

# **PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA**

## **Department of Economics University of Delaware**

Approved January, 2024

### **I. Promotion Procedures**

Promotion and tenure of faculty in the Department of Economics are governed by Section 4 of the Faculty Handbook. Candidates for promotion and tenure should familiarize themselves with that document. Additional guidance and requirements specific to the Department of Economics follow.

### **II. Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty**

The Department Promotion and Tenure Committees are responsible for making recommendations on 1) promotion in rank and 2) the granting of tenure. For tenure-track faculty, the Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of all tenured members of the department who are senior in rank to the candidate for promotion or tenure. If the number of faculty eligible to serve as voting members of a Promotion and Tenure Committee is fewer than four, the committee will invite appropriate faculty from related academic departments within the university to serve as temporary voting members. Faculty members holding administrative positions that have subsequent standing in the process (i.e., Department Chairperson, Dean) are not eligible for membership on the Committee. The chairperson of all Promotion and Tenure Committees must be a tenured professor, elected by the full-time faculty. The election of the chairperson shall be conducted annually by the end of the spring semester for the subsequent academic year.

### **III. Periodic Tenure-Track Faculty Evaluation Procedures**

In addition to its responsibility for making recommendations on promotion and tenure, the Department Promotion and Tenure Committees are responsible for conducting periodic evaluations of the research, teaching, and service activities of tenure-track faculty. The evaluations are based upon the criteria and evidence described in section IV below. An evaluation will lead to a written report, which is provided to the department chairperson and the faculty member. The Committees shall be as defined above for tenure-track faculty.

#### **III. A. Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty**

The performance of untenured faculty members must be evaluated at least every two years. Evaluations should be conducted for tenured associate professors at least once every five years, and for professors at least once every seven years. A faculty member may request

more frequent evaluations, but not more than once per year. A request for an evaluation must be made in writing to the chairperson of the Promotion and Tenure Committees by October 1. The Promotion and Tenure Committees determine their evaluation procedures each year and may create subcommittees of their members to perform the periodic evaluations. The purpose of these evaluations is to provide constructive and supportive feedback to faculty on how they can best support the research, teaching, and service missions of the department. For assistant and associate professors, the evaluation should focus on steps the faculty member can take to achieve promotion to the next rank. The faculty being evaluated should provide the Committee with materials demonstrating contributions to research, teaching, and service that have occurred since the last evaluation was conducted. These materials should include evidence of contributions as described in section IV below. These materials should be provided to the Committee by February 1 of the evaluation year. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committees will assign three ad hoc committees to conduct initial evaluations of candidates in the areas of research, teaching, and service.

### **III. A. 1. Research**

The research subcommittee shall be comprised of two or more faculty members with research expertise similar to the research of the faculty member under review.

### **III. A. 2. Teaching**

The teaching subcommittee shall be comprised of two or more faculty members with teaching experience similar to the teaching done by the faculty member under review.

### **III. A. 3. Service**

The service subcommittee shall be comprised of two faculty members with service experience similar to the service of the faculty member under review.

### **III. A. 4. Exceptions**

Exceptions to these guidelines may be made if the faculty members available to conduct reviews are limited. In such cases, the chair will construct subcommittees following the above guidelines as closely as possible.

## **IV. Promotion and Tenure Criteria for Tenure-Track Faculty**

The Promotion and Tenure Committees evaluate the candidate in the areas of research, teaching, and service. The evaluation of a candidate's contributions in the three areas must be made with reference to the fundamental departmental missions of adding to the body of economic knowledge and raising the level of understanding of economic issues. In general, these missions can best be accomplished through 1) research directed at important economic problems; 2) strong undergraduate and/or graduate teaching; 3) dissemination of economic knowledge to a wide audience; and 4) professional and/or public service.

The evaluation of a candidate's record will be made taking into account the candidate's assigned workload over the relevant time period. Minimum standards for promotion are given in Section 4 of the Faculty Handbook. Additional criteria used by the Department of Economics are described below.

#### **IV. A. Promotion to Associate Professor**

To be eligible for a positive departmental recommendation, a candidate for promotion to associate professor must receive a rating of "Excellent" in research and a minimum of "High Quality" ratings in all other assigned workload areas. There should be unmistakable evidence that the individual has progressed professionally and will continue to do so.

##### **IV. A. 1. Research**

To receive a rating of excellent in research, a candidate will have 1) established a successful research program; 2) received strong support from external reviewers; and 3) provided clear evidence that significant contributions to the research mission of the department will continue beyond promotion.

A successful research program will include articles published or accepted for publication in highly regarded refereed economics journals, including leading field and/or general economics journals or their equivalent. Articles currently in the review process may be considered if they have received positive referee reports and a request for resubmission from the journal editor.

Coauthorship and joint work are recognized as an important part of the research process. Work with a variety of different coauthors could be further evidence of a successful research program. Candidates whose record includes coauthored publications must document their contributions to this work. In addition, if a paper includes one or more coauthors who were on the candidate's dissertation committee or were faculty at the candidate's Ph.D. granting institution, the department chair will solicit a coauthor letter evaluating the candidate's contribution to the joint work from the most appropriate coauthor (as determined by discussion with the candidate). The same applies if the candidate has several publications with the same, senior coauthor. Coauthor letters should be sent to the department chair and will be treated as confidential information not made available to the candidate.

A successful research program may also include some items from the list below; none are necessary components of a successful research program.

- External grants;
- Scholarly books;
- Articles included in conference volumes and edited books;
- Conference presentations;
- Favorable citations in other published research and/or recorded in citation indices;

- Other evidence of professional recognition for scholarly work;
- All other items that are listed in Section 4 of the Faculty Handbook.

In evaluating the candidate's research, the promotion and tenure committee will weigh the tradeoffs among the types of evidence provided. Both the quality and quantity of the body of scholarly work and the candidate's contribution to that work will be considered, along with other indicators of the candidate's ability to successfully conduct research over an extended time period. There is no threshold number of publications necessary for promotion nor is there any number that guarantees promotion.

Publication in leading economics journals in the candidate's field of expertise and/or in general economics journals is expected for promotion.

#### **IV. A. 2. Teaching**

To receive a rating of High Quality in teaching, a candidate must make substantial contributions to the department's teaching mission and must demonstrate initiative in supporting this mission. A case for High Quality in teaching must be documented with evidence that includes peer evaluations of teaching and may include student teaching evaluations as described in the Faculty handbook as well as some of the items listed below. This documentation may include external reviews of the candidate's teaching record. Other evidence of teaching quality includes:

- Teaching awards or other external recognition;
- Contributions to the Ph.D. program, such as the direction of dissertation research and membership on dissertation committees;
- Direction of Masters and undergraduate honors theses and research papers;
- Grants providing financial support for graduate students;
- New course development;
- Publication of textbooks, supplementary readings, and other teaching aides;
- Publication of pedagogical articles in refereed journals;
- All other items that are listed in Section 4 of the Faculty Handbook.

In evaluating teaching evidence, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will consider all aspects of the candidate's contribution to the department's teaching mission. No one piece of evidence will be considered either necessary or sufficient for a rating of High Quality.

#### **IV. A. 3. Service**

To meet the minimum standard for high-quality service, the candidate must have constructively participated in the service responsibilities assigned by the department chair and in other appropriate professional activities. A case for High Quality in service may include some of the items listed below:

- Recognized leadership in professional organizations;

- Administrative responsibility in the person's service capacity;
- Participation in and/or organization of national and international conferences;
- Building partnerships with organizations at the local, state, and national level;
- Professional activities including journal and grant refereeing;
- Strongly favorable reviews;
- All other items that are listed in Section 4 of the Faculty Handbook.

In evaluating service evidence, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will consider all aspects of the candidate's contribution to the department's service mission. No one piece of evidence will be considered either necessary or sufficient for a rating of High Quality.

#### **IV. B. Promotion to Full Professor**

To be eligible for a positive departmental recommendation, a candidate for promotion to full professor must receive a rating of "Excellent" in research and a minimum of "High Quality" ratings in all other assigned workload areas. In evaluating a candidate for this rank, the committee applies demanding standards that require continued achievement and sustained performance in rank beyond that necessary for promotion to associate professor.

##### **IV. B. 1. Research**

To be rated as excellent in research a candidate typically will have 1) established a successful research program, evidenced by a substantial body of work accepted for publication in highly regarded, refereed journals (or their equivalent); 2) received strong support from external reviewers; and 3) provided evidence that significant contributions to the research mission of the department will continue beyond promotion.

A case for an Excellent rating in research must be documented with substantial evidence from the items listed in Section IV.A.1 above. In evaluating this evidence, the promotion and tenure committee will follow the procedures described in section IV.A.1. Evaluation of the quality and quantity of the candidate's research will be based primarily on published work conducted during the candidate's tenure as an Associate Professor. Articles in the review process will typically receive much less consideration. In evaluating the candidate's research, the promotion and tenure committee will carefully consider all aspects of the candidate's research program and weigh the tradeoffs among the types of evidence provided. There is no threshold number of publications necessary for promotion; both quality and quantity of the body of work will be considered. Success in obtaining external funding strengthens a candidate's case for promotion to professor; however, such success is neither necessary nor sufficient for attaining a rating of excellent in research.

##### **IV. B. 2. Teaching**

To meet the minimum standard for high-quality teaching, the candidate must have demonstrated competence and commitment in the performance of teaching responsibilities. A case for High Quality in teaching must be documented with evidence that includes peer evaluations of teaching and may include student teaching evaluations as described in the

Faculty Handbook as well as some of the items listed in Section IV.A.2 above. Additionally, candidates should have contributed to the Ph.D. program as directors of dissertation research and/or serving as a member on dissertation committees. This documentation may include external reviews of the candidate's teaching record.

#### **IV. B. 3. Service**

To meet the minimum standard for high-quality service, the candidate must have constructively participated in the service responsibilities assigned by the department chair, shown initiative in providing additional service to support the department, and performed other appropriate professional activities. A case for High Quality in service may include some of the items listed in Section IV.A.3 above.

#### **V. Promotion of Continuing-Track Faculty**

For the promotion of continuing-track faculty to higher professorial ranks, the Promotion Committee shall consist of those tenure-track and continuing-track faculty members of the department who are senior in rank to the faculty member applying. If the number of faculty eligible to serve as voting members of a Promotion and Tenure Committee is less than four, the committee will invite appropriate faculty from related academic departments to serve as temporary voting members. Faculty members holding administrative positions that have subsequent standing in the process (i.e., Department Chairperson, Dean) are not eligible for membership on the Committee. The chairperson of all Promotion and Tenure Committees shall be the same as defined above.

For cases of promotion to higher professorial ranks, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will include at least one continuing-track faculty member who is senior in rank to the faculty member applying for promotion. If there is no continuing-track faculty member within the department who is senior in rank, the committee will invite an appropriate continuing-track faculty member from a related academic department to serve as a temporary voting member.

#### **VI. Periodic Continuing-Track Faculty Evaluation Procedures**

In addition to its responsibility for making recommendations on promotion and tenure, the Department Promotion and Tenure Committees are responsible for conducting periodic evaluations of the research, teaching, and service activities of continuing-track faculty. The periodic evaluations are advisory to the department chair who incorporates the input of the committee into their own review and then makes a recommendation to the dean on whether the candidate's contract should be renewed. The committee's role is to assess the candidate's performance and advise the chair on whether the candidate at least shows potential for excellence in the primary workload area and high quality in all other areas. The peer review should note areas of particular strength and make recommendations for steps to improve performance. An evaluation will lead to a written report, which is provided to the department chairperson and the faculty member. For periodic evaluations,

the Committee shall consist of those tenure-track and continuing-track faculty members of the department who are senior in rank to the faculty member being evaluated.

Continuing-track faculty shall be evaluated during appointment years two, four, and six, or as specified by the Faculty Handbook. Thereafter evaluations shall be conducted as specified by the Faculty Handbook. A faculty member may request more frequent evaluations, but not more than once a year. A request for an evaluation must be made in writing to the chairperson of the Promotion and Tenure Committees by October 1. The Promotion and Tenure Committees determine their evaluation procedures each year and may create subcommittees of their members to perform the periodic evaluations following the same procedures as in Section III.A.

## **VII. Promotion Criteria for Continuing-Track Faculty**

The promotion criteria for continuing-track faculty shall be in agreement with those criteria stipulated in the Faculty Handbook. The expectations for promotion exceed the expectations for contract renewal.

### **VII. A. Promotion to Associate Professor**

The criterion for promotion of continuing-track faculty to the rank of Associate Professor is a rating of “Excellent” in the primary area of workload (either teaching or service) and a rating of “High Quality” in all other assigned workload areas. There should be unmistakable evidence that the promotion candidate has progressed in the primary area of responsibility during their time as Assistant Professor, and that the candidate will continue to make significant contributions.

#### **VII. A. 1. Teaching**

##### *Excellent in Teaching:*

The evaluation of “Excellent” in teaching will be guided by the proportion of workload dedicated to teaching. Candidates should report the average and range of their teaching workload since their original appointment and over the most recent 5 years if they have been at UD for more than 5 years. The criteria for “Excellent” stated below generally pertain to CT faculty whose average teaching workload is approximately 75%. For CT faculty with other teaching workloads (but teaching is still the primary workload), the criteria for “Excellent” should be adjusted appropriately.

The candidate should write a teaching narrative that discusses their experience, goals, and achievements in teaching with evidential materials to support the narrative.

To achieve a rating of “Excellent” in teaching, a candidate should demonstrate both excellent knowledge of teaching and teaching practice in their submitted dossier.

Excellence in teaching knowledge and practice may include evidence of:

1. Continued professional pedagogy development.
2. Evidence-based pedagogy in practice.
3. Significant contribution to the teaching needs of the department.
4. Leadership in teaching.
5. Contribution to the broader teaching community, which can include the department, college, and/or university.
6. Other significant teaching initiative or contribution.

The dossier must further include course materials, including recent syllabi, assignments, and assessments. Other course materials may also be included and will be considered in the review. The dossier must include either student teaching evaluations as described in the Faculty Handbook or evidence of student outcomes. Additional teaching feedback from students, parents, or other stakeholders may be included. The sampling method for the feedback should be explained. The candidate may also include any other accomplishments that may support their case. In evaluating teaching evidence, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will consider all aspects of the candidate's teaching contributions.

*Classroom Observation:* A peer evaluation including classroom observations conducted within the last year is also required. For candidates seeking a rating of "Excellent" in teaching, the evaluation team will include two members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and one pedagogy expert from outside the department. The pedagogy expert could be a UD faculty or staff member with experience in teaching evaluation.

In general, the procedure will follow Section VIII below. The observation team need not all attend the same class meeting. The peer observers should provide a report for the candidate to include in the dossier. The report should describe the candidate's classroom teaching, any related discussions with the candidate, and an evaluation of the candidate's course materials.

*External Reviews:* For an evaluation of "Excellent" in teaching, a candidate must have five "external" evaluations of teaching. "External" can mean external to the candidate's primary academic unit but internal to the University. The procedures to select and communicate with external reviewers appear Section IX below.

### *High-Quality in Teaching:*

To achieve "High Quality" in teaching, a candidate should demonstrate engagement with, but not necessarily expertise in, many of the elements described above. The candidate may also include any other accomplishments that may support their case; the Promotion and Tenure Committee will consider all aspects of the candidate's teaching contributions. A peer classroom observation as described above is required, but the involvement of the pedagogy expert is optional. The dossier may include student teaching evaluations as described in the Faculty Handbook. External reviews are not required for "High Quality."



## VII. A. 2. Service

### *Excellent in Service:*

The evaluation of “Excellent” in service will be guided by the proportion of workload dedicated to service. Candidates should report the average and range of their service workload since their original appointment and over the last 5 years if they have been at UD for more than 5 years.

The criteria for “Excellent” stated below generally pertain to CT faculty who have consistently had a service workload of approximately 60%. For CT faculty with other service workloads (but service is still the primary workload), the criteria for “Excellent” should be adjusted appropriately.

The candidate should write a service narrative that discusses their experience, goals, and achievements in service with evidential materials to support the narrative.

To achieve a rating of “Excellent” in service, a candidate should demonstrate excellent service practice in their submitted dossier.

Excellence in service may include evidence of:

1. Continued professional development in service areas.
2. Evidence of service impact.
3. Significant contribution to the service mission of the department.
4. Leadership in service.
5. Service contributions beyond the department.
6. Other significant service initiative or contribution.

Service feedback, such as testimonials, from students, faculty, administrators, or other stakeholders may be included at the discretion of the candidate. The sampling method for the feedback should be explained.

The candidate may also include any other accomplishments that may support their case. In evaluating service evidence, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will consider all aspects of the candidate’s service contributions.

External Reviews: For an evaluation of “Excellent” in service, a candidate must have five “external” evaluations of service. “External” can mean external to the candidate’s primary academic unit but internal to the University. The procedures to select and communicate with external reviewers appear Section IX below.

### *High-Quality in Service:*

To achieve “High Quality” in service, a candidate must have constructively participated in the service responsibilities assigned by the department chair, shown initiative in providing additional service to support the department, and performed other appropriate professional

activities. The candidate may also include any other accomplishments that may support their case; the Promotion and Tenure Committee will consider all aspects of the candidate's service contributions. Documentation, such as reports or testimonials, should be included, but external reviews are not required for "High Quality."

### **VII. A. 3. Research**

For CT faculty, research is broadly defined to include scholarship in teaching, service, and/or an economic field. Candidates should report the average and range of their research workload since their original appointment and over the most recent 5 years if they have been at UD for more than 5 years.

This section defines criteria for "High Quality" in scholarship for CT faculty who have an approximately 15% research workload. The criteria for "High Quality" should be adjusted appropriately for CT faculty with a different assigned research workload.

To achieve a rating of "High Quality" in scholarship, a candidate will have 1) established a successful research program, and 2) provided clear evidence that contributions to the research mission of the department will continue beyond promotion.

A successful research program will include articles published or accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals in the last five years. The published or accepted articles should make a substantial contribution to either an economic field, the teaching of economics, or to the scholarship on service.

Publications in general economics journals, economics field journals, or journals related to the candidate's primary area of appointment (i.e., education/pedagogy and service-related journals for teaching and service appointments, respectively) could be appropriate.

Articles currently in the review process can be considered if they have received positive referee reports and a request for resubmission. For coauthored publications, the candidate should discuss their contribution to the coauthored work in their dossier. Candidates may provide additional supporting evidence that might include conference and seminar invitations and presentations, unrefereed publications, or another scholarship element.

Evidence of a continuing research agenda could include additional working papers, works in progress, or presentations of yet unpublished work.

### **VII. B. Promotion to Full Professor**

The criterion for promotion of continuing-track faculty to the rank of Full Professor is a rating of "Excellent" in the primary area of workload (either teaching or service) and a rating of "High Quality" in all other assigned workload areas. In addition to the requirements for Associate Professor, the rank of Full Professor requires that the candidate demonstrates a reputation in the primary area of workload and significant contributions in all areas of workload since the last promotion.

### **VII. B. 1. Teaching**

The criteria for evaluations of “Excellent” and “High Quality” are the same as those specified in Section VII.A.1 above. In addition, for a rating of “Excellent,” a continuing-track candidate for Full Professor should have established a reputation in teaching that is either university-wide or in the professional community. Examples of reputation evidence include: a teaching-related award or grant, a teaching-related leadership position within the university or in a professional association, teaching-related publications, involvement in multiple teaching-related initiatives across campus, or a different accomplishment that demonstrates visibility within the teaching community.

### **VII. B. 2. Service**

The criteria for evaluations of “Excellent” and “High Quality” are the same as those specified in Section VII.A.2 above. In addition, for a rating of “Excellent,” a continuing-track candidate for Full Professor should have established a reputation in service that is either university-wide or in the professional community. Examples of reputation evidence include: a service-related award or grant, a service -related leadership position within the university or in a professional association, service -related publications, involvement in multiple service -related initiatives across campus, or a different accomplishment that demonstrates visibility within the service community.

### **VII. B. 3. Research**

The criteria for evaluation of “High Quality” are the same as those specified in Section VII.A.3 above.

### **VII. C. Promotion of Continuing-Track Instructor Faculty**

Consistent with the policy as specified by the Faculty Handbook, a recommendation of reappointment in year six is also a recommendation for promotion from the title of Instructor to the title of Associate Instructor. A recommendation of reappointment in year thirteen is also a recommendation for promotion to the title of Senior Instructor.

## **VIII. Procedures for Peer Evaluation of Teaching Performance**

The peer evaluators will follow the steps below.

1. Schedule a classroom observation. The evaluators and faculty member will identify a date or dates when the classroom visit(s) will occur.
2. Hold a pre-observation meeting. Prior to the classroom observation, the evaluators and faculty member will meet or correspond via email to discuss teaching objectives, classroom activities or technologies, observation protocols, and any other matters that the faculty member feels are relevant to the evaluation of her or his teaching

- performance.
3. Review teaching materials. The evaluators will review course materials compiled by the faculty member for the evaluation. This could include syllabi, exams, homework, handouts, etc.
  4. Conduct the classroom observation. Evaluators will attend one class meeting of each course that the faculty member is teaching during the observation semester.
  5. Hold a post-observation meeting. After the observation, the evaluators and faculty member will meet to discuss feedback and any other information relevant to the observation.
  6. Write a report. The evaluators will write a joint report for the candidate to include in the dossier. If an agreement cannot be reached, separate reports from each evaluator will be submitted. The report should describe the candidate's classroom teaching, any related discussions with the candidate, and an evaluation of the candidate's course materials.

The peer evaluation should ideally occur shortly before the candidate's contract renewal or promotion year but could be conducted within the last year.

## **IX. General Procedures for All Cases**

The procedures below apply to all Promotion and Tenure decisions:

- Any research published or accepted for publication prior to employment at the University of Delaware can be considered as evidence supporting the case for promotion and tenure and should be included in the dossier. For continuing-track faculty, teaching and service accomplishments (in addition to research) prior to employment at the University of Delaware can be considered as evidence supporting the case for promotion and should be included in the dossier. It is the candidate's responsibility to include evidence of this work in his/her dossier, to clearly identify when and where this work was performed, and to provide any other information that may be relevant to evaluating that work.
- A minimum of five external reviews should be obtained for all promotions. For reviews of tenure track faculty, the external reviews should provide an evaluation of the candidate's research and for continuing track faculty they should provide an evaluation of the candidate's teaching or service depending on the nature of the appointment. External reviewers for tenure track cases should be distinguished scholars in the candidate's primary research area. For continuing track cases, the external reviewers should be recognized as experts in teaching or service. External reviews are confidential and will not be made available to the candidate.

- The selection of reviewers implements procedures outlined in Section 4 of the Faculty Handbook as follows:
  - The candidate for promotion must provide the department chair and chair of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee with a list of five potential external reviewers who meet the criteria specified in the Faculty Handbook on or before April 30 (the deadline for notifying the department chair of the candidate's intent to be reviewed for promotion). The Committee adds five additional names and this list is submitted to the candidate for review no later than May 10.
  - Following any needed adjustments to the list of potential external reviewers, the department chair shall finalize the list and randomly select five external reviewers. The randomly selected reviewers shall include at least two reviewers suggested by the candidate. The department chair will then contact the external reviewers on behalf of the committee to request that they provide an evaluation of the candidate. If any reviewer declines, the department chair will contact the next reviewer on the list until either five external reviewers have agreed to evaluate the candidate or the list of potential reviewers has been exhausted. If the list is exhausted with fewer than five positive responses, the candidate shall provide three additional names and the Committee shall provide three additional names. These potential reviewers will be randomly ordered and the chair will continue to contact external reviewers sequentially until five external reviewers have agreed to provide an evaluation of the candidate.
- For candidates that have funded joint appointments in more than one unit, the P&T Committee from the primary unit will solicit information from the other units regarding the candidate's performance (e.g., teaching, scholarship, service) during the P&T review process.
- In addition to the right to appeal at each stage of the P&T process, candidates have the right to add additional information to their dossier, including clarifying or elaborating on any issues or concerns that emerge throughout this process.

## **X. Amendment Procedures**

Amendments to this document pertaining to tenure-track faculty must be approved by a majority of the tenure-track faculty. These are currently sections II, III, and IV. Amendments to this document pertaining to continuing-track faculty or all faculty must be approved by a majority of the tenure-track and continuing-track faculty. These are currently sections I, V, VI, VII, VIII, and IX. Proposed amendments must be made available to the faculty at least one week before taking a vote.