

PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA
Department of Economics
University of Delaware

I. Promotion Procedures

The Department Promotion and Tenure Committees are responsible for making recommendations on 1) promotion in rank and 2) the granting of tenure.

A Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of those members of the department who are senior to the candidate for promotion or tenure (e.g., all tenured faculty when a candidate seeks tenure). All faculty from other departments holding a joint appointment in the Economics Department are eligible to participate as nonvoting members of a committee, provided they have appropriate rank. Voting privileges can be extended to (or withdrawn from) joint appointees through a recommendation of the appropriate committee and majority approval of the tenure-track faculty. 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 kindred departments to serve as temporary voting members. The chairperson of all Promotion and Tenure Committees must be a professor, elected by the tenure-track faculty. The term of the chairperson is February 1 to January 31. The chairperson of the department is not eligible to serve on the committees.

A faculty member has the right to apply for promotion or tenure in any academic year except a terminal year, as described in Section III.K.3 of the faculty handbook, and alone has the responsibility for deciding at each stage of the process whether to continue or withdraw. The recommendations of the appropriate Promotion and Tenure Committee, including the committee's vote, will be provided to the chairperson of the department and the candidate no later than October 1. When they arise, signed minority statements will be included as an appendix to a committee's recommendation. The candidate has the right to include in the dossier a timely written response to a committee's recommendation.

The time schedule for the promotion and tenure process is outlined in Section III.K.8 of the Faculty Handbook.

Outside peer evaluations of research are important and must be solicited for candidates seeking 1) tenure or 2) promotion to either associate professor or professor. The solicitation of external evaluations must follow the guidelines outlined in Section III.K.9.b of the Faculty Handbook.

The department bases its promotion and tenure recommendations on the criteria and evidence described below in sections III and IV. The candidate must provide to the committee by September 1 a dossier containing all appropriate evidence pertaining to his or her performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The dossier should be thoughtfully prepared and well organized, with a general format consistent with University guidelines. While the committee will advise the candidate on the organization and content of the dossier, it is the candidate's responsibility to present the best case for promotion or tenure. At any stage in the process, information may be added to the dossier, provided the candidate agrees.

II. Faculty Evaluation Procedures

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

The performance of untenured faculty members must be evaluated at least every two years. In addition, the scholarly research of untenured assistant professors must be evaluated during their third year in rank. 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 one 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.

III. Promotion and Tenure Criteria

A. Prologue

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	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
----------------	----------	------	-----------	-----------

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 general level of understanding about economic issues. In general, these missions can best be accomplished through: 1) strong undergraduate and graduate teaching; 2) scholarly research directed at important economic problems; and 3) dissemination of economic knowledge to a wide audience. The definitions of "excellent" and "good" contributions in teaching, research, and service provided below serve as a frame of reference for the department's promotion and tenure decisions.

B. Qualifications for Promotion

Assistant Professor

To be eligible for departmental support for promotion to the rank of assistant professor, a candidate must have the Ph.D. or its equivalent, and must show the potential for growth and future accomplishments in teaching, research, and service.

Associate Professor

To be eligible for a positive recommendation for promotion to associate professor, a candidate must have achieved ratings 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. Achievements of a candidate for the rank of associate professor should be compared with those of professional economists who have attained that rank in comparable academic environments.

In the teaching area, a candidate must satisfy the high standards established by a department which stresses high-quality teaching. 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.A below. A candidate will usually document a case for excellent with superior results on student course evaluations. However, since student course evaluations measure teaching performance imperfectly, superior scores on them are not sufficient for a rating of excellent; they must be accompanied by other convincing evidence. Moreover, superior 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.

One of the department's objectives is to advance the state of economic knowledge through original scholarly research. In judging the value of a candidate's contribution in this area, both the quantity and quality of research output are important. To be rated as excellent in research a candidate 1) must have established a high quality, successful research program, evidenced by 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. For a

rating of good in research, a candidate 1) must have demonstrated a commitment to scholarly research as evidenced by several publications in reputable 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. While success in obtaining external funding strengthens a candidate's case for promotion or tenure, it is neither necessary nor sufficient for attaining any particular rating in the research area.

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 effort, 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.

Professor

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. Achievements of a candidate for the rank of professor should be compared with those of professional economists who have attained that rank in comparable academic environments.

To be rated as excellent in teaching, a candidate must have achieved a consistent and continuing record of high quality teaching. 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.A below. A candidate will usually document a case for excellent with superior results on student course evaluations. However, since student course evaluations measure teaching performance imperfectly, superior scores on them are not sufficient for a rating of excellent; they must be accompanied by other convincing evidence. Moreover, superior 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 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.

To be rated as excellent in research a candidate 1) must have established and maintained a high quality, successful research program, evidenced by 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. 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 reputable 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. Success in obtaining external funding strengthens substantially a candidate's case for promotion to professor; however, such success is neither necessary nor sufficient for attaining any particular rating in the research area.

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. Evidence for Rating Departmental Faculty Members

A. Teaching

Category I: Required Evidence

All candidates seeking promotion or tenure must submit evidence in the following two categories.

1. Student course evaluations. Candidates must submit summary statistics for all student course evaluations.
2. Peer evaluations. Candidates must also undergo a peer evaluation, which includes classroom visitations, examinations of course objectives, requirements, and materials, and an assessment of all evidence presented in the dossier. 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). Where appropriate and feasible, peer evaluators may also administer special tests or evaluations in an effort to generate additional measures of teaching performance.

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:

3. Written comments from the student course evaluations. (Candidates should include either all written comments or a random sample.)
4. Testimony from former students. (The method of selecting the students must be indicated.)
5. Direction of graduate research projects and undergraduate honors theses.
6. New course development, teaching innovations, and enhancement of the curriculum.
7. Representative samples of course syllabi, reading lists, course handouts, writing assignments, problems sets, and exams.
8. Publication of nonscholarly articles on teaching. (Scholarly work in economic education receives credit in the research category.)
9. Grants or contracts that provide financial support for graduate students.
10. Publication of textbooks, supplementary readings books, or computer software for use as a teaching aid.
11. Teaching awards or similar recognition of outstanding teaching contributions.
12. Student advisement, especially when it contributes to students' professional or career development.
13. Documentation of teaching improvement/development work (for instance, through the Center for Teaching Effectiveness).
14. Self-evaluation.
15. Student performance on nationally normed tests or on departmental common exams.
16. Other teaching measures as outlined in Section III.K.9.b.1 of the Faculty Handbook.

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 three 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 edited volumes.
2. Scholarly books and monographs published.

Scholarly publications of an appropriate quantity and quality are both necessary and sufficient for attaining a rating of "good" or above in research.

Category II: External Funding

Another important indicator of success in scholarly research is

3. Scholarly research projects receiving financial support from outside agencies, independently of any scholarly publications produced by the project.

External funding provides the department with additional resources for supporting research, and thus makes an important contribution to the department's research objectives. For this reason the department values externally funded projects independently of any scholarly publications they yield. (External funding that provides financial support for students receives credit in the teaching area.) However, success in obtaining external funding is neither necessary nor sufficient for attaining a rating of "good" or above in research.

Category III: Other

Indicators of less importance are

4. Papers presented at professional meetings, including those published in conference proceedings.
5. Unpublished technical reports on scholarly projects funded by external agencies.
6. Published book reviews that provide original insight or critical analysis.
7. Other measures of scholarly research outlined in Section III.K.9.b.2 of the Faculty Handbook.

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.

Service to the Community

4. Participation on boards, commissions, or societies at the local, state, or national level.
5. Position papers and nonscholarly books and articles on economic topics directed to the community.
6. Presentations or lectures on economic issues.
7. Organizing symposia or lecture series directed to the community.
8. Professional services provided to community groups, businesses, or government agencies.

Service to the Profession

9. 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.
10. Organizing professional meetings or conferences.
11. Serving as a chairperson or discussant at sessions of professional meetings or conferences.
12. Descriptive book reviews published.
13. 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. Amendment Procedures

Amendments to this document must be approved by a majority of the tenure-track faculty. Proposed amendments must be made available to the faculty at least one week before taking a vote.

Procedures for Evaluation of Teaching Performance

March 1994

The Subcommittee of the P&T Committee designated to evaluate a faculty member's teaching will consist of two members and will:

1. Meet with the faculty member under review. Discuss teaching objectives and any other matters which the faculty member feels are relevant to the evaluation of her/his teaching performance.
2. Review course syllabi and tests compiled by the faculty member for the evaluation.
3. After discussion with the faculty member, the subcommittee and faculty member will identify a three-week period within which class visitations might occur. They will inform the faculty member under review.
3. Conduct class visitations. In assessing the faculty members in-class performance the subcommittee will utilize the "Colleague Classroom Visitation Form" as a guide. The form is for the use of the subcommittee and is not a formal part of the subcommittee report. Each member of the subcommittee will attend at least two classes. Where possible the two members of the subcommittee will attend at least one class together. The subcommittee members will write a report describing the visitations. The report will be a joint statement coming from the subcommittee unless agreement cannot be reached. If separate reports are submitted because there is disagreement, it will be noted that the subcommittee could not agree on a common report.
5. The subcommittee will review student course evaluations and any other documentation provided in the dossier.
6. Based on all the above, the subcommittee will prepare a presentation to the Promotion and Tenure Committee.