

PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA  
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY AND BIOCHEMISTRY

I. GENERAL POLICY STATEMENT

In the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, it is not sufficient to guarantee a recommendation for promotion for the candidate to meet the minimally acceptable performance standards in the three areas of research, teaching, and service. Such a recommendation requires that the candidate demonstrate excellence in scholarly activities and high quality performance in the other areas. The following represents an elaboration upon the University's Personnel Policies for Faculty regarding Promotion & Tenure (candidates should consult the Faculty Handbook, at <http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-1-facpt.html>).

II. PROCEDURES

A. Candidate's Responsibilities

1. A faculty member has the right to apply for promotion at any time (subject to the provisions pertaining to promotion and tenure described in Section 4 of the Faculty Handbook) and he/she has the exclusive right to advance or withdraw the dossier from the promotion process. However, non-tenured faculty in the terminal year of a contract may not apply for promotion to a position with tenure. Time in rank is not a criterion for promotion. Continuing non-tenure track faculty are evaluated under the criteria delineated herein, i. e. the same criteria as tenure-track/tenured faculty, ensuring alignment with assigned workloads.
2. According to University guidelines, a candidate for promotion must notify the Department Chair in writing of intent to apply for promotion by March 15 of the year before a decision at the university level would be rendered.
3. The candidate shall submit his/her dossier to the Chair no later than the following July 1. The PTC may refuse to consider promotions of candidates who do not submit a dossier in a timely manner.

The dossier is the basis for decisions on promotion and recommendations for tenure. It is the responsibility of the candidate to prepare an organized, cogent dossier, representing the case for promotion as well as possible. The candidate is encouraged to consult with the Department Chair and members of the faculty concerning the content and preparation of this dossier. At each stage of the process, the candidate

has the right to add additional information, and to clarify and/or elaborate on any issues or concerns raised during the P&T review process.

The dossier should be organized as follows:

## 1. Preliminary Material

- a. Contents and Guidelines
  - i. Recommendation for Promotion Form
  - ii. A table of contents
  - iii. A copy of the University, college, and department promotion and tenure criteria
- b. Application for Promotion
  - i. Candidate's letter requesting promotion
  - ii. A curriculum vitae
  - iii. Candidate's statement (optional)
- c. Two and Four Year Reviews for Faculty Seeking Promotion to Associate Professor
  - i. Reviews conducted by the corresponding department committee
  - ii. Reviews or evaluations conducted by the department chair
- d. Internal Recommendations
  - i. The department committee's recommendation
  - ii. The chairperson's recommendation
  - iii. College committee's recommendation (if any)
  - iv. Dean's recommendation
  - v. University committee's recommendation
  - vi. Any appeal materials (appeals and rebuttals)
- e. External Recommendations
  - i. Letters of evaluation from peer reviewers together with supporting material. These letters will be numbered sequentially for reference.

## 2. Evidentiary materials

The nature of supporting materials is largely the choice and the responsibility of the candidate. The list below is a suggested set of evidentiary material; none is specifically required, but requests may be made by the various committees or administrators for information not included, if available. Examples of useful information that could be included, at the discretion of the candidate, are (for each category of effort):

### a. Research

- 1. A copy of each publication in the relevant time period
- 2. A copy of each manuscript "in press" or "submitted" for publication during the relevant time period

3. Copies of monographs produced during the relevant time period
4. A listing of invited and contributed presentations by the candidate
5. A summary of research funding; for multi-investigator grants a clear indication of funds received by the candidate
6. Copies of any current pending research grant proposals
7. Sources citing the candidate's work that may indicate its importance
8. A list of co-workers and the current status of each
9. A list of collaborators and discussion of contributions of each to the candidate's research program
10. Any unsolicited peer evaluations obtained by the candidate
11. Reviews of papers and/or proposals demonstrating the candidate's standing in the scientific community

b. Teaching

1. Information on the initiation of courses and/or substantial revision of existing courses
2. Evidence of interaction, stimulation and motivation of students (testimonials, written comments from persons outside the department, etc.) courses
3. Sample syllabi, examinations, and assignments.
4. Instructional and curriculum improvement proposals and grants.
5. Textbooks authored
6. Student course evaluations for courses taught, properly tabulated and summarized, with a discussion of the procedures used in obtaining the evaluations
7. Summaries of verbatim comments of students submitted with teaching evaluations
8. Student test scores on standardized examinations
9. Any further information that may demonstrate the teaching effectiveness of the candidate

c. Service

1. Summary of the candidate's activities on departmental, college and university committees
2. Summary of the candidate's activities in national professional organizations
3. Information concerning the candidate's organization of symposia or meetings relating to his/her area of expertise
4. Evidence of the candidate's active participation in the community of science through peer review of books, articles, research proposals, etc. and service on review panels of government agencies and foundations

## 5. Summary of the candidate's consulting activities

### B. Department's Responsibilities

#### 1. For Promotion to Associate Professor

##### a. Constitution of the Promotion-and-Tenure Committee (PTC)

The PTC consists of all tenured associate and full professors of the department except the department Chair.

##### b. Notification

The Chair of the department shall notify the PTC of receipt of the candidate's letter of intent promptly, but no later than March 16. The Chair shall notify the PTC of receipt of the candidate's dossier no later than July 2nd. This notification shall be documented.

##### c. The First Meeting of the PTC

The dossier will be made available by the Chair for inspection by members of the PTC. After a suitable interval, the Chair will convene the PTC to discuss the candidate's performance and the case for promotion. At this meeting, the PTC shall decide by recorded vote whether to seek the advice of external evaluators, of which decision the candidate shall be informed by the Chair.

If the decision is to proceed, the PTC will elect a Chair *Pro Tem* to handle all further details of the committee's evaluation process of the candidate. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to inform the candidate of the name of the Chair *Pro Tem*.

If the decision is not to proceed, the candidate shall be promptly informed in writing of the specific reasons and the vote by the Chair.

It is the right of the candidate to proceed with the promotion process despite the negative **advice of the committee**. The candidate shall inform the Chair in writing if he/she chooses to continue within five (5) days of notification. The Chair will call a meeting of the PTC to elect a Chair *Pro Tem*, and the proceedings will continue as if the vote had been favorable to the case.

#### d. Written Comments by External Evaluators

The PTC shall seek the advice of external scientists on the evidence for promotion, particularly about (but not restricted to) the candidate's contributions to research.

The Chair *Pro Tem* shall request the candidate and the members of the PTC to submit lists of potential evaluators within some reasonably short time after the meetings discussed above. The Chair *Pro Tem* will meet with the candidate and provide the candidate with names of all potential evaluators. The candidate shall have the opportunity to comment on any and all of these potential evaluators. The candidate may, for written, cogent reasons, request the Chair *Pro Tem* to exclude certain individuals as external evaluators.

With the advice of the PTC and the Chair of the department, the Chair *Pro Tem* will choose a minimum of eight external evaluators from these lists, so that at least four (4) evaluators are selected from the list submitted by the candidate and four (4) are from the list submitted by the PTC. [If, in the course of contacting the evaluators, one or more should decline to participate, the Chair *Pro Tem* shall choose others from the lists, bearing in mind that there should be a balance between evaluators selected from the two lists.]

The Chair *Pro Tem* shall write to the list of external evaluators requesting advice in a timely manner. The letter should be accompanied by (1) a copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae, (2) a copy of the candidate's statement (if one has been submitted), (3) copies of all the candidate's publications (including those "in press" or "submitted") resulting from studies at the University of Delaware and (4) a copy of this document ["Promotion and Tenure Criteria"]. The letter should request the external evaluator to: (1) analyze and critically evaluate the candidate's body of work and accomplishments, (2) compare the candidate with others in the same general area of research at a comparable career level, (3) comment on the candidate's potential for future development, (4) describe the nature of the relationship, if any, between the evaluator and the candidate, and (5) provide a copy of the evaluator's updated CV. The Chair *Pro Tem* may elect to contact evaluators by telephone or electronic mail before sending materials, to determine the individual's willingness to participate in the evaluation. All correspondence with the external evaluators shall be documented, and a summary of those contacted and their responses shall be made a part of the dossier. This summary shall not be made available to the candidate.

The letters from evaluators are to be added to the dossier by the Chair *Pro Tem*, and are to be accompanied by a copy of the letter requesting advice and a brief biographical statement summarizing the external evaluator's credentials and his/her relationship to the candidate. All letters received within the time limit set by the Chair *Pro Tem* in the letter must be included in the dossier. All letters of evaluation are to be considered confidential and may not be released to the candidate.

Other letters of evaluation not solicited by the Chair *Pro Tem* may be included in the dossier, but they must be distinguished from those specifically requested by the Chair *Pro Tem*. It is the responsibility of the Chair *Pro Tem* to notify the members of the PTC of the arrival of letters and to make them available to the members for consideration.

e. Committee Meetings

When a minimum of six (6) letters have been received from external evaluators, but not later than September 21, the Chair *Pro Tem* will call a meeting of the PTC to discuss the case for promotion and tenure of the candidate. Additional meetings of the PTC may be scheduled by vote of the PTC. The PTC should consult with the department's Chair at the meeting(s), and the Chair should listen to the deliberations of the PTC, but there shall also be a portion of the meeting(s) in which the department's Chair is not present for final deliberations. After the final meeting, but not later than September 28, the PTC shall vote, by secret ballot, on the question of promotion and tenure. The vote shall be recorded by the Chair *Pro Tem* and one other person, and will be reported to the PTC.

f. Written Report of the Recommendation of the PTC

The Chair *Pro Tem*, with the advice of the PTC, shall prepare a written summary of the committee's deliberations, recommendations and decisions. For candidates that have funded appointments in more than one unit and with primary appointment in this Department, the PTC will solicit information from the other department(s) regarding the candidate's performance in scholarly research, teaching and service. The PTC will request and consider written statements from the candidate and Chair regarding the candidate's assigned workload during the period under review. The candidate's accomplishments will be considered in light of the workload descriptions provided. The summary statement from the PTC shall describe the PTC's composition, the results of the vote, and

the evidence from comments in the meeting for the vote. The summary statement will carry the signature of each PTC member. When they arise, signed separate opinions by members of the PTC may be forwarded as appendices to the main report of the PTC, provided they are received by the Chair *Pro Tem* in a timely manner.

This statement (and any appendices) will be transmitted in writing to the department's Chair and the candidate no later than October 1, and shall be inserted into the candidate's dossier. [To maintain confidentiality, the copy of the PTC's summary that is provided to the candidate may delete portions of the statement that may identify external evaluators, either by name or by inference.]

g. Recommendation of the Chair of the Department

The Chair of the department shall review the candidate's dossier, the report of the PTC and Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry's "Promotion and Tenure procedures and Criteria" document, and make a written recommendation either supporting or failing to support the promotion of the candidate. This recommendation is transmitted in full and in writing to the candidate and is also inserted into the candidate's dossier. This must be complete before October 7.

h. Forwarding Procedures

If the PTC and the Chair of the department agree in recommending promotion and tenure, or if either or both recommend against promotion but the candidate chooses to continue by not explicitly withdrawing the application, then the full dossier, with the recommendations included, goes forward to the College promotion and tenure committee and to the Dean. Under current university guidelines, these documents are to be submitted by October 15.

i. Appeals Procedure

If the candidate wishes to appeal either the recommendation of the PTC or of the Chair, or to suggest amendments to the letters of recommendation, the candidate may request, in writing, reconsideration by the PTC and/or the department Chair within five (5) business days after he/she has received written notification of the PTC's and/or the department Chair's recommendation. This written request for reconsideration becomes part of the record and should be included in the dossier.

In the case of any request for reconsideration, the candidate must present in writing the arguments for reconsideration and provide at that time to the PTC and/or the Chair of the department any additional supporting material for reconsideration for inclusion in the dossier.

If the candidate requests reconsideration by the PTC, the Chair *Pro Tem* must convene a meeting of the PTC to consider the candidate's written arguments. At the conclusion of this meeting, a final vote shall be taken by secret ballot and a final recommendation will be made. Participation in a reconsideration vote is restricted to those members of the PTC who participated in the original vote. The Chair of the department shall not be present at any reconsideration meeting of the PTC, nor participate in its vote, nor participate in the writing of any amendment to its recommendation.

An appeal to the Chair in writing must be considered promptly by the Chair. Any written response from the Chair shall be included in the dossier and the members of the PTC shall be notified promptly.

A copy of any changes in the decisions and/or the letters of recommendation of the PTC and/or the Chair shall be transmitted in writing to the candidate and inserted in the dossier.

j. Schedule Summary

The time schedule for the promotion process is:

- |              |   |
|--------------|---|
| By March 15  | The candidate notifies the Chair of the department of the intention to apply for promotion.   |
| By March 16  | The Chair notifies the members of the PTC   |
| By July 1    | The candidate submits his/her dossier to the Chair of the department.   |
| By October 1 | The PTC submits a letter of recommendation, including the numerical results of the vote, to the department Chair, with a copy to the candidate. |
| By October 7 | The department Chair submits a letter of recommendation, with a copy to the candidate, and notifies the PTC of the decision.                    |

By October 15 The Chair of the department forwards the candidate's dossier, including the recommendation of the PTC and the Chair's recommendation, to the College Committee on Promotions and Tenure and to the Dean.

By January 2 The College Committee on Promotions and Tenure and the Dean forward their recommendations and the candidate's dossier to the University Committee on Promotions and Tenure.

By February 15 The University Committee on Promotions and Tenure forwards its recommendations and the candidate's dossier to the Provost.

By February 25 The Provost forwards his/her recommendation to the President, along with the candidate's dossier.

## 2. For Promotion to Professor

The Promotions Committee (PC) consists of all tenured full professors in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry except the departmental Chair. All the procedures of this committee are the same as those described in Section II.B.1 of this document, except PC should be substituted for PTC throughout.

## 3. For Recommendation for Tenure without Promotion

If a person has been hired at the rank of associate professor without tenure, then the procedures for evaluating that individual for tenure shall be identical with the procedures used when promotion with tenure is being considered to associate professor. It is expected that a person in this category would not be considered for tenure until he/she has served at least one year in rank.

# III. CRITERIA

## A. For Appointment to 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 service. At this rank, past achievements are less important than evidence for the promise of future

growth and accomplishment.

## B. For Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The Criteria are as follows:

### 1. Research

The candidate must have established a quality research program which demonstrates the ability to organize and sustain an independent, viable research program. Quality in this sense denotes original research of significance to chemistry and/or biochemistry. All scholarly work conducted at rank will be considered. The research program may be related to previous doctoral or postdoctoral research, but must show an independent approach. It must be shown that the candidate has contributed in a vital and innovative way to any collaborative research.

Publication of the results of the research is required. Review articles and monographs will be considered. The candidate's work should be presented in lectures and papers at institutions and meetings.

Both the amount and quality of research will be considered. Publication in refereed journals is an important indication of the quality of research. Quality is, in part, evidenced by the quality of the journals and also by the evaluation of published works by the external reviewers. Since research in some areas produces fewer publications for a given effort, the quantity of publication per se is less important than quality and will be considered in the light of the field, the teaching load, and the number of research coworkers (postdocs, graduate students and undergraduates). It is expected that the candidate will actively seek and obtain external funding to support his/her research program; evidence must be shown of continuing efforts to obtain funding. The extent of external funding will be considered with regard to the availability of funds in that research area and the needs requisite to sustain independent support of their research enterprise.

Other evidence of the quality of the research may include the following: invited papers and lectures, awards, reputation in his/her field among peers, and potential for national reputation in his/her research specialty.

A potential for continued growth of the research program is expected.

### 2. Teaching

High quality teaching is expected of each candidate. This includes both course content and an ability to communicate as judged by the faculty (classroom visitations, syllabus review, etc.) and by students (acceptable course and teacher evaluations) and written or oral opinions of former students. Successful mentoring of both graduate and undergraduate research students is also an important part of teaching. Anonymous comments shall not be considered by the committee until the candidate has an opportunity to review and comment on this material.

### 3. Service

The Department expects service on Department, College, or University committees, including Ph.D. research committees. University related community service will also be considered. The Department will expect involvement in administrative and/or committee duties on the part of assistant professors who should have had an opportunity to participate fully in determining and meeting the goals of the Department.

Service may be indicated by participating in the activities of national professional societies, organizing symposia or meetings, reviewing research proposals, papers, books, etc. Professional activities with high external visibility are valued.

### C. For Promotion to Professor

The Criteria are as follows:

#### 1. Research

The candidate must have established and maintained a quality research program. Quality in this sense denotes original research of significance to chemistry which has earned the candidate a national and international reputation in his/her discipline.

Publication of the results of the research is required, and it must be evident to the committee that the habit of consistent publication in leading journals has been firmly established. Review articles, and monographs will be included in the evaluation. The candidate's work should have been presented in lectures and papers at institutions and meetings.

Both the amount and quality of research will be considered. Publication in refereed journals is an important indication of the quality of research. Quality is, in part, evidenced by the quality of the journals and also by the

evaluation of published works by the external reviewers. Since research in some areas produces fewer publications for a given effort, the quantity of publications per se is less important than quality and consistency, and will be considered in light of the field, the teaching load, and the number of research coworkers (postdocs, graduate students and undergraduates) in the candidate's laboratory. It is expected that the candidate will have demonstrated the ability to obtain external funding to support his/her research program; continuous support is not a prerequisite for promotion, but evidence must be shown of continuing efforts to obtain funding. The extent of external funding will be considered with regard to the availability of funds in that research area and the needs requisite to sustain, independent support of their research enterprise.

Other evidence of the quality of the research may include the following: invited papers and lectures, awards, the achievements after graduation of students who have done their graduate work with the candidate, and the use which the candidate may have made of a sabbatical leave or leave of absence to enhance his/her research program.

A potential for continued growth of the research program is expected.

## 2. Teaching

High quality teaching is expected of each candidate. This includes both course content and an ability to communicate as judged by the faculty (classroom visitations, syllabus review, etc.) and by students (acceptable course and teacher evaluations) and written or oral opinions of former students. Successful mentoring of both graduate and undergraduate research students is also an important part of teaching. Anonymous comments shall not be considered by the committee until the candidate has an opportunity to review and comment on this material. Other evidence for the quality of teaching may include the following: the receipt of Fulbright and other teaching awards, or teaching sabbaticals; improvement of instruction grants; course initiation and major revision of existing courses; successful innovations in teaching methods; and effective counseling and advising of students.

## 3. Service

The Department expects significant high quality service on Department, College, or University committees, including Ph.D. research committees. University related community service will also be considered.

Candidates should have demonstrated leadership potential while executing their research, teaching, and service functions.

Professional development should be indicated by participating in the activities of professional societies, organizing symposia or meetings, consulting, reviewing research proposals, papers, or books, etc. Professional activities with high external visibility are valued.

#### D. Special Considerations

The preceding does not preclude the possibility that, in the future, an assistant professor or an associate professor may have duties differing substantially from the above. If such is the case, there should be a clear written understanding on the part of all parties of what is expected and what criteria will be used in evaluation for promotion or contract renewal.

Candidates appointed prior to the full adoption of the revised P&T Policy have the right to choose the version of the Policy under which they will be evaluated. The decision must be explicit in the dossier.

1/7/08