

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

April 7, 1980

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate was called to order on Monday, April 7, 1980 at 4:00 p.m., with President Smith presiding. Senators not in attendance were:

Donald Crossan	Charles Marler	John Pikulski
Alexander Doberenz	Harold Neikirk	Gerald Straka
William Gaither		

Senators excused were: Richard Agnello, David Ames, Ellis Bolton, William Boyer, Jeffrey Davidson, Daniel Neale, Karen Schaeffer, Elliot Schreiber, E.A. Trabant, Thomas Watson, John Zikakis.

I. Adoption of the Agenda. In the absence of objection the Agenda was adopted as distributed.

II. Approval of the Minutes. President Smith noted that the Agenda incorrectly called for approval of the Minutes of the December meetings, an action already taken by the Senate. He called for additions or corrections to the Minutes of January 7, February 4 and March 3, 1980; in the absence of objections he declared these Minutes approved as distributed.

III. Remarks. None.

IV. Announcements. None.

V. Old Business.

Item A, a resolution from the Committee on Budget Review regarding allocation of state funds in the University budget was introduced by Professor Hutchinson, chair of the committee. He explained that the intent of the resolution was not to make a decision on whether exposure of salaries was favored or not, but to make the salary exposure which is mandated under the state's "Sunshine Laws" as equitably and widely shared among University employees as possible. He added that essentially self-supporting operations (food service, residence halls, the book store, student health, and rental housing) and faculty paid from endowment and/or restricted income were excluded. University Treasurer Harrison said the plan was that no more than 80%, and probably about 60%, of any individual salary would be shown. He added that one legal opinion had said that if any portion were disclosed the whole salary had to be shown, while a second opinion, which the University would follow until there was a court clarification, said only the state funds must be accounted for.

There was no further discussion, and the following was approved by voice vote:

WHEREAS: the University is dedicated to furthering higher educational goals in the state of Delaware; and

WHEREAS: the faculty recognizes and welcomes its commitment to help serve the state's higher educational needs; and

WHEREAS: the efforts of almost every member of the University's educational staff contribute to these ends; and

WHEREAS: the State of Delaware recognizes the value of these efforts through yearly budget allocations;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the University shall allocate the State Funds budget so as to support some portion of every fulltime permanent Educational and General salary line, provided such action is consistent with state and federal laws, and the terms governing the use of legally restricted funds.

VI. New Business.

Item A, a resolution to become effective for the 1981 slate of nominees for Senate elections, was introduced by Professor Toensmeyer, chair of the Rules Committee. In support of the resolution he cited the recommendation in Robert's Rules of Order that "it is usually not sound to require a nominating committee to nominate more than one candidate for each office, since the committee can easily circumvent such a provision by nominating only one person who has any chance of being elected." He added that the resolution would make the job of the committee easier. President Smith noted that the Senate would retain its option to nominate candidates from the floor.

Senator Braun opposed the resolution as creating an undemocratic process; he added that if the Nominating Committee started early in the year they could find enough good candidates.

There was no further debate and President Smith moved the question; the resolution, as follows, was defeated on a voice vote:

RESOLVED, that the Bylaws, Section K, Election of Officers of the Senate (Handbook p. I-8) be changed by the deletion of the sentence: The slate shall have at least two eligible candidates for each office or position.

Item B, a resolution regarding course credits, was introduced by Professor O'Neill, chair of the Coordinating Committee on Education. There was no discussion and the following was approved by unanimous voice vote:

RESOLVED, that courses numbered 001-099 may count only toward the associate degree. This becomes effective with courses taken after June 1, 1980.

Item C, a resolution for the addition of a paragraph on "Censorship and Surveillance" to the Personnel Policies Section of the Faculty Handbook, was introduced by Professor Haskell, chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom. He explained that in the course of negotiating the present Academic Freedom Statement a similar paragraph had been dropped when the Trustees had felt it was misplaced because it was not an academic freedom matter.

Senator Chesson asked whether a chairman's review of office file copies not directed to him would be "monitoring communications," and Professor Haskell responded that in his opinion it would, but the way the policy would be interpreted would be decided by a later committee. In response to a question from Senator Warter, President Smith and Provost Campbell said regulations covering the use of University facilities for printing and distributing private materials were already presented in Section III-C-1 of the Handbook. President Smith called for the vote and the following was approved by voice vote:

RESOLVED, that the following statement be added at the end of Section III-C of the Faculty Handbook (p. III-C-2):

CENSORSHIP AND SURVEILLANCE

Censorship or surveillance of communications on or off campus is incompatible with freedom of expression in the University community. The monitoring or interference with communications emanating from a member or group of the University cannot be condoned. Practices such as telephone tapping, surveillance and stoppage of mail, censorship at the Duplicating Center of materials emanating from the university community, or censorship on bulletin boards designated for general use are contrary to University policy.

Item D, a resolution regarding classroom visitations for purposes of faculty evaluation, was also introduced by Professor Haskell for the Committee on Academic Freedom. He reported that 25 out of 40 units had responded to a survey by his Committee of current practices; 13 of those responding had no policy, but the remainder required classroom visitations as part of the review for promotion and tenure. Of that remainder, one had a policy of unannounced visits and all the others had a policy of scheduling and announcing such visits; in about 4 of the cases the policies were voluntary on the part of the person visited.

In response to a question as to whether an unannounced classroom visitation would be a violation of the proposed policy, Professor Haskell said that such a visit would be permissible if the affected faculty as a group had agreed it was acceptable; he added that, in his view, there could be a violation of academic freedom, however, if the classroom visits were an attempt to control what was going on in the classroom.

President Smith noted that the resolution, if approved, would go to the President for transmission to the Board of Trustees. Provost Campbell suggested that the appropriate place in the section on Academic Freedom for the new paragraph would be between the second and third of the italicized paragraphs. This was accepted as an editorial change.

President Smith called for the vote; the following was approved by a hand vote, 24 for and 18 opposed:

RESOLVED, that the following paragraph be added to the existing section on Academic Freedom on p. III-B-1 of the Faculty Handbook, as a paragraph inserted between the second and third italicized paragraphs of the Statement:

Classroom visitations for the purpose of teaching evaluation are compatible with academic freedom, but such visitations shall adhere to procedures contained in a written statement approved by a majority of department faculty.

Item E, two resolutions providing for the adoption of a revised statement on Promotions Policies, was introduced by Professor Reynolds, chair of the Committee on Promotions and Tenure. He requested the following editorial changes: 1) page 2, line 26, "or" should be "and"; 2) "curriculum vitae" should be spelled correctly throughout the document; 3) page 7, lines 1 and 2, should read "The chairperson should explain, in writing, the decision to the candidate and to the department committee."

In response to a question from Senator Warter it was determined that in the phrase "college or division," division referred to formal administrative units, specifically the Division of Physical Education. Senator Warter asked whether external peer evaluations could be requested at any level of the review process; Professor Reynolds responded that requests for additional information should be made through the candidate's department. Senator Warter asked whether any restrictions could be made, in the college rules for example, on the right of a faculty member to apply for promotion at any time. In the discussion that followed Professor Reynolds said probably not, but agreed that the policy would not preclude taking years of service into account; Provost Campbell said he thought a department requirement for years of service at each rank would be prohibited under the proposed policy.

Senator Vincent asked for a definition of "equivalent degree" (page 2, line 24). He made a motion, which was seconded, to amend the phrase by substituting "or other appropriate degree"; a suggestion from Senator Crawford to add "terminal" to read: "Apart from earning the Ph.D or other appropriate terminal degree" was accepted. Senator Chesson made a motion, which was seconded, to further amend by changing "Ph.D." to "doctorate"; this motion was approved by voice vote. The motion to amend the phrase to read as follows was then approved by voice vote:

Apart from earning the doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree....

Senator Chesson asked why, on page 8, line 16, and page 10, line 10, the department committee was omitted from the list of those receiving notice of the

decision; Senator Warren noted the same omission on page 9, line 21. After a brief discussion a motion was made, seconded, and approved by voice vote, to amend as follows:

Page 8, line 16 to read: *... the candidate, department committee and college committee....*

Page 9, line 21 to read: *the candidate, the department committee, the department chairperson,*

Page 10, line 10 to read: *... the candidate, the department committee, the department chairperson,*

A motion was made, seconded, and approved by unanimous voice vote, to amend page 15, line 17, by substituting "completed" for "pursued" to read:

completed in earning the doctorate....

Professor Warter made a motion to amend by deleting, from page 15, lines 17 and 18, the phrase "prior to arrival at the University of Delaware"; the motion was not seconded.

Senator Van Camp made a motion, which was seconded, and approved by voice vote, to make the document consistent by substituting for "Ph.D.", on page 15, line 17 and page 16, line 4, the phrase:

...doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree.

A discussion followed on the value toward promotion of work done and/or published after receipt of the terminal degree, but based on dissertation research and materials. Professor Reynolds stated that although this was discussed in the document, it was often a matter of judgment by the committee. Provost Campbell added that such publications could and should be taken into account.

Dean Brucker suggested that Section K could impose serious obligations on units which changed directions or priorities. President Smith noted that Section K was not new but was copied from the present policy. Professor Reynolds said it was intended to prevent abuses which could occur if departments changed priorities and criteria in mid-stream. Dean Gouldner said it might mean simply that a faculty member's probationary period could be extended. Senator Mangone said the paragraph represented one of the faculty's most far-reaching protections because it obliged the University to accommodate priorities as they arose.

Senator Braun said he felt Section L (page 18) was no longer in effect because there is already an imbalance between the ranks at the University, and it was likely to increase in the tenured ranks as the years go by. He suggested that the policy could be used against tenuring faculty and he made a motion, which was seconded, to delete Section L. Provost Campbell said the ranks presently balance out over-all, and added that Section L represented a Board of Trustees' policy and they would just put it back. President Smith pointed out that the trustees are at liberty to act as they wish, and the Senate should vote on what the Senate likes; he called for the vote and the motion to delete Section L on page 18 was approved by voice vote.

Professor Kleinman asked for a clarification of the sequence of events described in Section G on page 10. After a discussion of the intent a motion was made, seconded

and approved by unanimous voice vote to substitute "before" for "when" in line 3, to read:

... Before the Provost rejects recommendations made by...

Senator Morse made a motion, which was seconded, to delete the words "since the last promotion" on page 3, lines 15 and 16; after a brief discussion the motion was defeated by voice vote.

A motion by Provost Campbell to call the question on the entire document was approved by voice vote.

The following resolutions were then approved by voice vote:

RESOLVED, that the University Faculty Senate adopts the revised statement, as amended, on Promotion Policies for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook as Section III-K.

RESOLVED, that present Section III-F be deleted from the Faculty Handbook.

(Note: K: Promotion Policies, as approved by the Senate, is presented in Attachment 1.)

Item G. Senator Woodward introduced the following resolution, for action at the May meeting of the Senate:

WHEREAS there has been significant student reaction since the passage of the so-called "Free Week" proposal by the Senate on February 4, 1980, and

WHEREAS the Delaware Undergraduate Student Congress has polled its member organizations and all college councils, the Resident Students Association (RSA), the Inter-Fraternity Council (IFC), the Returning Adult Student Association (RASA), and the University Commuter Association (UCA) have officially voiced opposition to the proposal,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Senate repeal its action of February 4 that prohibits the administration of tests counting greater than or equal to 33.3% of the semester's grade for any class during the last five days of any regular semester.

No further business was introduced and President Smith declared the meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ulrich C. Toensmeyer

Ulrich C. Toensmeyer
Secretary

University Faculty Senate

UCT/b

Attachment: Promotion Policies

April 7, 1980

K: PROMOTION POLICIES

A. Introduction

The ultimate objectives of promotion policies at the University of Delaware are excellence and fairness. In order to preserve and enhance its reputation as an institution of higher education the University must establish and maintain high standards of teaching, scholarly and artistic activity, and service. At the same time, it must treat each faculty member with decency and respect. Thus, these procedures seek to promote the individual's welfare and professional development while at the same time fostering the University's growth toward excellence.

The process rests firmly on peer evaluations, for the faculty itself is best able to establish and apply promotion criteria. Furthermore, the promotion system recognizes the uniqueness of the disciplines that comprise the University community. Indeed, departments have the major responsibility of establishing and administering guidelines (subject to wider approval) and making initial promotion and tenure recommendations.

One should recognize, however, that such decisions affect the University as a whole, and consequently, college and University committees together with appropriate administrators also play an important role. They ensure that policies and decisions serve the interests of the University and are roughly comparable across its many divisions.

B. Minimum Standards for Promotion

Since the mission of the University encompasses teaching, scholarship, and service, faculty members must strive for excellence in all three areas. Scholarship, whether in the form of research, publication, professional development, or artistic creativity, 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.

The University's obligation to scholarship notwithstanding, a major goal of any educational institution is to encourage and 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 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. To provide comparability across the University, then, the following minimum achievements should be met:

Assistant Professor: Apart from earning the doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree, the primary requirement is the demonstrated ability and desire to achieve excellence in scholarship and teaching and to make positive contributions in all three areas. At this rank past achievements are not so important as evidence of future growth and accomplishment.

Associate Professor: Inasmuch as promotion within the University to this rank carries tenure--a binding commitment on the part of the University--the qualifications must be especially rigorous. At a minimum, the individual should show 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 merely satisfactory or adequate record as an assistant professor is not sufficient: there must be very clear indications, based on hard evidence and outside peer evaluations, that the candidate has in fact attained high levels of accomplishment.

Professor: This rank is reserved for individuals who have established reputations in their disciplines and whose contributions to the University's mission are unquestioned. There should be unmistakable evidence of significant development and achievement 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 material.

C. Candidate's Responsibilities

Faculty members have the right and responsibility to know all relevant departmental, college and University promotion criteria, policies, and practices. They should exercise this right at the earliest possible time and plan their academic development and activities with the guidelines in mind.*

*The evaluation procedures described in Section III-I of the Faculty Handbook provide an excellent opportunity for making such plans on a regular basis. Also see Parts J and K of this section.

A faculty member has the right to apply for promotion at any time (subject to the provisions pertaining to tenure described in Section III-L of the Faculty Handbook) and has the sole right to advance or withdraw the dossier from the promotion process.

A candidate for promotion also has the right to be informed in writing by each reviewing body--department committee, chairperson, college committee, dean, University Promotions and Tenure Committee, and Provost--of its decision. The reasons for adverse recommendations must be explained to the candidate as specifically and completely as possible and reasonable.

Keeping in mind the schedule given in Part H which requires that dossiers be submitted for departmental review no later than September 30, a candidate has the responsibility to consult with the department chairperson, promotion committees or any other appropriate person regarding the content and preparation of the dossier.*

D. Departmental Responsibilities**

The department bears the major burden of defining standards, specifying the procedures to be followed in deciding whether the standards are met and judging the credentials submitted in support of each application for promotion. Minimum requirements for the satisfactory discharge of these departmental responsibilities include:

1. After approval by the appropriate college committee, dean, the University Committee on Promotions and Tenure, and the Provost [see below], promotion criteria, policies, and practices must be published and distributed to all members of the department, to the appropriate committees and University officials, and to the University Faculty Senate through its Committee on Promotions and Tenure.
2. Changes in promotion and tenure statements, which should be made only for the most compelling reasons, should first be sent to the appropriate college committee and dean. They should then

* Note, however, that the schedule does not preclude the addition by the department of new evidence (e.g., recent publications or acceptances) at any time so long as the candidate concurs.

** In colleges, schools, or divisions without departments, all of the requirements for departmental action devolve upon the college or division.

be forwarded to the University Committee on Promotions and Tenure and to the Provost, both of whom will review the proposals for compliance with general University guidelines and suggest revisions if necessary. Upon acceptance of the revised document they will sign and date it to signify its approval. Proposed changes to existing statements must be submitted to the University Committee and Provost by March 1 to become effective by September 1.

3. The specific criteria upon which recommendations are based must be clearly set forth in the formal statement of promotion policies and procedures of the department. The qualities and achievements taken into account by the department in making its decisions have to be explicitly described. The kinds of evidence by which the attainment of the stated criteria is to be judged must also be specified in the published statement, as must the specific weight given the various criteria and the kinds of evidence to be submitted in support of their having been met.
4. Departmental promotion and tenure procedures must be democratic. Although the application of this principle will obviously vary from department to department, certain ground rules have to be observed. The department's promotion and tenure committee should be constituted and operated in such a fashion that due respect is given to the opinions and advice of all faculty who are at or above the rank to which a candidate seeks promotion.* The committee should also consult with the department chairperson, who should offer his counsel but not participate in its final deliberations nor vote on its recommendation. The committee should meet formally and follow recognized procedures.
5. The department's statement of recommendations and decisions, which should indicate the numerical vote, describe the committee's composition and explain the reasons for the decision, must be transmitted in writing to the candidate and to other individuals and committees reviewing the dossier. When they arise, signed minority opinions may be forwarded as appendices to the committee's recommendations.
6. The recommendations of the department committee shall be forwarded to the department chairperson, who will review the evidence submitted by the candidate, the report of the committee, and the stated criteria, and make a recommendation supporting or failing

* Departments lacking many or any full professors should solicit participation by full professors from kindred departments whenever a person seeks promotion to that rank.

to support the candidacy. The chairperson should explain, in writing, the decision to the candidate and to the department committee.

7. If the department committee and chairperson 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 committee's and the chairperson's recommendations.

E. Promotion Procedures at the College Level

In order to assure that both candidates and the University are well served, each college or division will establish and maintain a promotion and tenure committee. These committees must be sensitive to the special needs of their colleges, but should nevertheless observe these guidelines:

1. A Promotion and Tenure Committee, elected by the faculty of the college (or its representatives), shall evaluate the merits of each candidate's dossier as well as review departmental criteria to insure reasonable uniformity.* The college committee should be broadly representative of the major fields within its purview. Not every discipline can be represented, of course, but the committee should be sufficiently large to encompass a wide range of viewpoints. Like departmental committees, it should publish and distribute its policies and practices and make every effort to see that they are applied consistently from year to year.
2. The results of the review by the college committee shall be promptly reported in writing to the candidate and department and forwarded with the dossier for review and recommendation by the Dean or Director. Fairness to the candidate and department requires that the committee explain its disagreements (if any) with recommendations made at an earlier stage.
3. Before reaching a final decision, however, the committee may--indeed is encouraged to--consult with the candidate or department regarding additional evidence that might clarify the promotion dossier. The committee should allow a reasonable amount of time for this purpose.

* In colleges, schools, or divisions lacking departments, this review will be the initial peer evaluation, and will assume the responsibilities described for departments in part D above.

4. The Dean or Director shall review the dossier and shall either endorse or recommend against the promotion in a written notification to the candidate, department committee, and college committee. The Dean or Director shall also forward the dossiers and statements of action on them to the University Committee on Promotions and Tenure and the Provost.
5. Each college committee and dean will establish and publish procedures and schedules (consistent with Part H) for hearing appeals to their decisions.

F. The University Committee on Promotions and Tenure

This Committee serves two major functions: first, it, together with the Provost, assists departments (or colleges or divisions) in developing or revising their criteria for promotion and tenure; and, second, it makes recommendations to and consults with the Provost concerning every candidacy for promotion and tenure.

1. The Committee shall receive, consider, and confer with the Provost and with the initiating unit on any proposed new statement or criteria for promotion, or on any proposed changes in existing statements. No statement or revision shall become effective until approved by the Committee and the Provost. (See also K-B and K-D-2, above.)
2. In addition, the Committee receives from the Deans and Directors all promotion dossiers and makes a recommendation about each. In reviewing applications for promotion, the Committee judges the relevance and appropriateness of the credentials offered to support the request for promotion. In doing so, the Committee exercises its best judgment as to the adequacy of the evidence in meeting the unit's published criteria.

Following its review, the Committee will forward the dossier, together with its recommendations to the Provost and will notify the candidate, the department committee, the department chairperson, and the Dean or Director of its recommendation and the reasons for it.

3. The Committee, in the course of its reviews of applications and the criteria statements applicable to them, may discover deficiencies in the statements. It shall communicate such inadequacies to the Provost and to the unit, and shall assist in the satisfactory amendment of the statement.

G. The Provost

The final review of applications for promotion is made by the Provost of the University. Before the Provost rejects recommendations made by the Committee, s/he must report to it the reasons for the rejection, and will meet with the Committee to try to resolve the disagreement.

Following consultation with the Committee, the Provost forwards approved recommendations to the President for approval by the Board of Trustees. Should the Provost fail to support an application for promotion, the reasons for the decision will be given to the candidate, the department committee, the department chairperson, the college committee, the Dean or Director, and the University Committee on Promotions and Tenure.

H. Schedule

The time schedule for the promotion process is:

30 September	Dossiers to Department Committee and Chairperson
1 November	Department's recommendation to the College Committee and Dean
15 January	College Committee and Dean's recommendation to the University Promotions and Tenure Committee
1 March	University Promotions and Tenure Committee recommendations
10 March	Provost's recommendations

Whenever possible, these dates should be anticipated and dossiers forwarded (with recommendations) at an earlier date. (Note, however, that candidates should not be required to submit dossiers before September 1.)

As noted above, each college and dean will establish schedules for hearing appeals. The University Senate Committee on Promotions and Tenure and the Provost's Office will receive and hear appeals up to but not beyond March 30. The deadlines are established to provide candidates with an adequate period of reconsideration consistent with deliberate reviews by the appropriate persons and to prepare final recommendations to the Trustee Committee on Education and Training, which meets in early April. Any appeals not filed and heard by March 30 must be carried over to the following academic year.

I. Promotion Dossiers

It is the individual's responsibility to present the best case for promotion since s/he is most clearly involved in the outcome. It is extremely

important that the dossier be well organized and carefully prepared for redundant, superfluous or confusing information may obscure more than it clarifies one's qualifications and achievements.

All dossiers should be organized under the following headings in this order:

A. Preliminary Matter:

1. A table of contents
2. Application for promotion form
3. A copy of the Department's promotion and tenure criteria
4. A curriculum vitae
5. The Department Committee's recommendation
6. The Chairperson's recommendation
7. College Committee's recommendation (if any)
8. Dean or Director's recommendation or endorsement
9. University Committee's recommendation
10. Copies of letters of evaluation from peer reviewers together with supporting material (See below)
11. Candidate's statement (optional)

B. Evidential Materials

1. Teaching

Teaching is an extremely important factor in promotion decisions and one must incorporate into the dossier several kinds of evidence. The possibilities include:

- a) Peer evaluations that attest to the candidate's pedagogical competence, knowledge of the subject matter, organization and preparation, ability to stimulate intellectual curiosity, innovative capacity and the like.
- b) Student evaluations, properly tabulated and summarized, with means, standard deviations, and the rate of return for each question. The procedures used in administering the evaluations should also be described. Where available comparable departmental evaluations and past measures of the candidate's performance should be provided.*
- c) Verbatim copies of student comments from student evaluations.
- d) Testimonials from a random selection of former and current undergraduate and graduate students. The procedures for drawing the sample should be clearly described.

* Note: Student evaluations should only be used in conjunction with other indicators and only to measure teaching competence, not popularity. Also the type and size of courses should be taken into account.

- e) Criterion-referenced measurement
- f) Course portfolio evaluation
- g) Student performance in later sequential courses
- h) Standardized test scores
- i) Self-evaluation
- j) Long-term follow-up of students

2. Scholarship

As in the case of teaching, the evaluation of scholarship requires much thought and care. Some professional activities count more than others, and units should indicate their weighting of these activities.

The main types of evidence of scholarly attainment include:

a) Solicited Peer Evaluations

Solicited peer evaluations are always required for promotion. Although the number will vary by rank and department or division, every dossier should include outside peer reviews, written by individuals with established reputations in the candidate's field. These statements should analyze and evaluate critically the candidate's work and accomplishments and compare them to others in the field who are at a comparable level. They should also comment on the candidate's potential for future development.

Since peer evaluations are such an important indicator of a person's achievements, they should be included in the preliminary matter of the dossier where they are easily accessible. Furthermore, the solicitation of these evaluations must follow certain guidelines.

1. A candidate may submit a list of potential reviewers but the department committee should suggest additional names. Although the candidate must be informed of all potential reviewers and have an opportunity to comment on them, s/he does not make the selection, the department does.
2. Letters of evaluation should be confidential.
3. Each peer review should be accompanied by the letter requesting the evaluation and a curriculum vitae or biographical statement describing the reviewer's credentials and relationship to the candidate. Insofar as reasonable and possible, only reviewers without personal ties to the candidate should be selected.
4. If a person jointly authors an article, it must be known what the individual contributions of each contributor are to the finished work. Where authors are listed alphabetically or an individual is the junior author on a number of joint publications, it is important that

the individual's contributions to each scholarly publication be assessed. Reviewers must be able to determine whether an individual can execute research in his or her own right.

b) Unsolicited Peer Evaluations

There are other kinds of information that can be interpreted as peer evaluations, although not of the same kind as derived through solicitation. This material, which should also be included in the dossier since it too describes the candidate's accomplishments, includes among others: a) articles citing the individual's work and the reasons for its importance; b) reviews of books, particularly when the reviews are in depth; c) reprinting of articles or parts of books in collections of distinguished contributions to a subject, and so forth.

c) Professional Activity Prior to University Employment

Scholarly productivity for promotion to the rank of associate professor generally cannot be based on work completed in earning the doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree prior to arrival at the University of Delaware. The research involved for that degree was one of the reasons for initial employment; promotion, on the other hand, must consider evidence of scholarship accomplished subsequent to that performed for the degree.

This requirement does not mean that publications based on the dissertation should be totally ignored. Rather, the candidate must offer clear evidence of substantial scholarly achievement made after the awarding of the doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree.

Like research, any prior teaching or service plays its role in the hiring contract, the level of monies involved, and the responsibilities attached to it. Prior activity plays little or no role in the promotion except to form a meaningful context against which later development and accomplishments can be judged. The point is simply that there must be evidence of continuing productivity.

d) Prestigious Grants

The acquisition of research or other grants, such as Guggenheim or NSF awards, is obviously a testimony to a person's competence and reputation and should be described in the dossiers.

e) Unpublished Material

Unpublished material may in some circumstances be an important indicator of a candidate's competence and

achievements. Its evaluation, however, must be especially thoughtful. In particular, if it's to be a formal part of the dossier, it should be sent to outside reviewers for a critical assessment of its merits. The comments are meant to apply to unpublished manuscripts as well as so-called "in house" publications such as research reports that are not subject to an external review process.

3. Service

Service includes innumerable types of activities rendered for the benefit of the department, college, university, community, profession or nation. Willingness to undertake such work and competence in performing it are taken into account in the promotion process.

Evaluating service, however, is difficult. Promotion and tenure committees need to know when there has been an outstanding level of service that has taken appreciable effort, service that has been done in some way that can be noted as excellent. Other than that, the main concern is that a person has fulfilled his or her service commitment under the criteria of the academic unit concerned and that the unit is satisfied. Administrative responsibilities can be considered as part of the service component, but they may not be used as a substitute for accomplishment in a scholarly discipline.

J. Career Development of Assistant Professors

There should be a major plan worked out with every new arrival to a unit so that there is an orderly progression to a stated goal, in this case promotion within a reasonable time. Participation should be offered in a number of activities, and help and assistance given as needed. A coordinated plan of development suited to the academic unit and the candidate concerned should be devised and updated annually.

In units that have a considered plan for their members, this progression is worked out in great detail with allowance for an orderly development in all of the three categories that are concerned in promotion. Teaching functions and the setting up of courses should take priority. Then, in those units where scholarly output is heavily weighted, a research program should be mounted and, finally, some shouldering of service responsibilities should be undertaken. A new assistant professor should not be heavily laden with service commitments in the first year. The entire commitment should be under the guidance of senior people who should take an active role in career development.

K. Changes in Departmental Priorities

When departments and colleges change priorities (e.g., development of a graduate program, reorientation of the direction of departmental teaching at all levels), there are faculty members, hired when their departments had one set of priorities, that are now at some disadvantage because of the change. Departments have clear obligations to recognize such situations and to provide such faculty members with both the time and the resources to accommodate themselves to the new priorities.