

TO: Dean Timothy Barnekov and the CHEP Council

FROM: Promotion and Tenure Committee, CHEP
Margaret Wilder, Professor, SUAPP (Chair)
Francis Kwansa, Associate Professor, HRIM
Kathleen Minke, Professor, SOE
Belinda Orzada, Associate Professor, CNST
Barbara Settles, Professor, IFST

SUBJECT: Recommendations Regarding Policies and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Reviews in CHEP

As stated in the official CHEP policy documents, one of the explicit responsibilities of the CHEP P&T Committee is:

2.1 To clarify policies and procedures.

2.1.1 Advise the faculty, dean of the College, the heads of academic units, and department or school promotion and tenure committees on the adequacy, comparability and equity of departmental or school procedures, standards, and criteria.

During the course of carrying out its duties during the fall of 2006, the CHEP P&T Committee encountered a number of issues with respect to the review process for tenure and promotion. We believe that these issues can be effectively addressed through changes in: the explicit policy statements of the College's academic units, procedures used by the units to conduct P&T reviews, and the guidance given by units to potential candidates for tenure and promotion. We are available to discuss any and all of these matters.

What follows are a list of recommendations that we are making to academic units within CHEP, the CHEP Council, and the Dean.

1) Academic units need to rigorously enforce the time schedule and deadlines associated with the College-level review process or withdraw candidates from the process if deadlines cannot be met. Units that anticipate difficulty meeting the CHEP deadline need to adjust departmental deadlines in order to avoid penalizing candidates. In the event that a delay occurs or a deadline is not met, units should notify the CHEP P&T Committee of the reasons for the delay and what steps have been taken to avoid penalizing the candidate(s).

2) A minimum of four (4) external reviews of a candidate's record should be obtained. The qualifications of the external reviewers should be made clear. The unit committee should describe the process used for selecting external reviewers and obtaining the letters. Reviewers should be asked to describe their relationship, if any, with the candidate under review. External reviewers who have published with the candidate, served as an editor of the candidate's work, or otherwise worked closely with the candidate should be excluded, except under unusual circumstances. If such an individual is selected as an external reviewer, an explanation of this choice should be provided in the dossier.

- 3) When a candidate is being assessed primarily on a service or non-traditional (e.g., not peer-reviewed publications) scholarship record, external reviews should be obtained from senior persons in comparable roles or fields. These reviews should directly assess the candidate's productivity and accomplishments relative to standards in the field.
- 4) Each unit's P&T Committee and administrative head should explicitly report the nature of the candidate's workload during the period under review, and describe what if any implications this may have for the individual's record of accomplishments.
- 5) Academic units need to give explicit directions on the content, internal organization, and physical preparation of the dossier. For example: candidates should organize their dossiers in ways that minimize the need to pull items in and out of plastic sleeves, and that make it easy to find particular information; candidates should select binders that can withstand repeated openings and readings.
- 6) Academic units should make clear how scholarly work completed prior to employment at the University of Delaware will be weighed in tenure and promotion reviews.
- 7) An explicit policy should be established across all CHEP units regarding the inclusion of mid-review letters in the tenure and promotion dossiers.
- 8) Each unit should have an explicit policy detailing the appropriate use of two and four year review letters and annual appraisal data as part of the P&T process. This information should be used consistently across candidates. These policies should recognize the inherent limitations of these data. For example, annual appraisals primarily are used to distribute merit money not to evaluate performance on a criterion referenced basis. Furthermore, two and four year reviews do not include external review data and, therefore, may not provide much information about the quality of an individual's scholarly work.
- 9) If an academic unit uses the quality of journals (e.g., journal ratings, acceptance rates) as a factor in assessing the quality and/or impact of publications, this criterion should be made explicit in the unit's P&T guidelines.
- 10) When an academic unit changes its promotion and tenure policies, a candidate may choose to have work done prior to the policy change evaluated under the criteria of the old document or the new. This decision should be explicit in the dossier.
- 11) If the acquisition of funding for research or service activities is a criterion for tenure or promotion within a unit, the unit's P&T guidelines should make clear how funding is to be assessed beyond the simple reporting of a dollar figure.
- 12) If anything "unusual" (meaning different from the normal process) happens with respect to a candidate's review, the letters from the unit P&T committee and/or the administrative head should make clear what has occurred and what steps have been taken to insure that the process has not been compromised.

