

The background features a large, light blue watermark of the University of Delaware seal. The seal is circular and contains the text 'UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE' around the top edge and '1743' at the bottom. In the center, there is a shield with an open book. The book's pages contain the words 'GRAMM', 'PHIOL', 'RHETOR', 'ETHICA' on the left and 'METAPH', 'LOGICA', 'MATHEM', 'PHYSICA' on the right. Below the book, the word 'SOL' is visible.

# Promotion & Tenure Review at UD

Matt Kinservik  
Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs



# Goals of this Session

- Review key elements of the P&T process for reviewers (committees and administrators).
- Discuss recent changes to the Faculty Handbook policy on P&T.
- Answer questions and consider suggestions for improvement.

# Faculty Handbook

The ultimate objectives of promotion policies at the University of Delaware are **faculty excellence** and **procedural 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.

# Hallmarks of UD's P&T Process

- Transparency
- Fairness
- Procedural Clarity

# Transparency

- Candidates see the review letters at every stage of the process.
- Review letters are signed, include vote totals, and the rationale for the decision.
- Signed minority reports are also allowed.

# Fairness

- Candidates have the right to appeal the decision at every stage of the process.
- Candidates can add evidential material at any stage of the process.
- Reviewers can solicit additional information from the candidate and previous reviewers that might clarify the dossier.

# Procedural Clarity

- Section 4.4 of the Faculty Handbook is the governing P&T policy.
- It contains an outline for the dossier and a timeline for the review process.
- College and department policies must align with the Handbook policy.
- When policy statements conflict, the Handbook policy prevails.

# Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

- Responsible for overseeing the process.
- Offers guidance to candidates and reviewers.
- Assists the Provost in the review of dossiers.

# Candidate's Responsibilities

- To “apply for promotion in any academic year.”
- To prepare an “organized and cogent dossier, representing the case for promotion as well as possible.”
- To withdraw from the process at any time.

# Reviewers' Responsibilities

- Faithfully review the evidence in the dossier.
- Judge the case on the evidence provided in the dossier.
- Judge the case by the criteria in the approved departmental P&T document.
- Discuss the case only with appropriate parties to the process.
- Maintain the confidentiality of external letters and of committee deliberations.

# Recent Changes to the University P&T Policy

- Appeals (4.4.4)
- Statement on Workload (4.4.5)
- Statement on Analytics (4.4.16)
- Revised Guidance on Evidence (4.4.11)
- Expedited Tenure Review (4.4.17)

## Appeals (4.4.4)

Appeals are possible at every level, but must be made to the committee or administrator whose decision is being appealed. **Appeals are typically made on the grounds of procedural irregularities, the interpretation of evidence in the dossier, or the introduction of new evidence.** An intention to appeal must be given to the appropriate body within five working days of notification of the decision. An appeal includes: (1) a letter documenting the basis of the appeal, usually written by the candidate; and (2) a scheduled meeting with the appropriate person or committee. It is strongly recommended that the candidate attend the appeal meeting.

Representatives of the candidate 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.

# Statement on Workload (4.4.5)

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

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

## Statement on Analytics (4.4.16)

The use of analytics for evaluating faculty must be done judiciously and within the context of the individual's work and field, and must be subordinate to long-accepted standards of peer review. Reviewers shall avoid over-reliance on third-party analytical data in making tenure and promotion decisions. The department/unit must clearly stipulate if, how, or whether analytics are to be used in the promotion process. Furthermore, any data and analytics to which candidates do not have access over the course of the review period cannot be used for evaluating faculty or included in reviews of the dossier.

# Student Course Feedback (4.4.11)

Quantitative student course feedback (collected using institutional measures) properly tabulated and summarized. The procedures used in administering the feedback should also be described in context. Where available, comparable departmental measures should be provided. **Student course feedback can reflect unconscious bias and may not reflect student learning. Such measures should only be considered in conjunction with other indicators of teaching quality.**

# Work Done Prior to UD (4.4.11)

It is expected that for promotion, the candidate must offer clear evidence of substantial scholarly achievement made after the awarding of the doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree or postdoctoral work. The research involved for that degree or postdoctoral work 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 or postdoctoral work. **However, this requirement does not mean that publications based on the dissertation or postdoctoral work should be totally ignored. Additionally, new publications based on previously collected large datasets may have merit in certain disciplines. Through mentoring, departmental P&T guidelines, letter of appointment, and the peer review process, each department is responsible for making clear to new faculty members what work will (and will not) count toward the promotion and tenure decision.**

# Expedited Tenure Review (4.4.17)

When a faculty hiring action includes the award of tenure, an expedited tenure review process is required. This expedited review process involves a minimum of three external review letters from distinguished scholars, selected by the departmental P&T Committee, in consultation with the department chair. The letters may include evaluation letters submitted as part of the application. The candidate must provide a dossier of work for review by the department and the external reviewers. This can be an abbreviated dossier, but it must include evidence of the quality of the candidate's teaching, research/creative activities, and service. After review and recommendation by the department P&T committee, the dossier—including the external review letters— will be sent for review to the department chair, the dean, and the provost. All expedited reviews must be completed prior to the effective hire date. In the event of an unfavorable decision by the Provost, candidates will be required to apply for the award of tenure no later than their third year.

# Reminders/Clarifications

- Changes in unit priorities (4.4.13)
- No double reviewing (4.4.7)
- Chair's role (4.4.6)

# Changes in Unit Priorities (4.4.13)

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. **Those faculty who are candidates for promotion and/or tenure during the probationary period prior to the granting of tenure have the right to be reviewed under the policy and procedure in force at the time of hiring, rather than under any revised policy or procedure subsequently adopted.** Any candidate for tenure who wishes to be considered under the policy and procedure in force at the time of hiring must do so by informing the Department Chair of his or her desire at the time of the initial written application for promotion. Faculty who are candidates for a promotion subsequent to the granting of tenure and/or promotion during the probationary period shall be reviewed under the policy and procedure in force at the time they declare such candidacy for promotion.

## No double reviewing (4.4.7)

Faculty members may participate and vote on either the department or the college level, but not on both.

## Department Chair's Role (4.4.6)

“The committee should also consult with the department chairperson, who should offer counsel but neither participate in its final deliberations nor vote on its recommendation.”