

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE
NEWARK, DELAWARE
19711

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
303 HULLIHEN HALL
PHONE: 302-738-2829

March 31, 1980

MEMORANDUM

TO: All Faculty Members

FROM: Arthur E. Hoerl, Vice President
University Faculty Senate *Arthur E. Hoerl*

SUBJECT: Regular Faculty Meeting, April 7, 1980

In accordance with Section IV, paragraph 6 of the Constitution, the regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Monday, April 7, 1980 at 4:00 p.m. in room 110 Memorial Hall.

AGENDA

- I. Adoption of the Agenda.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of the regular and continued Senate meetings of December 3, 10 and 17, 1979; the regular meeting of January 7, 1980; and the regular meeting of March 3, 1980.
- III. Remarks by President Trabant and/or Provost Campbell.
- IV. Announcements - Senate President Smith.
- V. Old Business
 - A. Resolution from the Committee on Budget Review (H. Hutchinson, chair) regarding University allocation of the State Funds budget. (Note: this item was returned to committee by the Senate on 10/1/79.)

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

- A. Resolution from the Committee on Rules (U. Toensmeyer, chair) regarding the slate of nominees for Senate elections.

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.*

(Note: with the sentence to be deleted in italics, Section K presently reads as follows:

In accord with Section IV, Article 7, of the Constitution, a Nominating Committee whose composition and charge are prescribed under the Standing Committee document shall provide for the Senate a slate of nominees at the May meeting. *The slate shall have at least two eligible candidates for each office or position.* Nominations to the slate from the floor are permitted. In the event that there are three or more nominees to an office, and if in the balloting no individual receives a majority, the subsequent ballot will be between the two nominees receiving the highest plurality.)

- B. Resolution from the Coordinating Committee on Education (J. O'Neill, chair) regarding course credits.

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

- C. Resolution from the Committee on Academic Freedom (M. Haskell, chair) for an addition to the Faculty Handbook.

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.

- D. Resolution from the Committee on Academic Freedom (M. Haskell, chair) for an addition to the Faculty Handbook.

RESOLVED, that the following paragraph be added to the existing section on Academic Freedom on p. III-B-1 of the Faculty Handbook:

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.

- E. Resolution from the Committee on Promotions and Tenure (H. Reynolds, chair) for adoption of a revised statement on Promotion Policies (Attachment 1).

RESOLVED, that the University Faculty Senate adopts the revised statement 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.

- G. Such items as may come before the Senate. (No motion introduced at this time may be acted upon until the next meeting of the Senate.)

AEH/b

Attachment: 1. Revised Statement on Promotion Policies

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

Academic Freedom

Case of alleged censorship of faculty correspondence

Committee on Committees

Selection of nominees for committee membership 1980/1981
Committee membership for Director of University Honors Program
Council on Teacher Education

Educational Innovation and Planning

Survey to access Winter Session

Library

Faculty fines for books not returned after the end of the loan period

Student and Faculty Honors

Processing of: Excellence in Teaching Nominations
 : Francis Alison Award Nominations
Review of Degree with Distinction requirements and procedures
Assignment of Committee members to attend Degree with Distinction examinations
Coordination of Honors Day activities

Undergraduate Studies

Minor in Geology
Minor in Italian
Minor in Art
Survey of faculty regarding undergraduate grading procedures

1 K: PROMOTION POLICIES

2 A. Introduction

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

11
12 The process rests firmly on peer evaluations, for the faculty itself
13 is best able to establish and apply promotion criteria. Furthermore, the
14 promotion system recognizes the uniqueness of the disciplines that comprise
15 the University community. Indeed, departments have the major responsibility
16 of establishing and administering guidelines (subject to wider approval)
17 and making initial promotion and tenure recommendations.

18
19 One should recognize, however, that such decisions affect the University
20 as a whole, and consequently, college and University committees together
21 with appropriate administrators also play an important role. They ensure
22 that policies and decisions serve the interests of the University and are
23 roughly comparable across its many divisions.

24

25 B. Minimum Standards for Promotion

26 Since the mission of the University encompasses teaching, scholarship,
27 and service, faculty members must strive for excellence in all three areas.

28

1 Scholarship, whether in the form of research, publication, professional
2 development, or artistic creativity, is a significant part of each person's
3 contribution to the academic community. Everyone must pursue some form of
4 scholarly activity. How this work is made available to other scholars
5 obviously depends upon the particular discipline, but promotion requires
6 evidence that significant achievements have been and will continue to be made.
7

8 The University's obligation to scholarship notwithstanding, a major
9 goal of any educational institution is to encourage and demonstrate excellence
10 in teaching. Hence, faculty members with teaching responsibilities must
11 demonstrate high-quality teaching performance.
12

13 Service at all levels--department, college, University, community,
14 profession, or nation--is also an integral part of the University's mission
15 and must not be neglected on the grounds that scholarship and teaching have
16 higher priority.
17

18 These considerations suggest University expectations for promotion to
19 various academic ranks. Although departments write specific criteria to
20 fit their particular circumstances and needs, they must conform to the
21 spirit of these standards. Unsatisfactory performance in any of the three
22 areas, for example, precludes promotion. To provide comparability across
23 the University, then, the following minimum achievements should be met:

24 Assistant Professor: Apart from earning the Ph.D. or equivalent
25 degree, the primary requirement is the demonstrated ability and
26 desire to achieve excellence in scholarship or teaching and to make
27 positive contributions in all three areas. At this rank past
28 achievements are not so important as evidence of future growth and

1 accomplishment.

2 Associate Professor: Inasmuch as promotion within the University
3 to this rank carries tenure--a binding commitment on the part of the
4 University--the qualifications must be especially rigorous. At a
5 minimum, the individual should show excellent achievement in scholar-
6 ship or teaching and high quality performance in all areas. Furthermore,
7 there should be unmistakable evidence that the individual has progressed
8 and will continue to do so. A merely satisfactory or adequate record
9 as an assistant professor is not sufficient: there must be very clear
10 indications, based on hard evidence and outside peer evaluations, that
11 the candidate has in fact attained high levels of accomplishment.

12 Professor: This rank is reserved for individuals who have established
13 reputations in their disciplines and whose contributions to the
14 University's mission are unquestioned. There should be unmistakable
15 evidence of significant development and achievement since the last
16 promotion. Once again, the candidate's claim to have met these require-
17 ments must be thoroughly and completely documented by outside peer
18 evaluations and other material.

19 20 C. Candidate's Responsibilities

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

25
26 *The evaluation procedures described in Section III-1 of the Faculty Handbook
27 provide an excellent opportunity for making such plans on a regular basis.
28 Also see Parts J and K of this section.

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

5
 6 A candidate for promotion also has the right to be informed in writing
 7 by each reviewing body--department committee, chairperson, college committee,
 8 dean, University Promotions and Tenure Committee, and Provost--of its
 9 decision. The reasons for adverse recommendations must be explained to
 10 the candidate as specifically and completely as possible and reasonable.

11
 12 Keeping in mind the schedule given in Part H which requires that
 13 dossiers be submitted for departmental review no later than September 30,
 14 a candidate has the responsibility to consult with the department chair-
 15 person, promotion committees or any other appropriate person regarding
 16 the content and preparation of the dossier.**

17
 18 D. Departmental Responsibilities*

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

23
 24 **Note, however, that the schedule does not preclude the addition by the
 25 department of new evidence (e.g., recent publications or acceptances)
 at any time so long as the candidate concurs

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

1 departmental responsibilities include:

2 1. After approval by the appropriate college committee, dean, the
 3 University Committee on Promotions and Tenure, and the Provost
 4 [see below], promotion criteria, policies, and practices must be
 5 published and distributed to all members of the department, to
 6 the appropriate committees and University officials, and to the
 7 University Faculty Senate through its Committee on Promotions
 8 and Tenure

9 2. Changes in promotion and tenure statements, which should be made
 10 only for the most compelling reasons, should first be sent to
 11 the appropriate college committee and dean. They should then
 12 be forwarded to the University Committee on Promotions and Tenure
 13 and to the Provost, both of whom will review the proposals for
 14 compliance with general University guidelines and suggest revisions
 15 if necessary. Upon acceptance of the revised document they will
 16 sign and date it to signify its approval. Proposed changes to
 17 existing statements must be submitted to the University Committee
 18 and Provost by March 1 to become effective by September 1.

19 3. The specific criteria upon which recommendations are based must be
 20 clearly set forth in the formal statement of promotion policies
 21 and procedures of the department. The qualities and achievements
 22 taken into account by the department in making its decisions have
 23 to be explicitly described. The kinds of evidence by which the
 24 attainment of the stated criteria is to be judged must also be
 25 specified in the published statement, as must the specific weight
 26 given the various criteria and the kinds of evidence to be submitted
 27 in support of their having been met.

1 4. Departmental promotion and tenure procedures must be democratic.
2 Although the application of this principle will obviously vary
3 from department to department, certain ground rules have to be
4 observed. The department's promotion and tenure committee should
5 be constituted and operated in such a fashion that due respect
6 is given to the opinions and advice of all faculty who are at
7 or above the rank to which a candidate seeks promotion*. The
8 committee should also consult with the department chairperson,
9 who should offer his counsel but not participate in its final
10 deliberations nor vote on its recommendation. The committee should
11 meet formally and follow recognized procedures.

12
13 5. The department's statement of recommendations and decisions, which
14 should indicate the numerical vote, describe the committee's
15 composition and explain the reasons for the decision, must be
16 transmitted in writing to the candidate and to other individuals
17 and committees reviewing the dossier. When they arise, signed
18 minority opinions may be forwarded as appendices to the committee's
19 recommendations.

20
21 6. The recommendations of the department committee shall be forwarded
22 to the department chairperson, who will review the evidence sub-
23 mitted by the candidate, the report of the committee, and the
24 stated criteria, and make a recommendation supporting or failing

25
26 *Departments lacking many or any full professors should solicit participation
27 by full professors from kindred departments whenever a person seeks promotion
28 to that rank.

1 to support the candidacy. The chairperson should provide a
2 full and specific explanation, in writing, of the decision to
3 the candidate and to the department committee.
4

5 7. If the department committee and chairperson agree in recommending
6 promotion, or if either or both recommend against promotion but
7 the candidate chooses not to withdraw it, the application goes
8 forward to the college committee and the dean, together with the
9 committee's and the chairperson's recommendations.
10

11 E. Promotion Procedures at the College Level

12 In order to assure that both candidates and the University are well
13 served, each college or division will establish and maintain a promotion
14 and tenure committee. These committees must be sensitive to the special
15 needs of their colleges, but should nevertheless observe these guidelines:
16

17 1. A Promotion and Tenure Committee, elected by the faculty of the
18 college (or its representatives), shall evaluate the merits of
19 each candidate's dossier as well as review departmental criteria
20 to insure reasonable uniformity.* The college committee should
21 be broadly representative of the major fields within its purview.
22 Not every discipline can be represented, of course, but the
23 committee should be sufficiently large to encompass a wide range
24 of viewpoints. Like departmental committees, it should publish
25 and distribute its policies and practices and make every effort to
26 see that they are applied consistently from year to year.

27
28 *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.

1 2. The results of the review by the college committee shall be
 2 promptly reported in writing to the candidate and department and
 3 forwarded with the dossier for review and recommendation by the
 4 Dean or Director. Fairness to the candidate and department
 5 requires that the committee explain its disagreements (if any)
 6 with recommendations made at an earlier stage.

7
 8 3. Before reaching a final decision, however, the committee
 9 may--indeed is encouraged to--consult with the candidate or
 10 department regarding additional evidence that might clarify the
 11 promotion dossier. The committee should allow a reasonable
 12 amount of time for this purpose

13
 14 4. The Dean or Director shall review the dossier and shall either
 15 endorse or recommend against the promotion in a written notification
 16 to the candidate, department and college committee. The Dean or
 17 Director shall also forward the dossiers and statements of action
 18 on them to the University Committee on Promotions and Tenure and
 19 the Provost.

20
 21 5. Each college committee and dean will establish and publish
 22 procedures and schedules (consistent with Part H) for hearing
 23 appeals to their decisions.

24
 25 F. The University Committee on Promotions and Tenure

26 This Committee serves two major functions: first, it, together with the
 27 Provost, assists departments (or colleges or divisions) in developing or
 28 revising their criteria for promotion and tenure; and, second, it makes

1 recommendations to and consults with the Provost concerning every candidacy
2 for promotion and tenure.
3

4 1. The Committee shall receive, consider, and confer with the Provost
5 and with the initiating unit on any proposed new statement or
6 criteria for promotion, or on any proposed changes in existing
7 statements. No statement or revision shall become effective
8 until approved by the Committee and the Provost. (See also K-B
9 and K-D-2, above.)
10

11 2. In addition, the Committee receives from the Deans and Directors
12 all promotion dossiers and makes a recommendation about each. In
13 reviewing applications for promotion, the Committee judges the
14 relevance and appropriateness of the credentials offered to
15 support the request for promotion. In doing so, the Committee
16 exercises its best judgment as to the adequacy of the evidence
17 in meeting the unit's published criteria.
18

19 Following its review, the Committee will forward the dossier,
20 together with its recommendations to the Provost and will notify
21 the candidate, the department chairperson, and the Dean or
22 Director of its recommendation and the reasons for it.
23

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

1 G. The Provost

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

6
7 Following consultation with the Committee, the Provost forwards approved
8 recommendations to the President for approval by the Board of Trustees. Should
9 the Provost fail to support an application for promotion, the reasons for the
10 decision will be given to the candidate, the department chairperson, the
11 college committee, the Dean or Director, and the University Committee on
12 Promotions and Tenure.

13

14 H. Schedule

15 The time schedule for the promotion process is:

16	30 September	Dossiers to Department Committee and Chairpersons
17	1 November	Department's recommendation to the College Committee
18		and Dean
19	15 January	College Committee and Dean's recommendation to
20		the University Promotions and Tenure Committee
21	1 March	University Promotions and Tenure Committee recommendations
22	10 March	Provost's recommendations

23

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

27

28

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

10
11 I. Promotion Dossiers

12 It is the individual's responsibility to present the best case for
13 promotion since s/he is most clearly involved in the outcome. It is extremely
14 important that the dossier be well organized and carefully prepared for
15 redundant, superfluous or confusing information may obscure more than it
16 clarifies one's qualifications and achievements.

17
18 All dossiers should be organized under the following headings in this
19 Order:

20 A. Preliminary Matter:

- 21 1. A table of contents
- 22 2. Application for promotion form
- 23 3. A copy of the Department's promotion and tenure criteria
- 24 4. A curriculum vita
- 25 5. The Department Committee's recommendation
- 26 6. The Chairperson's recommendation
- 27 7. College Committee's recommendation (if any)
- 28 8. Dean or Director's recommendation or endorsement

- 1 9. University Committee's recommendation
- 2 10. Copies of letters of evaluation from peer reviewers together
- 3 with supporting material. (See below)
- 4 11. Candidate's statement (optional)

5

6 B. Evidential Materials

7 1. Teaching

8 Teaching is an extremely important factor in promotion decisions

9 and one must incorporate into the dossier several kinds of

10 evidence. The possibilities include:

- 11
- 12 a) Peer evaluations that attest to the candidate's
- 13 pedagogical competence, knowledge of the subject
- 14 matter, organization and preparation, ability to
- 15 stimulate intellectual curiosity, innovative capacity
- 16 and the like.
- 17
- 18 b) Student evaluations, properly tabulated and summarized,
- 19 with means, standard deviations, and the rate of return
- 20 for each question. The procedures used in administering
- 21 the evaluations should also be described. Where available
- 22 comparable departmental evaluations and past measures of
- 23 the candidate's performance should be provided.*
- 24
- 25 c) Verbatim copies of student comments from student evaluations.
- 26

27 *Note: Student evaluations should only be used in conjunction with other

28 indicators and only to measure teaching competence, not popularity.

 Also the type and size of courses should be taken into account.

1 d) Testimonials from a random selection of former and current
2 undergraduate and graduate students. The procedures for
drawing the sample should be clearly described

4
5 e) Criterion-referenced measurement

6 f) Course portfolio evaluation

7 g) Student performance in later sequential courses

8 h) Standardized test scores

9 i) Self-evaluation

10 j) Long-term follow-up of students

11
12 2. Scholarship

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

17
18 The main types of evidence of scholarly attainment include:

19 a. Solicited Peer Evaluations

20 Solicited peer evaluations are always required for
21 promotion. Although the number will vary by rank and
22 department or division, every dossier should include
23 outside peer reviews, written by individuals with
24 established reputations in the candidate's field. These
25 statements should analyze and evaluate critically the
26 candidate's work and accomplishments and compare them

1 to others in the field who are at a comparable level.
2 They should also comment on the candidate's potential
3 for future development.
4

5 Since peer evaluations are such an important indicator of
6 a person's achievements, they should be included in the
7 preliminary matter of the dossier where they are easily
8 accessible. Furthermore, the solicitation of these evaluations
9 must follow certain guidelines.
10

- 11 1. A candidate may submit a list of potential reviewers but
12 the department committee should suggest additional names.
13 Although the candidate must be informed of all potential
14 reviewers and have an opportunity to comment on them,
15 s/he does not make the selection, the department does.
- 16 2. Letters of evaluation should be confidential.
- 17 3. Each peer review should be accompanied by the letter
18 requesting the evaluation and a curriculum vita or
19 biographical statement describing the reviewer's
20 credentials and relationship to the candidate. Insofar
21 as reasonable and possible, only reviewers without
22 personal ties to the candidate should be selected.
- 23 4. If a person jointly authors an article, it must be known
24 what the individual contributions of each contributor
25 are to the finished work. Where authors are listed
26 alphabetically or an individual is the junior author
27 on a number of joint publications, it is important that
28 the individual's contributions to each scholarly publi-
cation be assessed. Reviewers must be able to determine
whether an individual can execute research in his or her own right.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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 or 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 pursued in earning the Ph.D. 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

1 on the dissertation should be totally ignored. Rather,
2 the candidate must offer clear evidence of substantial
3 scholarly achievement made after the awarding of the
4 Ph.D.

5
6 Like research, any prior teaching or service plays its
7 role in the hiring contract, the level of monies involved,
8 and the responsibilities attached to it. Prior activity
9 plays little or no role in the promotion except to form
10 a meaningful context against which later development
11 and accomplishments can be judged. The point is simply
12 that there must be evidence of continuing productivity.

13
14 d. Prestigious Grants

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

19
20 e. Unpublished Material

21 Unpublished material may in some circumstances be an
22 important indicator of a candidate's competence and
23 achievements. Its evaluation, however, must be especially
24 thoughtful. In particular, if it's to be a formal part
25 of the dossier, it should be sent to outside reviewers
26 for a critical assessment of its merits. The comments
27 are meant to apply to unpublished manuscripts as well
28 as so-called "in house" publications such as research
29 reports that are not subject to an external review process.

1 3. Service

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

7
8 Evaluating service, however, is difficult. Promotion and
9 tenure committees need to know when there has been an out-
10 standing level of service that has taken appreciable effort,
11 service that has been done in some way that can be noted as
12 excellent. Other than that, the main concern is that a person
13 has fulfilled his or her service commitment under the criteria
14 of the academic unit concerned and that the unit is satisfied.
15 Administrative responsibilities can be considered as part of
16 the service component, but they may not be used as a substitute
17 for accomplishment in a scholarly discipline.

18
19 J. Career Development of Assistant Professors

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

26
27 In units that have a considered plan for their members, this progression
28 is worked out in great detail with allowance for an orderly development in

1 all of the three categories that are concerned in promotion. Teaching
2 functions and the setting up of courses should take priority. Then, in
3 those units where scholarly output is heavily weighted, a research program
4 should be mounted and, finally, some shouldering of service responsibilities
5 should be undertaken. A new assistant professor should not be heavily laden
6 with service commitments in the first year. The entire commitment should
7 be under the guidance of senior people who should take an active role in
8 career development.

9 10 K. Changes in Departmental Priorities

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

18 19 L. Faculty Ratio

20 It is University policy to keep an overall balance between the number
21 of faculty in the upper two ranks and the number in the lower ranks. This
22 ratio holds for the University as a whole but may vary widely from department
23 to department.

24

25

26

27

28