

PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA:

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The promotion and tenure guidelines of the University Faculty Senate state, "The promotion system recognizes the uniqueness of the disciplines that comprise the University community." The uniqueness of the Department of Business Administration derives from the fact that the faculty teaches, conducts research, consults and interacts not only with students and other academicians, but also with business people, government officials and community groups.

In this context, the basic objectives of the Department's promotion and tenure policies, practices and criteria are to establish and maintain faculty excellence, to treat candidates with fairness, decency and respect, and to accomplish these objectives on a basis that is roughly comparable to the other divisions of the University.

I.

Promotion and Tenure Policies

The Department's primary policies are:

1. All candidates for promotion and/or tenure will be evaluated in three major areas of attainment and potential: teaching, scholarship, and service.
2. A critical element in the candidate's performance evaluation for promotion and/or tenure is evidence in all three major areas that significant achievements have been and will continue to be made.
3. Every candidate for promotion and/or tenure must demonstrate scholarly and teaching ability and achievement and provide evidence that these will continue.
4. Service must be considered an important part of a faculty member's responsibility to the University.

5. An unacceptable rating in any of the three major areas of performance evaluation precludes promotion and/or tenure.

6. Activities in teaching, scholarship and service prior to employment at the University normally play little or no role in promotion since such activities have already been taken into account in the hiring contract. However, prior activities can be meaningful as a context within which later accomplishments and developments may be judged and as evidence of continuing productivity.

7. A faculty member may apply for promotion and/or tenure at any time subject only to the University tenure rules stated in the Faculty Handbook and the provisions of this document. In general, to establish sufficient basis for evaluation, a minimum of three years in rank is necessary before promotion to Associate or Full Professor.

8. The candidate may be advised throughout the promotion/tenure process by anyone of his/her choosing, but the candidate is the sole judge of whether he/she will continue or withdraw at any of the formal stages of the evaluation process.

9. The promotion and tenure recommendation rests entirely on the candidate's peers in the Department since they are best able to establish and apply the standards and criteria that are unique to Business Administration.

10. The candidate will be informed in writing of the recommendation and reasons for it by all individuals and groups in the formal evaluation process.

11. In the event the Department approves any changes in the promotion and tenure policies, practices and criteria, it is the responsibility of the Department to provide candidates with time and resources to accommodate to such changes.

12. In promotion and tenure decisions, it is the policy of the University of Delaware that no person shall be subjected to discrimination on the grounds of race, color, religion, sex, national or ethnic origin, age and handicapped or veteran status.

II.

A. Promotion and Tenure Procedures

The faculty of the Department of Business Administration is represented in all promotion and/or tenure decisions by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee. This committee consists of all those members of the Department who are at or above the rank to which a candidate seeks promotion. However, if the number of Professors in the Department is less than three, the Chairperson of the Promotion and Tenure Committee may invite additional Professors from other departments in the University to serve for purposes of considering a candidate to the rank of Professor. The Chairperson of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will be elected by the Committee. The Chairperson of the Department is not a member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Promotion and/or tenure recommendations will be forwarded to the Chairperson of the Department by the Committee. Except in the case of a tie, a simple majority will determine whether the recommendation is favorable or unfavorable. In the case of a tie, two opinions and rationales will be forwarded. Individual or minority opinions by Committee members can also be forwarded with the Committee report. The recommendations of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall include the vote count and the Committee's rationale(s). The rationale(s) shall include comments on all major issues bearing on the decision. These shall be made available to the candidate in writing.

Within three working days of receiving the Chairperson's and/or the Department Committee's written recommendations, the candidate may respond by providing additional information for the dossier. The added information will be clearly identified as being supplemental to the information considered in the previous stage(s) of evaluation and be placed in a separate section of the dossier. While the candidate may add information to the dossier, the candidate may not otherwise alter the information that has been previously included in the dossier and considered

in the evaluation process. At this point, should they arise, signed minority opinions may be forwarded as appendices to the Department Committee's recommendation.

The candidate is responsible for informing the Chairperson in writing of his/her candidacy for promotion and/or tenure by March 15th before the academic year in which promotion or tenure is sought. It is also the responsibility of the candidate to insure that evidence concerning performance in the areas of teaching and advisement, scholarly activity, and service are included in a dossier and that the dossier is up-to-date as of September 1. The Promotion and Tenure Committee must consider, but is not restricted to, the information included in the dossier. However, no evaluation information will be solicited from other sources without the candidate's knowledge.

At any stage in the evaluation process, valid information may be added to the dossier with the candidate's knowledge. The added information will be clearly identified as being supplemental to the information considered in the previous stage(s) of the evaluation and be placed in a separate section of the dossier. While information may be added to the dossier, information that has been previously included in the dossier and considered in the evaluation process may not be otherwise altered.

Outside peer evaluation is an important indicator of a candidate's qualifications and performance and must be solicited for candidates seeking tenure or promotion to Associate Professor or Professor. The candidate may submit a list of reviewers, but faculty members in the candidate's academic area may suggest additional names. While the candidate must be informed of all potential reviewers and have an opportunity to comment on them, it is the Department, not the candidate, that makes the final selection. Insofar as is reasonable and possible, only reviewers without personal ties to the candidate should be selected. Furthermore, all candidates for promotion and tenure must document their relationship to the external reviewers. The reports of

the reviewers are confidential and only those making or reviewing a decision have access to it.

Candidates must not contact potential reviewers about the promotion process at any time.

In addition to the following time schedule, the evaluation process will conform to all guidelines established by the University of Delaware Faculty Senate.

March 15	Candidate notifies Department Chairperson
September 1	Dossiers to Department Committee and Chairperson
October 1	Department's recommendations to the Chairperson
October 15	Chairperson's recommendation to College Committee and Dean
December 1	College Committee's recommendation to Dean
January 2	Dean's recommendation to University Faculty Senate Committee of Promotions and Tenure Committee
February 15	Recommendations from University Faculty Senate Committee on Promotions and Tenure
February 25	Recommendations from Provost

B. Promotion and Tenure Committee Procedures

Preamble: Serving on the Promotion and Tenure Committee is one of the most important responsibilities of a tenured faculty member. These procedures are designed to insure that all cases that come before the Committee are handled in a professional and objective manner. Parts 3 and 4 shall be read at the beginning of each meeting of the Committee.

1. Responsibilities:

a. Review of candidates for promotion and/or tenure or appointment with tenure and making written recommendations to the Department Chairperson based upon that review.

b. Review of untenured faculty members whose contracts are up for renewal and making written recommendations to the Department Chairperson based upon that review.

c. All written recommendations shall be prepared by the Committee Chairperson or a committee member designated by the Committee and shall be circulated for review and signed by all members of the Committee that participated in the vote. A copy of the recommendation shall be sent to the candidate.

d. Periodically reviewing the approved Promotion and Tenure Policies, Procedures and Criteria of the Department of Business Administration and recommending changes to the faculty of the Department.

2. Criteria:

All candidates shall be evaluated on the basis of the approved Promotion and Tenure Criteria of the Department of Business Administration.

3. Options:

a. In promotion and tenure cases or appointment with tenure, each member of the Committee shall vote either YES, NO, or ABSTAIN.

b. In contract renewal cases, each member of the Committee shall vote either TWO, TERMINAL, or ABSTAIN with:

TWO designating a two year renewable contract and

TERMINAL designating a one year nonrenewable contract.

4. Confidentiality:

Meetings of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are open only to members of the Committee. All deliberations are confidential. There shall be no communication other than the written recommendation(s) about the discussion or vote in a meeting between a member of the Committee and nonmembers of the Committee with these exceptions:

a. A member of the Committee, generally a tenured faculty member in the candidate's academic area, may be authorized and instructed to convey information orally to counsel the candidate. This type of counseling is especially important in contract renewal cases.

b. The Chairperson of the committee or an Area Head is permitted to communicate the vote orally to the Department Chairperson.

c. If permitted by the higher level committees, members of the Committee who serve on the college or university promotion and tenure committees may communicate information that will help those committees in their evaluation of the candidate. In these cases, it is important that the information represent the conclusions of the Committee as represented in the recommendation and not the personal views of the Committee member.

5. Preparation and Discussion:

All Committee members should be fully prepared prior to the Committee meetings. The discussion will begin with an objective review of the candidate's case by the area head.

Committee members are encouraged to express their views candidly. For purposes of clarification, the Committee may seek additional information about a candidate's qualifications.

6. Schedule:

The Committee shall not be rushed to complete its deliberations. Thus, a series of meetings shall be scheduled and published to members of the Committee and meetings shall be adjourned without action if a quorum is lost. Three-fourths of the members of the Committee must agree to vote before a vote may be taken.

7. Absences:

With the exception of faculty members on sabbatical or leave of absence, all members are expected to attend all meetings of the Committee and those meetings shall be scheduled at a time that all members can attend.

Faculty members on sabbatical or leave of absence are eligible to attend Committee meetings and to vote.

8. Quorum:

To conduct business, a quorum is necessary. A quorum is defined as 80 percent of the tenured faculty members in the Department of Business Administration who are not on sabbatical or leave of absence. If a faculty member on sabbatical or leave elects to attend a meeting, he/she shall be added to the list of eligible tenured faculty members in determining the 80% quorum requirement.

9. Committee Chairperson:

The Committee shall be chaired by a full professor. The Chairperson for the new academic year shall be elected at the last spring meeting of the previous academic year.

III.

Promotion and Tenure Criteria

The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chairperson will, to the greatest extent possible, base their promotion and/or tenure recommendations on the following areas of evaluation, performance ratings and performance requirements by rank. However, it is recognized that exceptions may occur in cases of very unusual circumstances.

A. Areas of Evaluation

Teaching. Listings of the kinds of materials to be used as evidence in support of evaluations in this area are given in Section IV of this document.

Teaching is defined as the effective communication of relevant professional knowledge, insights, concepts and skills and meaningful guidance in the structuring of a study program for the individual's professional development. The essential criteria here are relevance, soundness, rigor and depth.

Scholarship. Scholarship includes the creation of new concepts of organizational management or methodologies for problem solving in business, government and not-for-profit organizations and the dissemination of results. Also included are the testing and validation of such

concepts and methodologies, studies of interactions between society and business, and other efforts which advance the knowledge and practice of organizational administration.

Service. Included here are: substantive contributions to the operations of the Department, College, University, government, business organizations, not-for-profit institutions, and groups; consulting; the communication of relevant and useful information to government and business offices, organizations and the general public.

B. Performance Requirements by Rank

The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee will adhere as closely as possible to the following guidelines in making its recommendations to the Chairperson. It is recognized, however, that unique circumstances will arise. The committee will treat each case on its own merits, noting in the recommendations the circumstances of unique cases when they occur.

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 all three areas. At this rank, past achievements are not so important as evidence of future growth and accomplishment. Moreover, teaching performance and service must be acceptable.

Performance Rating.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee evaluates candidates in the areas of teaching, scholarly research, and service. The evaluations result in ratings within the following categories:

Not Acceptable Acceptable Good Very Good Excellent

Promotion to Associate Professor.

Inasmuch as promotion within the University to this rank carries tenure--a binding commitment on the part of the University--the standard must be especially rigorous. There should be unmistakable evidence that the individual has progressed and will continue to do so. A merely satisfactory or adequate record as an Assistant Professor is not sufficient; there must be very clear

indications, based on hard evidence and outside peer evaluations, that the candidate has in fact attained high levels of accomplishment.

To be eligible for a positive recommendation for promotion to associate professor, a candidate must have achieved a rating of excellent in either teaching or research and at least good in the other categories. Furthermore, there should be clear indications that the candidate will continue to attain high levels of accomplishment.

Candidates are normally expected to teach at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. The effectiveness of a candidate's teaching is evaluated with respect to soundness, rigor, quality, depth, and applicability of course material to the level of the students. A case for an "excellent" rating in teaching must be thoroughly documented with evidence from several of the teaching categories listed in section IV. below. A candidate will usually document a case for excellent with results on student course evaluations. However, since student course evaluations measure teaching performance imperfectly, excellent scores on them are not sufficient for a rating of excellent, they must be accompanied by other convincing evidence. Moreover, excellent scores on course evaluations are not required for a rating of excellent, provided the other forms of evidence are especially strong and convincing. Similarly, a case for "good" teaching should be documented and supported with several types of evidence, usually including results on student course evaluations that are at least within the middle range of scores achieved by colleagues in comparable courses. However, if the other forms of evidence are sufficiently compelling, a rating of good can be justified even though the scores on a candidate's student course evaluations fall below the mid-range for the department.

In judging the value of a candidate's scholarly contribution, the quality of research is most important. To be rated as "excellent" in research a candidate 1) must have established a high quality, successful research program which is normally evidenced by publication in the leading journal(s) in the candidate's field as part of a record of numerous publications in recognized

refereed journals (or their equivalent as listed in Section IV B category I); 2) should have received strong support from the external reviewers; and 3) should have provided unmistakable evidence that the high flow of quality scholarly contributions will continue beyond promotion. For a rating of "good" in research, a candidate 1) must have demonstrated a commitment to scholarly research as evidenced by several publications in recognized refereed journals (or their equivalent); 2) should have received positive external reviews; and 3) should have provided clear indications that scholarly research will continue following a positive promotion decision. Although single authored publications are not required, a candidate who presents a record largely composed of multi-authored publications must carefully document his/her contribution to this work.

The service category is important, and includes activities to benefit the university, the community, or the profession. In evaluating service a committee takes into account the quantity and the quality of the faculty member's activities, and assesses the candidate's contribution, leadership, and the value or importance of his or her service activities. To receive a rating of "good" in service, a candidate must demonstrate that he or she has effectively discharged assigned service responsibilities. For a rating of "excellent" in service, a candidate must document numerous important contributions beyond those associated with assigned responsibilities.

Tenure at Associate Professor

To be eligible for Department~ recommendation for tenure at the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate must meet all the requirements set forth in this document for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. In addition, the candidate must meet any requirements set forth in the letter of appointment.

Promotion to Professor:

This rank is reserved for individuals who have established reputations in their disciplines and whose contributions to the Departments mission are unquestioned. There should be unmistakable evidence of significant development and achievement in all three areas since the last

promotion. Once again, the candidate's claim to have met these requirements must be thoroughly and completely documented by outside peer evaluations and other material.

To be eligible for a positive departmental recommendation for promotion to the rank of Professor, a candidate must have achieved ratings of excellent in teaching or research and at least good in the other categories. Promotion to this rank requires sustained high-quality performance in teaching, research and service. In evaluating a candidate for this rank, a committee employs demanding standards and requires continued achievement beyond that necessary for promotion to Associate Professor.

To be rated as "excellent" in teaching, a candidate must have achieved a consistent and continuing record of high quality teaching which normally includes assignments at the graduate and undergraduate levels. The effectiveness of a candidate's teaching should be evaluated with respect to soundness, rigor, quality, depth, and applicability of course material to the level of the students. In addition, a candidate should have demonstrated initiative in the teaching area, and continuing concern for the success of the department's teaching mission. A case for "excellent" must be thoroughly documented with evidence from several of the teaching categories listed in section IV. below. A candidate will usually document a case for excellent with results on student course evaluations. However, since student course evaluations measure teaching performance imperfectly, excellent scores on them are not sufficient for a rating of excellent; they must be accompanied by other convincing evidence. Moreover, excellent scores on course evaluations are not required for a rating of excellent, provided the other forms of evidence are unusually strong and convincing. Similarly, a case for "good" teaching should be documented and supported with several types of evidence, usually including results or student course evaluations that are at least within the middle range of scores achieved by colleagues in comparable courses. However, if the other forms of evidence are sufficiently compelling, a rating of good can be justified even though the scores on a candidate's student course evaluations fall below the mid-range for the department.

To be rated as "excellent" in research a candidate 1) must have established and maintained a high quality, successful research program which is normally evidenced by publication in the leading journals in the candidate's field as part of a continuing flow of numerous publications in recognized refereed journals (or their equivalent); 2) should have received strong support from the external reviewers; and 3) should have provided unmistakable evidence that the high flow of quality scholarly contributions will continue beyond promotion; 4) should have provided evidence of an established reputation in the candidate's discipline. For a rating of "good" in research, a candidate 1) must have demonstrated a commitment to scholarly research as evidenced by a continuing flow of publications in recognized refereed journals (or their equivalent); 2) should have received positive external reviews; and 3) should have provided clear indications that scholarly research will continue following a positive promotion decision. Although single authored publications are not required, a candidate who presents a record largely composed of multiauthored publications must carefully document his/her contribution to this work.

The service category is important. To receive a rating of "good" in service, a candidate must have demonstrated initiative and commitment in the performance of assigned service responsibilities. For a rating of "excellent" in service, a candidate must document a sustained high-level of achievement, leadership, and initiative in substantive service activities that go well beyond assigned responsibilities.

IV.

PROMOTION DOSSIER

All promotion and tenure dossiers must include the following information in this order:

1. A table of contents
2. An application for promotion form
3. A copy of the Department's promotion and tenure criteria
4. A curriculum vitae

5. The Department Committee's recommendation
6. The Chairperson's recommendation
7. College Committee's recommendation
8. Dean's recommendation or endorsement
9. University Committee's recommendation
10. Copies of letters of evaluation from peer reviewers together with supporting material
11. Candidate's statement (optional)
12. Evidence of scholarly accomplishment, teaching and advisement, and service.

It is important to note that in all three of the performance evaluation areas teachers of Business Administration interact with individuals and organizations at all levels of age and experience--students, business managers, government officials and other academicians. Evaluators will take this into account in weighing these evidences of competency. The following are suggested as examples of the kinds of evidence the candidate may submit to document accomplishment in the three evaluation areas. The evidence can originate from undergraduate and/or graduate students as well as from business and/or government people and academicians who are qualified to evaluate the candidate's competency.

A. Evidence of Teaching Competence

Category I:

The most important indicators of a faculty member's contribution toward the teaching objective are:

1. Student course evaluations. In presenting course evaluations, candidates may submit any comparative information they deem appropriate. However, candidates must present a semester by semester summary of course evaluation data for each course taught. If the candidate has taught one or more undergraduate or graduate

core courses, ratings of each of these core courses should be compared to the ratings received by other tenure track faculty teaching the same core course.

2. Department solicited testimony from former students that provides information about:
 - a) The professor's in-class performance
 - b) The overall impact of the course on the student, and the contribution the course made to the student's personal or professional development
 - c) The overall impact the faculty member had on the student, including teaching, advisement, and counsel, and the contribution the faculty member made to the student's personal and professional development
3. Peer evaluations. Candidates must also undergo a peer evaluation, which includes classroom visitations, examinations of course objectives, requirements, and materials. The purpose of the peer evaluation is to assess such factors as a candidate's pedagogical competence, knowledge of the subject matter, organization and preparation, ability to communicate the course material to the students and to stimulate intellectual curiosity, effort devoted to teaching, and contributions to the curriculum (e.g.. through the development of new courses).
4. Publications related to the teaching function.
5. New course development.

Note: Items 1-3 are required evidence

Category II: Other Evidence

When available and appropriate, other forms of evidence on teaching effort, performance, and contributions should also be incorporated into the dossier. The categories (listed in no particular order) include:

1. Written comments from the student course evaluations. (Candidates should include all written comments for a given course section.)
2. Direction of graduate research projects and undergraduate honors theses.
3. Teaching innovation, and enhancement of the curriculum.
4. Teaching awards or similar recognition of outstanding teaching contributions.
5. Student advisement, especially when it contributes to students' professional or career development.

6. Documentation of teaching improvement/development work (for instance, through the Center for Teaching Effectiveness).

The preceding categories are not necessarily exhaustive. In evaluating teaching, a committee considers all pertinent evidence on a candidate's contribution to the department's teaching objectives, even though it may not fit neatly into any of the foregoing categories.

B. Scholarly Research

Research activities fall into the following two categories, ranked in order of importance.

Category I: Scholarly Publications

The most important indicators of a faculty member's contribution toward the research objective are

1. Scholarly papers published in refereed professional journals or in refereed edited volumes. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide evidence of the quality of these journals and volumes.
2. Scholarly books and monographs published.
3. Other evidence of the impact of a faculty member's work (e.g., citations, reprints in edited volumes, etc.).

Category II: Other

Indicators of less importance are

4. Invited chapters in books.

5. Papers presented at professional meetings, that are published in conference proceedings.
6. Other papers presented at professional meetings.

For the most part, these items indicate activity that should lead eventually to scholarly publications, which would then receive credit under Research Category I. Thus, they receive little credit in this category.

Seminar presentations to departmental colleagues and graduate students receive no separate credit in the research category; however, they often provide evidence helpful in judging the quality of a faculty member's research. Likewise, professional service activities (e.g., organizing sessions at professional meetings, serving on editorial boards of professional journals) receive no credit in the research category; yet, when these activities provide significant, highly visible contributions, they offer additional evidence of a faculty member's scholarly reputation and standing in the profession.

The preceding categories are not necessarily exhaustive. In evaluating research, a committee considers all pertinent evidence on a candidate's contribution to the department's research objectives, even though it may not fit neatly into any of the foregoing categories.

C. Service

The various types of service activities are listed below, but not in any particular order of importance. Faculty are not expected to carry out activities in all categories. Indeed, the committees expect that some faculty will specialize in certain types of service efforts to the exclusion of others. In evaluating service activities, a committee values most highly those efforts that are active, successful, and important, and that demonstrate leadership and initiative.

Service to the University

1. Work on department, college, and university committees.
2. Administrative assignments within the university.
3. Seminar presentations or lectures to members of the university community.

4. Participation on boards, commissions, or societies at the local, state, or national level.
5. Presentations or lectures on management issues.
6. Organizing symposia or lecture series directed to the community.
7. Professional services provided to community groups, businesses, or government agencies.

Service to the Profession

8. Service as a journal or book editor, member of editorial boards, or as a referee for professional journals; reviewer of grant proposals, scholarly research monographs, or textbooks.
9. Organizing professional meetings or conferences.
10. Serving as a chairperson or discussant at sessions of professional meetings or conferences.
11. Descriptive book reviews published.
12. Substantive contributions to colleagues' research efforts.

The preceding categories are not necessarily exhaustive. In evaluating service, a committee considers all pertinent evidence on a candidate's contribution to the department's service objectives, even though it may not fit neatly into any of the foregoing categories.

V.

Conclusion

The Faculty of the Department of Business Administration believes the preceding promotion and tenure policies, practices and criteria sensibly and fairly reflect the unique nature of instruction, scholarship and service in business and constitute a rough comparability with other divisions in the University.

(Revised -approved by Department P&T Committee 4/24/98)