

University of Delaware
College of Health Sciences
Department of Kinesiology & Applied Physiology

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION, TENURE AND REVIEW

I. INTRODUCTION

The mission of the Department of Kinesiology and Applied Physiology encompasses scholarship, teaching, and service. Faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure must demonstrate achievements in all areas where workload has been assigned. Although all faculty are subject to the same set of criteria for promotion and tenure, demonstration of those criteria will vary depending upon individually assigned roles and workload. Since the mission of the University encompasses scholarship, teaching, and service, faculty members should strive for excellence in all three areas. For further information, faculty should consult the current University Guidelines as listed in the Faculty Handbook for guidance: <http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/>.

II. EVALUATION CATEGORIES

A. Scholarship

Scholarship includes all endeavors and activities that contribute to the generation and/or advancement of knowledge areas within the Department of Kinesiology and Applied Physiology. The ultimate goal for faculty is to have an externally funded, sustainable program of research. As scholars, faculty members must demonstrate independence and leadership in scholarly endeavors, activities and accomplishments as well as collaboration as appropriate to meet scientific goals. Findings of research endeavors are disseminated to appropriate audiences through a variety of media including peer-reviewed professional publications and scientific presentations.

Three primary indicators of scholarly performance are the publication record, external sponsorship of the candidate's research, and written comments from outside peer evaluations in the candidate's field. These three indicators are now briefly addressed.

Regarding the publication record, publication in peer-reviewed scientific and technical journals and publications of scholarly books (including textbooks) will be considered important indications of scholarly achievement, as will patents or other indications of professional inventive accomplishments. Peer-reviewed publications that are indexed are weighed more heavily than those that are not. Lesser weight shall be attached to non-peer-reviewed publications, unless the significance of such work is established through outside evaluations. The number of publications is secondary to their quality. When developing their scholarship statement, candidates are encouraged to identify a small number of key publications and to indicate the quality of the journals, and, when appropriate, the number of citations and any other evidence that will assist the university committees in evaluating the impact on the professional community. The candidate should describe his/her contributions to co-authored work.

Obtaining contracts and grants to carry out scholarly research, while largely regarded as promise for future work, also reflects upon the quality of those activities. It is expected that faculty will develop and maintain rigorous research programs; clear evidence of the sustainability of this research is expected, although specific funding levels will not be employed as a condition for promotion or the granting of tenure.

Significant weight is placed on letters from external experts. Such letters are to address the aggregate importance of the candidate's work in furthering the field and an assessment of the candidate's likely future as a contributing scholar/expert in the field. The selection of reviewers is carried out as described below in "Review Procedures".

Special Note for faculty hired at the same rank as the previous institution: Unless otherwise noted in the faculty appointment letter, all work in rank, even if conducted at other institutions of higher education, shall be considered for promotion and tenure. It shall be the faculty member's responsibility to include evidence of this work in his/her dossier and to clearly identify when and where this work was performed. 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.

B. Teaching

A major goal of the Department of Kinesiology and Applied Physiology is to encourage all faculty to strive for excellence in teaching. Hence, faculty members with teaching responsibilities must demonstrate at a minimum high quality teaching performance. Indicators of teaching performance may include student evaluations, faculty peer evaluation, course materials, learning outcome measures, teaching awards, new course development, and development of new curricula. We understand that high quality teaching includes activities both inside and outside the classroom, such as advising undergraduates and mentoring graduate students.

C. Service

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

III. STANDARDS OF PROMOTION

The Department of Kinesiology and Applied Physiology maintains an excellent reputation for providing a quality educational experience for its students. With the belief that an active research agenda can enhance quality teaching, we particularly value faculty profiles

demonstrating clear linkages among scholarship, teaching, and service activities. The standards for quality of teaching and service are the same for all faculty, whether they are tenure-track or continuing-track.

- We value excellence and high quality performance and contributions in scholarship, teaching, and service.
- We consider indexed peer-reviewed publications of greater merit than non-indexed or non-peer-reviewed publications, unless evidence such as outside peer evaluations or impact clearly establishes the significance of the latter.
- We value collaboration; however, we place greater value on those collaborative projects in which the candidate has demonstrated a significant contribution and a leadership role.
- We value evidence of a focused and sustained record of research, as illustrated by publications in quality journals and growth in levels of funding.

A. Criteria for Promotion of Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

For appointment or promotion to:

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR. The candidate must have an earned doctoral degree, and must demonstrate ability and desire to make positive contributions in all three areas of scholarship, teaching and service.

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

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR. The candidate must demonstrate excellent achievement in scholarship and high quality performance in teaching and service. There must be clear indication, based on documented evidence and outside peer evaluations, that the candidate has in fact attained appropriate levels of accomplishment for promotion to this rank. Information derived from online citation indexes (e.g., Web of Science) such as h-index and total number of citations may be used to evaluate the candidate's overall research productivity and impact to the field.

- **High quality achievement in scholarship** is demonstrated by an independent, clearly focused program of research with dissemination of research findings in indexed peer-reviewed professional journals, presentation of research at national meetings, reasonable, ongoing efforts made to obtain external funding, and favorable reviews by outside peer evaluations. For each 20% workload assigned per year to scholarship, one peer-reviewed publication that is data-based or contributes to the advancement of science is the minimum requirement for promotion with the understanding that two or more peer-reviewed publications (per 20% scholarship workload per year) would make

a stronger case for promotion. Success in acquiring internal and/or external grant support for research makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.

- **Excellent achievement in scholarship** is demonstrated by the candidate meeting all of the requirements for high quality achievement in scholarship and also 1) having been successful in obtaining internal or external funding support for research, *and* 2) having a publication record exceeding that required for high quality achievement in scholarship.
- **High quality achievement in teaching** should be documented through student and peer evaluations. The quantitative student evaluation scores will be compared to the departmental average, with the expectation that “high quality” achievement is documented with scores that fall within 1 SD of the department mean. Advisement of students and/or course/curriculum development makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.
- **Excellent achievement in teaching** should be documented by peer reviews of a candidate’s teaching that attest to the rigor, quality, depth, and applicability of course material. Student evaluations must similarly document excellence in teaching, with the expectation that “excellent” achievement is documented with quantitative student evaluation scores that are above the departmental mean. Further evidence of excellence may include publications or textbooks related to teaching, and a portfolio documenting new course development, use of teaching innovations, and/or receipt of teaching awards. In evaluating teaching, the Committee considers all pertinent evidence of a candidate’s contribution to the departments’ teaching objectives.
- **High quality service** contributions should include regular participation in appropriate professional organizations, service on school and college committees, and when possible, contributions to civic or government organizations or boards. Having served in leadership positions in service activities makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.
- **PROFESSOR.** This rank is reserved for individuals who have established professional reputations as scholars and are renowned experts (i.e., national and international) in their fields, and whose contributions to their profession and the University's mission are excellent. There should be unmistakable, clear documented evidence and outside peer evaluations of significant development and achievement (consistent with workload assigned) in teaching, scholarship, and service since the last promotion. The candidate must demonstrate leadership and excellent achievement in teaching or scholarship and high quality performance in all areas. Some examples of evidence of national or international recognition are: 1) citations of the candidate’s work in indexed, peer-reviewed professional journals (information derived from online citation indexes such as h-index and total number of citations may be used to evaluate the candidate’s overall research productivity and impact to the field, 2) awards recognizing scholarly achievement (e.g., attaining fellowship status or serving as an officer in professional societies), and 3) serving as a scholarly expert (e.g., keynote speaker, symposium panelist, grant proposal reviewer). Information derived from online citation indexes (e.g., Web of Science) such as h-index and total number of citations may be used to evaluate the candidate’s overall research productivity and impact to the field. Excellent achievement in teaching must be documented in several ways detailed below, including quantitative student evaluation scores that are consistently above the departmental mean. **High quality** achievements in scholarship must demonstrate a clearly focused

and sustained program of research. For each 20% workload assigned per year to scholarship, one refereed publication in a high-quality, top-tier journal within the candidate's area of study that is data-based and contributes to the advancement of science is the minimum requirement for promotion with the understanding that additional publications would make a stronger case for promotion. In addition, candidates are expected to prepare and deliver presentations of research findings at national and international professional meetings and have submitted external research proposals. Success in acquiring external support (e.g., grants, contracts, etc) for research makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.

- To be rated as **excellent** in scholarship, a candidate must have met all of the requirements for high quality achievement in scholarship and also 1) have been successful in obtaining external funding support for research, and 2) have a publication rate exceeding that required for high quality achievement in scholarship.
- **High quality** teaching performance should be documented through positive student and peer evaluations. The quantitative student evaluation scores will be compared to the departmental average, with the expectation that "high quality" achievement is documented with scores that fall within 1 SD of the department mean. Advisement of students and/or course/curriculum development makes a stronger case for promotion to this rank.
- **Excellent** achievement in teaching should be documented by peer reviews of a candidate's teaching that attest to the rigor, quality, depth, and applicability of course material to the level of the students. Student evaluations must similarly document excellence in teaching, with the expectation that "excellent" achievement is documented with quantitative student evaluation scores that are above the departmental mean. Further evidence of excellence may include publications or textbooks related to teaching, and a portfolio documenting new course development, use of teaching innovations, and/or receipt of teaching awards. In evaluating teaching, the Committee considers all pertinent evidence of a candidate's contribution to the departments' teaching objectives.
- **High quality** service contributions should include leadership in appropriate national or international professional organizations and on department, college, or university committees. Participation in government organizations or boards strengthens the case for promotion.

B. Criteria for Promotion of Continuing Track Faculty

Continuing track faculty are eligible for promotion in academic rank and sabbaticals utilizing similar criteria and procedures that apply to tenure-track faculty, with the caveat that workload assignment will generally be different than a tenure track faculty member.

The minimum criterion for promotion for continuing track faculty is excellence in teaching or service, depending upon the nature of the appointment and the assigned workload during the review period. All CT faculty must have some portion of their workload dedicated to service. The standards for quality of teaching and service are the same for all faculty, whether they are tenure-track or continuing-track.

When the P&T Committee undertakes evaluation of a CT promotion candidate, the committee will consult with the Department chair prior to its deliberations to insure that all parties understand the nature of each CT workload agreement. In most cases, CT faculty will be evaluated for promotion on the basis of excellence in their primary workload depending on the nature of the faculty member's appointment. In exceptional cases where departmental need results in a shift in workload, the primary category of evaluation for promotion may not be the category of predominant workload assignment. A minimum of five external review letters are required for promotion.

Additional information regarding non-tenure track faculty appointments is found in the University of Delaware Faculty Handbook (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/>).

IV. PROCEDURES

A. Review Procedures

1. Candidate submits the dossier to the Chairperson of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee (elected among members of the voting body as described below) according to the calendar established by the university; see section D below. Guidelines for organizing the dossier are clearly delineated in the University of Delaware Faculty Handbook (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/>). Tenure-track candidates to the rank of Associate Professor will be required to include the 2- and 4-year peer reviews (i.e., reviews conducted by the corresponding Department committee and reviews conducted by the Department chair). Continuing track candidates to the rank of Associate Professor will be required to include all available peer reviews. Dossiers that do not include these reviews will be considered incomplete.
2. Solicitation of outside peer evaluations follows the University guidelines. Solicited outside peer evaluations are always required for promotion. Although the number may vary by rank, every dossier must 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. They also should comment on the candidate's potential for future development.
 - a. A candidate submits a list of names and email addresses of potential outside reviewers but the Department committee will suggest additional names. Consistent with the Faculty Handbook, the candidate will have an opportunity to comment on the departmentally generated list. A minimum of five (5) outside reviews of a candidate's record should be obtained. The list of external reviewers is approved by the committee. For CT faculty, "external" can mean internal to the University of Delaware but external to the faculty member's primary academic unit.
 - b. The candidate should provide an updated curriculum vita and written statements to the chairperson of the committee. The written statements are submitted before the dossier is completed (see timeline below) and should highlight accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The chairperson of the committee will send these materials along with a copy of the department's P & T document to the external reviewers.

- c. The Chairperson of the Committee solicits letters of evaluation. Letters soliciting outside peer review of a candidate should request a current, truncated curriculum vitae (e.g., NIH biosketch) and a statement describing the reviewer's relationship to the candidate. Only outside peer reviewers *without* personal/professional conflicts of interest to the candidate should be selected. External reviewers that come from 'comparable' departments and/or institutions are generally preferred.
3. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of all tenured faculty of the Department. The composition of each voting body is described below. Each voting body must have no fewer than 3 members.
 - a. All tenured faculty in the Department are the voting body for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor.
 - b. All Associate and Full Professors in the Department are the voting body for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.
 - c. All Full Professors in the Department are the voting body for promotion to the rank of Full Professor. If this voting body is fewer than 3 full professors, then the voting body will be expanded in accordance with the faculty handbook. In consultation with the full committee, the chair of the promotion & tenure committee will select the additional committee members.
4. Department promotion and tenure procedures must be democratic. Certain rules must 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, and that all deliberations are to be strictly confidential. The voting body will meet, discuss the candidate's application for promotion and/or tenure, and members of the voting body in attendance who reviewed the dossier shall, by secret ballot, vote for promotion, against promotion, or abstain from voting. Proxy (absentee) votes will be accepted only for unusual cases, e.g., sabbaticals, determined on an individual basis by the committee. The voting body is encouraged to consult with the candidate regarding additional evidence that might clarify the dossier.
5. The Chairperson of the Committee shall draft a comprehensive written report that reflects accurately the proceedings of the committee meeting, including the numerical vote, recommendations and the reasons for the decision. The report will be made available for all committee members to read and sign.
6. The signed report will be transmitted to the Department Chair for inclusion in the candidate's dossier in accordance with the university's timeline outlined below. When they arise, signed minority opinions will be forwarded as appendices. A copy of the report and any appendices shall be given to the candidate. Upon conclusion of the committee process, the Chairperson of the Committee will forward to the Department Chair the outside faculty reviews and external student/alumni letters for inclusion in the dossier.

B. Appeals

Appeals are possible at every level, but must be made to the committee or administrator whose decision is being appealed. 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 can also 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)

C. Dossier Preparation and Presentation

1. The candidate is strongly encouraged to consult with members of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee at the time of each periodic review prior to application for promotion regarding the content and preparation of the dossier.
2. The candidate should organize the dossier according to the pattern outlined in the University of Delaware Faculty Handbook (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/>). The Application for Tenure and/or Promotion form is available from the Provost's website.
3. The candidate must include a chart documenting the percentage of workload assigned to teaching, scholarship, and service. This information must be verified by the Department Chair.

D. Timetable

Promotion Process Schedule

The time schedule for the promotion process is shown below. Whenever possible, these deadlines should be anticipated and dossiers forwarded (with recommendations) at an earlier date. Although dossiers are due to the Department Committee on September 1st, the candidate may add additional information to the dossier at any time during the dossier evaluation period.

15 March	Candidate notifies Department Chair of intention to apply for promotion in writing. Department Promotion and Tenure Committee begins the process of soliciting peer evaluations.
1 May	Candidate submits CV, selected publications, written statements highlighting accomplishments (in scholarship, teaching, and service), and a list of suggested outside peer reviewers to the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee
1 June	A cover letter, CV, selected publications, written statements, and average workload during the evaluation period are provided to outside peer reviewers
1 September	Dossier to Department Committee and Department Chair.

1 October	Department Committee's recommendation to the Department Chair.
15 October	Department Chair's recommendation to the College Committee and Dean.
1 December	College Committee's recommendation to the Dean.
2 January	Dean's recommendation to the University Promotions and Tenure Committee.
15 February	University Promotions and Tenure Committee recommendations to Provost.
15 March	Provost's recommendations.

Revised and approved by faculty vote May 1st, 2013.

Revised and approved by faculty vote November 16th, 2015.

Approved April 2017