

**University of Delaware**  
**College of Health Sciences**  
**Department of Kinesiology & Applied Physiology**

**GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION, TENURE AND REVIEW**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

The mission of the Department of Kinesiology and Applied Physiology encompasses scholarship, teaching, and service. Faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure must demonstrate achievements in all areas where workload has been assigned. Although all faculty are subject to the same set of criteria for promotion and tenure, demonstration of those criteria will vary depending upon individually assigned roles and workload. Since the mission of the University encompasses scholarship, teaching, and service, faculty members should strive for excellence in all three areas. For further information, faculty should consult the current University Guidelines as listed in the Faculty Handbook for guidance: <http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/>.

**II. EVALUATION CATEGORIES**

**A. Scholarship**

Scholarship includes all endeavors and activities that contribute to the generation and/or advancement of knowledge areas within the Department of Kinesiology and Applied Physiology. The ultimate goal for faculty is to have an externally funded, sustainable program of research. As scholars, faculty members must demonstrate independence and leadership in scholarly endeavors, activities and accomplishments as well as collaboration as appropriate to meet scientific goals. Findings of research endeavors are disseminated to appropriate audiences through a variety of media including peer-reviewed professional publications and scientific presentations.

Three primary indicators of scholarly performance are the publication record, external sponsorship of the candidate's research, and written comments from outside peer evaluations in the candidate's field. These three indicators are now briefly addressed.

Regarding the publication record, publication in peer-reviewed scientific and technical journals and publications of scholarly books (including textbooks) will be considered important indications of scholarly achievement, as will patents or other indications of professional inventive accomplishments, commercialization of research, and entrepreneurial activities. It should be recognized that by law to obtain intellectual property in the form of a patent the data, information, and ideas included in the patent application have never been made available to the public in any format including, but not limited to, published abstracts, conference posters and presentation, publications. Therefore, withholding submission of abstracts, manuscripts, and certain grants leading up to filing a patent application is required. Further, to maintain proprietary knowledge and keep trade secrets confidential many times withholding manuscripts and abstracts is beneficial for commercialization and licensing even after patents have been granted. The candidate should provide evidence of such withholding such as the number of publications that will be submitted

once the patent is approved, along with evidence of invention disclosure and non-provisional patent filings.

Peer-reviewed publications that are indexed are weighed more heavily than those that are not. Lesser weight shall be attached to non-peer-reviewed publications, unless the significance of such work is established through outside evaluations. The number of publications is secondary to their quality; candidates should provide supporting information, which may include but is not limited to journal impact factor, journal acceptance rate, candidate h-index or number of citations for a publication as evidence of quality of publications. When developing their scholarship statement, candidates should identify a small number of key publications and to indicate the quality of the journals, and, when appropriate, the number of citations and any other evidence that will assist the university committees in evaluating the impact on the professional community. The candidate should describe his/her contributions to co-authored work. Ultimately, it is the candidate's responsibility to explain and demonstrate the quality of their work.

Obtaining contracts and grants to carry out scholarly research, while largely regarded as promise for future work, also reflects upon the quality of scholarship. It is expected that faculty will develop and maintain rigorous research programs; clear evidence of the sustainability of this research is expected. This expectation includes at least one awarded grant as well as evidence of potential success with current grant proposals, although specific funding levels will not be employed as a condition for promotion or the granting of tenure. Depending on rank and other factors such as the nature of the candidate's proposed work, a candidate may be able to support a case for excellence with success in obtaining funding, even with a publication record that is still emerging. Federal grants and other significant mechanisms are considered evidence of an established or promising scholar.

Significant weight is placed on letters from external experts. Such letters are to address the aggregate importance of the candidate's work in furthering the field and an assessment of the candidate's likely future as a contributing scholar/expert in the field. The selection of reviewers is carried out as described below in "Review Procedures".

Special Note for faculty hired at the same rank as the previous institution: Unless otherwise noted in the faculty appointment letter, all work in rank, even if conducted at other institutions of higher education, shall be considered for promotion and tenure. It shall be the faculty member's responsibility to include evidence of this work in his/her dossier and to clearly identify when and where this work was performed. Scholarly productivity for promotion to the rank of associate professor generally cannot be based on work completed in earning the doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree prior to arrival at the University of Delaware.

## **B. Teaching**

A major goal of the Department of Kinesiology and Applied Physiology is to encourage all faculty to strive for excellence in teaching. Hence, faculty members with teaching responsibilities must demonstrate at a minimum high quality teaching performance. We recognize that high quality teaching includes activities both inside and outside the classroom, such as mentoring and advising graduate and undergraduate students, serving as chair or a member on thesis and dissertation

committees and other teaching-learning activities. Candidates should provide clear evidence of teaching quality and commitment within their dossiers using a variety of indicators such as student evaluations, faculty peer evaluation, course materials, learning outcome measures, teaching awards, new course development, and development of new curricula. Peer-reviewed publications about the scholarship of teaching will be considered as evidence of excellence in teaching.

### **C. Service**

Service on departmental, college, and university committees and/or service to the profession is expected of all faculty members (consistent with workload assignment), and is considered in the evaluation of the candidate for promotion. Service to the university will be measured by the contributions made by the faculty member on university, college and departmental committees and administrative assignments. Evaluation letters from the Committee Chairperson or from those affected by the candidate's work and having knowledge of it may be sought in the case of especially significant or demanding activities. Service to the community and the profession that contributes to the department's mission will be considered. Overall, service activities should be in line with the faculty member's professional expertise.

## **III. STANDARDS OF PROMOTION**

The Department of Kinesiology and Applied Physiology maintains an excellent reputation for providing a quality educational experience for its students. With the belief that an active research agenda can enhance quality teaching, we particularly value faculty profiles demonstrating clear linkages among scholarship, teaching, and service activities. The standards for quality of teaching and service are the same for all faculty, whether they are tenure-track or continuing-track.

- We value excellence and high quality performance and contributions in scholarship, teaching, and service.
- We consider indexed peer-reviewed publications of greater merit than non-indexed or non-peer-reviewed publications, unless evidence such as outside peer evaluations or impact clearly establishes the significance of the latter.
- We value collaboration; however, we place greater value on those collaborative projects in which the candidate has demonstrated a significant contribution and a leadership role.
- We value evidence of a focused and sustained record of research, as illustrated by publications in quality journals and growth in levels of funding.

The evaluation of faculty members by their respective committees shall culminate in their being rated as *excellent*, *high quality* or *below criteria* achievement for each area of workload. The definitions of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service given below shall serve as a frame of reference for promotion decisions. Excellence should be achieved in the predominant area of the faculty member's workload. Expectations in other areas should also be aligned with workload.

### **A. Criteria for Promotion of Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty**

### **For appointment or promotion to:**

**ASSISTANT PROFESSOR.** The candidate must have an earned doctoral degree, and must demonstrate ability and desire to make positive contributions in all three areas of scholarship, teaching and service. Faculty should focus on the items below when developing their dossier for two- and four-year reviews.

- Goals in the area of scholarship should be presented in a well-articulated plan for defining/expanding a program of research through internal and external funding and with timely dissemination of results aimed towards promotion and tenure. This should include a written set of short and long-term goals for the period until projected promotion and tenure. Progress towards these goals will be evaluated at least yearly by the candidate's mentorship team.
- Goals in the area of teaching should also be presented in a plan for growth and development in teaching effectiveness, including but not limited to innovation, student mentoring, advising, or course development. This should include a written set of short and long-term goals for the period until projected promotion and tenure. Progress towards these goals will be evaluated at least yearly by the candidate's mentorship team. Peer evaluations of teaching should occur at least once per academic year.
- Documented service contributions should include participation in appropriate professional organizations as well as service within the University.

**ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR.** The candidate must demonstrate excellent achievement in scholarship and high quality performance in teaching and service. There must be clear indication, based on documented evidence and outside peer evaluations, that the candidate has in fact attained appropriate levels of accomplishment for promotion to this rank. Information derived from online citation indexes (e.g., Web of Science) such as h-index and total number of citations may be used to evaluate the candidate's overall research productivity and impact to the field. Continual development of Teaching is expected and can be evidenced by participation in relevant workshops and programs, documented responses to peer evaluations, and evaluation of newly implemented or refined practices. Teaching performance as evidenced by student and peer evaluations must demonstrate consistent high quality. Candidates are also expected to attract, train and mentor graduate students to completion of advanced degrees. Examples of supporting evidence within each area of workload can be found in Section 4C: Evidential materials

- **High quality achievement in scholarship** is demonstrated by an independent, clearly focused program of research with dissemination of research findings in indexed peer-reviewed professional journals, patents or other indications of innovative accomplishments, presentation of research at national meetings, reasonable, ongoing efforts made to obtain external funding, other creative activities and favorable reviews by outside peer evaluations.
- **Excellent achievement in scholarship** is demonstrated by the candidate meeting all of the requirements for high quality achievement in scholarship and also having been successful in obtaining internal or external funding support for research.

- **High quality achievement in teaching** is demonstrated by evidence of past and present development in or quality and effectiveness of teaching. The effectiveness of the candidate's teaching should be evaluated with respect to not only effort (soundness, rigor, quality, and depth), but also to explicit learning outcomes for students and peer review.
- **Excellent achievement in teaching** is demonstrated by the candidate meeting all of the requirements for high quality achievement in teaching and also through evidence of substantial contributions to the teaching mission of the KAAP Department. This can be documented by various means such as
  - Long-standing, exemplary teaching and mentoring of students in undergraduate, professional or graduate programs. .
  - Development or implementation of innovative methods to promote and assess learning
  - Contributions to curricular development.
  - Effectiveness in administration and organization of education programs.
  - Obtaining intramural or extramural funding in support of teaching.
  - Teaching awards
- **High quality service** contributions should include regular participation in appropriate professional organizations, service on department, college or university committees, and when possible, contributions to civic or government organizations or boards.
- **Excellence achievement in service** is demonstrated by the candidate meeting all of the requirements for high quality achievement in service and also through evidence that supports the candidate's contributions and leadership to KAAP department, university and profession.

**PROFESSOR.** To be considered for promotion to the rank of Professor, the candidate must provide unmistakable evidence of significant development and achievement since the last promotion. This rank is reserved for individuals who have established professional reputations as scholars and are renowned experts (i.e., national and international) in their fields, and whose contributions to their profession and the University's mission are excellent. There should be unmistakable, clear documented evidence and outside peer evaluations of significant development and achievement (consistent with workload assigned) in teaching, scholarship, and service since the last promotion. The candidate must demonstrate leadership and excellent achievement in teaching or scholarship and high quality performance in all areas. It should be evident that the candidate's success in attracting, training and mentoring graduate students to advanced degrees has and will continue. The candidate must demonstrate that he/she has established national and international reputation in his/her discipline. Examples of supporting evidence within each area of workload can be found in Section IV.C: Evidential materials.

- **High quality achievement in scholarship** must demonstrate a clearly focused and sustained program of research. Peer reviewed publications should be in high-quality, top-tier journals within the candidate's area of study that are data-based and contributes

to the advancement of science. In addition, candidates are expected to prepare and deliver presentations of research findings at national and international professional meetings and have a record of funded external research proposals.

- **Excellent achievement in scholarship** is demonstrated by the candidate meeting all of the requirements for high quality achievement in scholarship and also having evidence of additional funding since last promotion.
- **High quality achievement in teaching** is demonstrated by evidence of past and present quality and effectiveness of teaching. The effectiveness of the candidate's teaching should be evaluated with respect to not only effort (soundness, rigor, quality, and depth), but also to learning outcomes for students.
- **Excellent achievement in teaching** is demonstrated by the candidate meeting all of the requirements for high quality achievement in teaching and also through evidence of substantial contributions to the teaching mission of the KAAP Department. This can be documented by various means such as
  - Long-standing, exemplary teaching and mentoring of students in undergraduate, professional or graduate programs. Development of innovative methods to promote and assess learning, and contributions to curricular development.
  - Effectiveness in administration and organization of education programs.
  - Obtaining intramural or extramural funding in support of teaching.
- **High quality service** contributions should include regular participation in appropriate national and/or international professional organizations, service on department, college or university committees, and when possible, contributions to civic or government organizations or boards.
- **Excellence achievement in service** is demonstrated by the candidate meeting all of the requirements for high quality achievement in service and also through evidence that supports the candidate's commitment to leadership (e.g. executive committee membership, editorial board membership) and substantial contributions to the service mission of the KAAP department both within and outside of the University of Delaware.

## **B. Criteria for Promotion of Continuing Track Faculty**

Continuing track faculty are eligible for promotion in academic rank utilizing similar criteria and procedures that apply to tenure-track faculty, with the caveat that workload assignment will generally be different than a tenure track faculty member. All CT faculty must have some portion of their workload dedicated to service. The standards for quality of teaching and service are the same for all faculty, whether they are tenure-track or continuing-track.

When the P&T Committee undertakes evaluation of a CT promotion candidate, the committee will consult with the Department chair prior to its deliberations to ensure that all parties understand the

nature of each CT workload agreement. In most cases, CT faculty will be evaluated for promotion on the basis of excellence in their primary workload depending on the nature of the faculty member's appointment. In exceptional cases where departmental need results in a shift in workload, the primary category of evaluation for promotion may not be the category of predominant workload assignment. A minimum of five external review letters are required for promotion; for CT faculty, "external" can mean internal to the University of Delaware but external to the academic unit.

Additional information regarding non-tenure track faculty appointments is found in the University of Delaware Faculty Handbook (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/>).

### **For appointment, contract renewal or promotion to:**

**INSTRUCTOR.** To be eligible for Departmental recommendation for appointment to the rank of CT Instructor, a faculty must show the potential for future growth and accomplishment in teaching and advising or other service. Instructors usually have minimal or no scholarship responsibility.

To be eligible for Department recommendation for contract renewal, CT faculty must at a minimum have achieved ratings of excellent in the emphasis of their academic workload and high quality performance in all other categories that are recognized as part of their workload. Furthermore, there should be clear indications that the individual will continue to perform at these levels.

For CT faculty, peer review for recommendations on contract renewal occurs at intervals specified by the University. Typically, this occurs at years 2, 4, 6, 9, 13, and at 5 year intervals thereafter. A full peer-review will be conducted at years 6 and 13. Evaluations and recommendations from the Committee and the Chairperson will be conducted at this time. Successful peer reviews at these stages will result in advancement to the title of Senior Instructor.

**ASSISTANT PROFESSOR.** To be eligible for Departmental recommendation for appointment or promotion to the rank of CT Assistant Professor, a faculty must hold a terminal degree and show the potential for future growth and accomplishment in teaching, scholarship, and/or service. Eligibility for Departmental recommendations for contract renewal are the same as those for CT Instructor. This should include a written set of short and long-term goals for the period until projected promotion and tenure. Progress towards these goals will be evaluated at least yearly by the candidate's mentorship team. If teaching is the primary workload area, peer evaluations of teaching should occur at least once per academic year.

**ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR.** To be eligible for Department recommendation for appointment to the rank of CT Associate Professor, the candidate must at a minimum have a level of distinction warranting the appointment. Furthermore, there should be clear indications that the candidate will continue to achieve excellence consistent with his or her workload. Eligibility for Departmental recommendations for contract renewal are the same as those for CT Instructor.

To be eligible for Department Recommendation for promotion to the rank of CT Associate Professor, the candidate must at a minimum have achieved ratings of excellence in teaching and instructional activity and high-quality performance in all other categories that are recognized as part of their workload using the same standards described for Tenure Track faculty. Furthermore, there should be clear indications that the candidate will continue to achieve excellence in the instructional program and high-quality performance in all other categories consistent with his or her workload.

**FULL PROFESSOR.** To be appointed to the rank of CT Full Professor, the candidate will be expected to have sustained a level of accomplishment sufficient to be judged as demonstrating excellence in teaching, and excellence or high-quality performance in the other areas defined by the workload. This rank denotes exemplary potential in instruction, demonstrated continued scholarship of teaching and service, and significant contributions to student education. Eligibility for Departmental recommendations for contract renewal are the same as those for CT Instructor.

To be promoted to the rank of CT Full Professor, a CT Associate Professor will be expected to have sustained a level of accomplishment sufficient to be judged as demonstrating excellence in teaching, and excellence or high-quality performance in the other areas specified in the most recent contract and or workload agreement using the same standards described for Tenure Track faculty. The overall record in these areas is important but particular attention is paid to achievements since promotion to CT Associate Professor. This rank denotes exemplary accomplishment in instruction, demonstrated continued scholarship of teaching and service, and significant contributions to student education. In addition to teaching courses, a CT Professor can have considerable responsibility in student advising, overseeing course development, or managing administrative or service responsibilities related to the instructional program, or special instructional initiatives. All of these activities reflect his or her role as an instructional leader.

## IV. PROCEDURES

### A. Review Procedures

1. Candidate submits the dossier to the Chairperson of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee (elected among members of the voting body as described below) according to the calendar established by the university; see section D below. Guidelines for organizing the dossier are clearly delineated in the University of Delaware Faculty Handbook (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/>).
  - Tenure-track candidates to the rank of Associate Professor will be required to include the 2- and 4-year peer reviews (i.e., reviews conducted by the corresponding Department committee and reviews conducted by the Department chair).
  - Continuing track candidates to the rank of Associate Professor will be required to include all available peer reviews. Dossiers that do not include these reviews will be considered incomplete.



2. Solicitation of outside peer evaluations follows the University guidelines. Solicited outside peer evaluations are always required for promotion. Although the number may vary by rank, every dossier must include outside peer reviews, written by individuals with established reputations in the candidate's field. These statements should analyze and evaluate critically the candidate's work and accomplishments. They also should comment on the candidate's potential for future development.
  - a. A candidate submits a list of names and email addresses of potential outside reviewers but the Department committee will suggest additional names. Consistent with the Faculty Handbook, the candidate will have an opportunity to comment on the departmentally generated list. A minimum of five (5) outside reviews of a candidate's record should be obtained. The list of external reviewers is approved by the committee. For CT faculty, "external" can mean internal to the University of Delaware but external to the faculty member's primary academic unit.
  - b. The candidate should provide an updated curriculum vita and written statements to the chairperson of the committee. The written statements are submitted before the dossier is completed (see timeline below) and should highlight accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service; the statements should focus on the candidate's primary workload area while providing additional supporting information in the remaining areas. The chairperson of the committee will send these materials along with a copy of the department's P & T document to the external reviewers.
  - c. The Chairperson of the Committee solicits letters of evaluation. Letters soliciting outside peer review of a candidate should request a current, truncated curriculum vitae (e.g., NIH biosketch) and a statement describing the reviewer's relationship to the candidate. Only outside peer reviewers *without* personal/professional conflicts of interest to the candidate should be selected. External reviewers that come from 'comparable' departments and/or institutions are generally preferred.
3. Composition of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The composition of each voting body is described below. Each voting body must have no fewer than 3 members.
  - a. The Promotion and Tenure Committee for tenure track faculty shall consist of all tenured faculty the Department.
    - i. All tenured faculty in the Department are the voting body for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor.
    - ii. All tenured Associate and Full Professors in the Department are the voting body for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.
    - iii. All tenured Full Professors in the Department are the voting body for promotion to the rank of Full Professor. If this voting body is fewer than 3 full professors, then the voting body will be expanded in accordance with the faculty handbook. In consultation with the full committee, the chair of the promotion & tenure committee will select the additional committee members.
  - b. The Promotion Committee for Continuing Track faculty shall consist of those TT and CT faculty members of the department who are senior in rank to the particular faculty member applying.

4. Department promotion and tenure procedures must be democratic. Certain rules must be observed. The department's promotion and tenure committee should be constituted and operated in such a fashion that due respect is given to the opinions and advice of all faculty, and that all deliberations are to be strictly confidential. The voting body will meet, discuss the candidate's application for promotion and/or tenure, and members of the voting body in attendance who reviewed the dossier shall, by secret ballot, vote for promotion, against promotion, or abstain from voting. Proxy (absentee) votes will be accepted only for unusual cases, e.g., sabbaticals, determined on an individual basis by the committee. The voting body is encouraged to consult with the candidate regarding additional evidence that might clarify the dossier.
5. The Chairperson of the Committee shall draft a comprehensive written report that reflects accurately the proceedings of the committee meeting, including the numerical vote, recommendations and the reasons for the decision. The report will be made available for all committee members to read and sign.
6. The signed report will be transmitted to the Department Chair for inclusion in the candidate's dossier in accordance with the university's timeline outlined below. When they arise, signed minority opinions will be forwarded as appendices. A copy of the report and any appendices shall be given to the candidate. Upon conclusion of the committee process, the Chairperson of the Committee will forward to the Department Chair the outside faculty reviews and external student/alumni letters for inclusion in the dossier.

## **B. Appeals**

Appeals are possible at every level, but must be made to the committee or administrator whose decision is being appealed. An intention to appeal must be given to the appropriate body within five working days of notification of the decision. An appeal includes: 1) a letter documenting the basis of the appeal, usually written by the candidate; and 2) a scheduled meeting with the appropriate person or committee. It is strongly recommended that the candidate attend the appeal meeting. Representatives of the candidate can also attend and participate in the appeal meeting. Appeals must be handled within two weeks, except under extenuating circumstances. The University Faculty Senate Committee on Promotions and Tenure will hear no appeals beyond March 1, and the Provost's Office will hear no appeals beyond April 15. Any appeals not heard by these dates must be carried over to the following academic year. (Rev. Fac Sen 2/98; 5/2016)

## **C. Dossier Preparation and Presentation**

### **Dossier Preparation and Presentation**

1. The candidate is strongly encouraged to consult with their mentorship team a regarding the content and preparation of the dossier.
2. The candidate should organize the dossier according to the pattern outlined in the University of Delaware Faculty Handbook (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/>). The Application for Tenure and/or Promotion form is available from the Provost's website.

3. The dossier must include the following introductory materials and those evidentiary material chosen by the candidate for inclusion.

### **Introductory Material**

1. **Contents and Guidelines**
  - a) Recommendation for Promotion Form
  - b) A table of contents
  - c) Copies of the University's, College's and Department's P&T criteria (must be the one chosen by the candidate if the P&T policies for the Department have changed since the time of hire. If promotion from Associate Professor to Professor is sought, the criteria in place at the time of the application must be used.)
2. **Application for Promotion**
  - a) Candidate's letter requesting promotion
  - b) A curriculum vitae
  - c) A letter from the department specifying the average workload(s) for the period under review. The percentages in this letter must correspond to the percentages in the letter to the external reviewers.
  - d) Candidate's summary statement, limited to two (2) pages, addressing teaching, scholarship and service
3. **Two- & Four-Year Reviews - Faculty Seeking Promotion to Associate Professor**
  - a) Reviews conducted by the Department P&T committee
  - b) Reviews conducted by the Department Chairperson
4. **Internal Recommendations**
  - a) The Department committee's recommendation
  - b) The Department Chairperson's recommendation
  - c) College committee's recommendation
  - d) Dean's recommendation
  - e) University committee's recommendation
  - f) Any appeal materials (appeals and rebuttals)
5. **External Recommendations**
  - a) A copy of the letter soliciting feedback from the external evaluators, which includes a breakdown of the faculty member's workload for the period under review, and a copy of the departmental P&T guidelines provided for use in providing the evaluation, must be included in the front of this section.
  - b) The list of the external reviewers who were nominated by the candidate versus those nominated by the department committee, and the criteria used to request from specific reviewers
  - c) Letters of evaluation from external reviewers together with supporting material; these letters will be numbered sequentially for reference.

**Evidential Materials.** The nature of supporting materials is largely the choice and responsibility of the candidate. The list below is a non-exhaustive, suggested set of evidentiary material; none specifically is required, and they are placed in no order of priority.

1. **Teaching**
  - a) Statement of teaching philosophy

- b) Peer evaluations that attest to the candidate's classroom and laboratory competence, knowledge of subject matter, organization and preparation, ability to stimulate intellectual curiosity and creativity in the classroom and laboratory setting. Evaluators may share their evaluations with the candidate who must include them in the dossier.
- c) Data from student evaluations (of the instructor and of the course), including class size, number returned, means/standard deviations or frequencies, should be presented in a tabulated format. The procedures used in administering the evaluations should also be described. These may not serve as the only basis for the evaluation.
- d) Verbatim copies of student comments from student evaluations. Note that all comments should be included.
- e) Solicited evaluations from former students; procedures for drawing the sample should be clearly described.
- f) Course portfolio: *One course* is selected for which the candidate supplies copies of typical course materials: syllabus, objectives, handouts, assignments and exams; demonstrating coordination of material in lecture and laboratory courses is expected; honors section materials should be included, if applicable. The course material submitted for evaluation should be a reflection of the candidate's own skill in the development of the required teaching materials. Any materials obtained from another faculty member, and not revised by the candidate, must be identified as such and will not be considered in the evaluation of the candidate's teaching skills.
- g) Graduate mentoring details
- h) Student performance on national standardized examinations in the candidate's teaching area; this information needs to clearly define the candidate's role in the teaching process
- i) Teaching awards
- j) Teaching grants
- k) Program/project grants. Note that if included here, cannot also be in "scholarship".
- l) Contributions to curriculum by demonstration of new course development, design or significant course revision or program development.
- m) Requests for/acknowledgment of consultation in teaching, curriculum/program development, etc.
- n) Continuing professional development in teaching pedagogy, or teaching topics related to the candidate's expertise.
- o) Listing of directed undergraduate studies (e.g., degree with distinction advisement, independent study, honors sections); directed graduate studies (e.g., thesis and research supervision, thesis/dissertation committees)
- p) Listing of the number of non-research academic advisees per academic advisement
- q) Publication in journals, book chapters, textbooks, poster presentations, and talks at meetings as they pertain to the candidate's area of expertise and courses taught. Note that an activity included here cannot be included in

another level.

## 2. Scholarship

- a) Statement summarizing candidate's scholarly activity program, including previous, current and projected focus
- b) Publication of refereed research articles, review articles, books, book chapters, technical reports, clinical papers, abstracts, computer software, and computer assisted instruction materials. A listing of either acceptance rates or impact factors for each journal is required to provide evidence of journal quality. Notation should be provided about the significance, if any, of the placement of the candidate's name in a co-authored manuscript (first author, last author, etc).
- c) Manuscripts accepted or in-press for publication. A statement of work documenting candidate contribution to each publication should be included; also should include where work was performed. Notation should be provided about the significance, if any, of the placement of the candidate's name in a co-authored manuscript (first author, last author, etc).
- d) All research grants funded/non-funded/submitted for review, to include grant reviews. In those grants where the candidate is a Co-PI, the actual amount of funds received by the candidate must be indicated. In addition, in any award, internally or externally funded, the candidate should state his/her exact role and percent effort, supported by the appropriate documentation.
- e) Presentations (clearly identified as refereed, invited, keynote, podium or poster) given at scientific meetings.
- f) Awards (local, regional, national or international) received in recognition of scholarship.
- g) Professional consultation in scholarly or clinical projects; examples of professional consultation may include but are not limited to review of manuscripts, review of grant proposals, book reviews, practice innovations, etc. (Note that if an activity is included here, it cannot also be included in "Service".)
- h) Non-refereed publications.
- i) Colloquia, seminars, conferences, lectures, etc. that involve non-research data but that contribute to the advancement of the candidate's field of study.
- j) Elected membership in professional honor societies or fellowship in professional organizations.
- k) Patents and entrepreneurial activities

## 3. Service

- a) Statement summarizing candidate's service activities.
- b) Evaluation letters from the Committee Chairperson or from those affected by the candidate's work and having knowledge of it may be sought in the case of especially significant or demanding activities.
- c) University Service
  - i. Departmental committees, recruiting activities, and special assignments
  - ii. Non-academic advisement of students (career, professional, or personal)

- iii. Participation in affairs related to student activities
- iv. College committees and special assignments
- v. University Faculty Senate, University committees, and special assignments/elected activities
- vi. Administrative appointments
- d) Professional Service
  - i. Chairing sessions at colloquia, seminars, and/or conferences
  - ii. Serving as an officer or committee member of a professional organization
  - iii. Editorial duties
  - iv. Review of abstracts or manuscripts (Note that if an activity is included here, it cannot also be included in “Scholarship”.)
  - v. Presentation of continuing education offerings
- e) Community Service
  - vi. Community service (local, state, regional, national, international), such as election or appointment to boards, commissions, committees, and other positions of leadership
  - vii. Invited lectures to community groups
  - viii. Community engagement
- f) Awards or recognition for service
- g) Requests for/acknowledgment of professional consultation in service activities.

## D. Timetable

### Promotion Process Schedule

The time schedule for the promotion process is shown below. Whenever possible, these deadlines should be anticipated and dossiers forwarded (with recommendations) at an earlier date. Although dossiers are due to the Department Committee on September 1<sup>st</sup>, the candidate may add additional information to the dossier at any time during the dossier evaluation period.

15 March	Candidate notifies Department Chair of intention to apply for promotion in writing. Department Promotion and Tenure Committee begins the process of soliciting peer evaluations.
1 May	Candidate submits CV, selected publications, written statements highlighting accomplishments (in scholarship, teaching, and service), and a list of suggested outside peer reviewers to the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee
1 June	A cover letter, CV, selected publications, written statements, and average workload during the evaluation period are provided to outside peer reviewers
1 September	Dossier to Department Committee and Department Chair.

1 October	Department Committee's recommendation to the Department Chair.
15 October	Department Chair's recommendation to the College Committee and Dean.
1 December	College Committee's recommendation to the Dean.
2 January	Dean's recommendation to the University Promotions and Tenure Committee.
15 February	University Promotions and Tenure Committee recommendations to Provost.
15 March	Provost's recommendations.

Revised and approved by faculty vote May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2013.

Revised and approved by faculty vote November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2015.

Approved April 2017

Revised April 2018

Revised and approved by faculty vote April, 2019.