate the quality and impact of the candidate's work. Therefore, the selection of reviewers and the process by which their letters are solicited and included in the dossier should be clearly indicated in the Faculty Handbook. Currently, this information is insufficiently clear and is well-hidden in a long section of the handbook describing the elements of the promotion dossier. We recommend that a new section entitled "External Review Letters" be added to the Faculty Handbook.

Whereas the selection of external reviewers and solicitation of their review letters is a key feature of the promotion & tenure process; and

Whereas reviews should only be sought from scholars with a demonstrated record of scholarly excellence; and

Whereas the current Handbook language on this topic is insufficient and subordinated to a

description of the promotion dossier in 4.4.9 of the Faculty Handbook;

Therefore be it resolved that a new, stand-alone section of the Handbook should be created, entitled "External Reviews" and read as follows:

1. The purpose of obtaining letters from external reviewers is to assess the quality of the candidate's work in their field. To accomplish this purpose, departments should select external reviewers who are outstanding scholars in the candidate's field. The selection of reviewers should not preclude outstanding scholars from outside of the United States or who are not at Ph.D. granting institutions or departments. The quality and appropriateness of the reviewer should be the central concern in the selection of reviewers.
2. Procedure for choosing external reviewers.
 - A. Solicited external evaluations serve as a major indicator of an individual's impact on the profession and are always required for promotion. Although the number required may vary by rank and department or division, and may be defined by the College, every dossier must include external reviews solicited by the departmental committee and written by highly qualified individuals with established reputations in the candidate's field.
 - B. Solicitation of reviewers must be fully documented by the department, and must be done with a standard letter that is the same for all potential reviewers for a given candidate. Details required in the solicitation letter are described in Section D below.
 - C. The solicitation of reviewers must follow these guidelines:



1) A candidate will submit a list of potential reviewers, some of whom will be approached for recommendations. The department committee will suggest additional reviewers. Neither the candidate nor the department may recommend reviewers with whom the candidate has had a personal relationship or under whom the candidate studied. Ineligible as evaluators are former advisors, mentors, coauthors, and collaborators. Professional acquaintance (e.g., through professional meetings or seminar visits) does not normally represent a conflict. Many external evaluators also serve as book or journal editors, and familiarity with the work of the candidate in an editorial capacity does not normally represent a conflict; nor does serving on the same panel at a conference.

2) The total list of names must be greater than the total number of letters required to be solicited. Although the candidate must be informed of all potential reviewers and have an opportunity to comment on them, it is the department

committee, and not the candidate, that makes the final selection. The final list of names will not be given to the candidate so as to preserve confidentiality of the reviewers. The department committee is not required to seek approval of the list of names through a higher administrative office.

3) As a minimum requirement, external evaluators should hold at least the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered. If a letter from a non-academic external evaluator is included, the departmental committee must provide justification for choosing that reviewer.

4) Candidates must not contact potential reviewers about the promotion process at any time.

5) Letters of evaluation will be confidential and external reviewers will not be mentioned by name or affiliation in any recommendations or evaluations. Reviewers may be referred to only by number.

6) The electronic dossier of external evaluations must include the letter requesting the evaluation, the evaluations as received from the reviewers, and curriculum vitae or biographical statements describing the reviewers' credentials.

7) If a candidate has collaborative works, it must be clear to the external evaluator what the candidate's contributions were to the finished work. The candidate must clearly indicate on his or her curriculum vitae the share of any collaborative work attributed to the candidate's own efforts. Reviewers must be able to determine whether an individual can execute scholarship in his or her own right.

8) External teaching evaluations should attest to the candidate's pedagogical competence, knowledge of the subject matter, organization and preparation, ability to stimulate intellectual curiosity and discussion in students, innovative capacity, and such.

9) External service evaluations will be required for those CT faculty or any other faculty, whose primary contracted area of responsibility is service. For CT faculty, the external evaluations can be performed locally, but should be external to the academic unit.

10) Members of the department must not contact external reviewers with the intention of influencing the content of their reviews. Communication with external reviewers should be exclusively handled by the promotion & tenure Committee chair.

D. Letters soliciting reviewers must contain the following information:

1) The letter must be accompanied by a

copy of the departmental promotion & tenure document.

2) The letter must include clear directions to the evaluator to analyze and critically evaluate the candidate's work and accomplishments during the review period in the context of the departmental promotion & tenure document and the candidate's assigned workload over the period under review. Reviewers also should be requested to comment on the candidate's potential for future development.

3) Evaluators must be asked to define their relationship with the candidate in the letters they write, and to affirm that they can offer an impartial opinion.

4) Evaluators must be asked to provide their curriculum vitae or a detailed biographical statement in addition to the evaluation letter.

5) When a candidate has used the extended probationary period under the University's "Stop-the-Tenure-Clock" policy, reviewers should be made aware of this so that they do not judge the candidate by a different standard. Therefore, a statement should be included in the letter to the referees clarifying the extra year(s) with the following language: "Stop-the-TenureClock is a UD policy that 'stops the tenure clock' for one year for reasons such as the birth or adoption of a child (up to two times) or for family illness. In these cases, the candidate is to be evaluated on the basis of the standard probationary period."

RECOMMENDATION #4: **WORK-IN-RANK**

There is significant confusion, especially among

junior faculty, regarding what work counts in promotion & tenure decisions. This has arisen because the Faculty Handbook says that “promotion to the rank of associate professor generally cannot be based on work completed in earning the doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree or postdoctorate work prior to arrival at the University of Delaware” (4.4.9)

We agree that doctoral/postdoctoral publications should not be considered the major part of the promotion dossier. However, the current language stating that scholarly productivity cannot be based on any “work” from the doctoral/postdoctoral period may cause confusion. In some disciplines, it is standard practice that research initiated during

the doctoral program or postdoctoral appointment is continued as an assistant professor. In other areas, it is common that researchers may spend years evaluating major datasets that were collected during the doctoral/postdoctoral stage. We recommend that the language of the P&T document be made more precise to avoid confusion about what constitutes “publications based on the dissertation”.

The essential point is that candidates must demonstrate substantial scholarly achievement after their hire at the University. Through mentoring and the peer review process, each department is responsible for making clear to new faculty members what work will (and will not) count toward the promotion & tenure decision.

The University of Delaware does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, disability, religion, age, veteran status, gender identity or expression, or sexual orientation, or any other characteristic protected by applicable law in its employment, educational programs and activities, admissions policies, and scholarship and loan programs as required by Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and other applicable statutes and University policies. The University of Delaware also prohibits unlawful harassment including sexual harassment and sexual violence. Inquiries or complaints may be addressed to:

Susan L. Groff, Ed. D.,
Director, Institutional Equity & Title IX Coordinator
305 HULLIHEN HALL, NEWARK, DE 19716
(302) 831-8063
titleixcoordinator@udel.edu

For complaints related to Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and/or the Americans with Disabilities Act, please contact:

Anne L. Jannarone, M.Ed., Ed.S.
Director, Office of Disability Support Services
Alison Hall, Suite 130
Newark, DE 19716
(302) 831-4643

OR contact the U.S. Department of Education - Office for Civil Rights.
