

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA

Approved by the Faculty May 13, 2020

I. Process

In initiating personnel actions and assessing the qualifications of faculty members for promotion and/or tenure, the Department of Political Science and International Relations relies on the judgment of both the Department Chair and Personnel Action Committee (PAC), which includes at least three senior members working in, or familiar with, the candidate's field of expertise. For Continuing Track (CT) Faculty, defined as those individuals hired for non-tenure track lines that are renewable under the terms of the Faculty Handbook (Sections 4.1.6), the PAC shall be qualified to assess the faculty member based on assigned workload. It is the responsibility of the candidate to submit to the PAC and the Chair a file of evidence covering every aspect of his/her qualifications as appropriate to workload, and this file is carefully examined by each member of the Personnel Action Committee and the Department Chair.

A Tenure Track or Continuing Track faculty member has the right to apply for promotion at any time and has the sole right to advance or withdraw the dossier from the promotion process, as stated in the Faculty Handbook (www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-3-rights.html). Furthermore, an appeals process in compliance with the procedures and schedules stated in the Faculty Handbook (www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-8-schedule.html) will be followed as necessary. 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. The Department will adhere to the time schedule and deadlines associated with the promotion and tenure process as laid out in the Faculty Handbook (www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-8-schedule.html) for both Tenure Track and Continuing track faculty.

Tenure Track Faculty members are expected to strive for excellence in all three categories of criteria— teaching, research and service. The candidate is expected to exhibit strong qualifications in each category. Unsatisfactory performance in any of the three areas precludes promotion. Candidates will be evaluated in all three areas on the basis of their assigned workload during the period of review. Continuing Track Faculty members are expected to strive for excellence in the area(s) that constitute their assigned workload.

I. A. The Personnel Action Committee

To deal with all matters relating to promotion and tenure, in the spring semester the Department Chair and staff shall organize the election of a Personnel Action Committee (PAC) that reflects the candidate's primary subfield (American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Political Theory) and/or primary areas of scholarship. A ballot comprising the names of eligible tenured faculty in the candidate's primary subfield to be part of the PAC shall be voted by the faculty at large. The elected PAC will be in effect until the end of the academic year and will be chaired by the senior member of the group as determined first by rank and second by years of service in the Department. The PAC shall consist of at least three members. Members of the PAC can also be members of the Executive Committee. The PAC will

carry out appropriate tenure, promotion, and pre- and post-tenure reviews.

The PAC must always consist of faculty who are at or above the rank to which a candidate seeks promotion. In those instances where there are not enough faculty in the subfield or at the appropriate rank to fulfill this requirement, the Department will hold a special election to expand the committee's membership. As per the Faculty Handbook 4.4.6, the department may "solicit participation from kindred departments."

The PAC reviews the candidate's dossier and makes its recommendation in writing to the Chair. In making its recommendations, the PAC follows the guidelines outlined in this document as well as those in the Faculty Handbook (<https://facultyhandbook.udel.edu/handbook/446-departmental-responsibilities>). The PAC will solicit and review such additional information as it deems appropriate as well as opinions from all members of the faculty regarding the candidate's qualifications. Other than letters from solicited peer reviewers and those individuals in the promotion ladder, including members of the Department Faculty, any information added to the dossier by the PAC must be approved by the candidate (Faculty Handbook 4.4.4.)

Where external reviews are required, in compiling a list of potential external reviewers of the candidate's scholarship and/or teaching, the PAC will solicit names from members of the Department as well as from the candidate, while observing all guidelines specified in the Faculty Handbook (www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-9-dossier.html). The PAC shall provide a rank-ordered list of potential reviewers to the Chair, who shall solicit the reviews. The list must include a mix of PAC and candidate recommendations. For Tenured and Tenure Track faculty, as well as Continuing Track faculty, a minimum of five external reviews must be included in the candidate's dossier. As per the Faculty Handbook 4.4.12 (<https://facultyhandbook.udel.edu/handbook/4412-external-reviewers>),

"The purpose of obtaining letters from external reviewers is to assess the quality of the candidate's work in their field. To accomplish this purpose, departments should select external reviewers who are outstanding scholars in the candidate's field. The selection of reviewers should not preclude outstanding scholars from outside of the United States or not from Ph.D. granting institutions or departments. When justified, non-academic reviewers may be included. The quality and appropriateness of the reviewer should be the central concern in the selection of reviewers."

For Continuing Track faculty, reviewers should be in the area of the candidate's primary workload assignment. For CT faculty, 'external' is defined as anyone outside the Department and not necessarily outside the University.

All letters to external reviewers will insert language regarding the Department's criteria for tenure and promotion, as applicable to the candidate under review.

Recommendations of the PAC require a majority vote. The Department Chair may be consulted by the PAC but shall absent himself/herself from deliberations and not vote on the committee's final recommendation.

The candidate as well as the full faculty will be informed of the PAC recommendation. In the event of a negative recommendation, the candidate may appeal the PAC decision to the entire faculty. The faculty, all voting except the candidate, may overrule the PAC's decision by a

majority vote of faculty at or above the rank sought by the candidate.

For promotion with tenure decisions, only the tenured faculty may vote. For promotion to Full Professor, only Full Professors with Tenure may vote. For promotion of Continuing Track Faculty, all Tenured and Continuing Track Faculty at or above the rank sought by the candidate may vote. A majority vote of eligible voting faculty is necessary to overturn a negative PAC recommendation. Voting will be by secret ballot. In such a case, the faculty's decision stands as the Department's recommendation.

The Department Chair makes his/her independent recommendation to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and to the Dean of the College in writing. The Chair is responsible for transmitting both his/her letter and the PAC's letter to the College Committee and to the Dean of the College.

I. B. Appointment from Instructor to Assistant Professor

For those with Ph.D. pending hired on Tenure Track, recommendations for appointment from Instructor to Assistant Professor are automatic with the completion of the PhD degree, provided that the faculty member demonstrates ability and desire to contribute in all three areas of faculty responsibility.

II. Internal Pre- and Post- Tenure and Contract Renewal Peer Reviews

During years two and four of Continuing Track and Tenure Track faculty members' probationary period, the PAC, working in close collaboration with the Chair, shall conduct contract renewal reviews. The purpose of these reviews is twofold: to develop a Departmental recommendation on contract renewal and to assess faculty member's progress toward promotion. In each instance, information shall be solicited from the faculty member regarding activities and performance in scholarship, teaching, and service. Candidates will be provided with feedback and advice regarding their progress toward meeting Departmental expectations for promotion to Associate Professor. The fourth-year review is particularly important as a final opportunity for feedback prior to the sixth-year review and shall be more exhaustive than the second-year review. Reviews will be conducted according to the timeline provided by the College of Arts and Sciences and the University. The Chair will assist faculty in assembling the necessary materials for the reviews. The second- and fourth-year reviews must be included in the candidate's dossier for promotion, tenure, or contract renewal.

Post-tenure, and 8th year, 13th year, and subsequent five-year reviews for Continuing Track faculty, will be conducted in a similar manner to the above, under the responsibility of either the PAC or an *ad hoc* Review Committee, as determined in the Departmental Bylaws and this document, and within the time frames specified in the Faculty Handbook.

III. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

For promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, the Department expects Tenure Track faculty to seek excellence in teaching, scholarship and service, and Continuing Track faculty to seek excellence in their primary area of appointment. At a minimum, tenure Track Faculty must show excellent achievement in scholarship and high quality performance in teaching and service. There are multiple paths to achieving excellent or high quality performance in each of these areas. As per the Faculty Handbook (4.4.2.2),

“Faculty on the continuing track have a specific contracted primary area of responsibility (teaching, research or service). Promotion of CT faculty members is to be based on excellence in one role, aligned with the preponderance of workload during the period at current rank. For promotion, CT faculty members will need to demonstrate at least high quality performance in other areas presented in their workload.”

III. A. *Scholarship*

The primary considerations on this dimension are 1) the ability of candidates to conduct excellent research and disseminate the findings, and 2) the candidates’ promise as productive scholars in the future. Although the list of scholarly products is long, not all items are of equal weight. Books (including edited collections and co-authored monographs), publications in refereed journals, other scholarly articles, works in progress and presentations at professional meetings are to be taken as evidence of scholarly contributions to the discipline. Also to be considered are public lectures, invited presentations, and general scholarly reputation, as indicated by reviews of work and citations by others in the field. In the case of multiple authors, a candidate’s contributions should be clearly specified by the co-authors. Books containing valuable scholarship shall not be discounted simply because they may be widely assigned as textbooks. Consistent with the view that there are multiple paths to promotion, recognition must be given to the balance between the quantity and quality of a candidate’s scholarly productivity.

Excellent performance: To be judged excellent, a candidate’s record normally should include one of the following: 1) Publication with a well-respected, peer-reviewed press of a book reporting original research, plus additional published works which show evidence of scholarly productivity beyond the book; or 2) A minimum of 6 peer-reviewed journal articles, most of which would normally be in prominent peer-reviewed journals (or their equivalent), or peer-reviewed book chapters, most of which appear in prominent presses in the candidate’s area of specialization and most of which report original research. In both cases, consideration will be given to the balance between quantity and quality. Prominent journals include ones that are among the most respected in the candidate’s area of specialization. The reputations of book publishers and journals vary across time and as measured through different methodologies. Candidates are advised to direct their scholarship toward outlets with solid reputations. On the standing of publication outlets, both the candidates and the Department shall receive guidance from those department faculty in the candidate’s subfield, as well as the assessments of external reviewers. When the editorial and refereeing processes for online and new journals are commensurate with disciplinary standards, publications in them will be evaluated alongside established journals. Scholarly excellence for promotion to Associate Professor is also reflected in recognition of the value of the candidate’s work within the discipline, as indicated by external reviews. Evidence of sustained productivity shall be considered a hallmark of excellence.

High quality performance: Tenure Track faculty are expected to meet the criteria for excellence in scholarship. Continuing Track faculty shall be assessed according to their contract with the standard proportional to their assigned workload. To be judged high quality in scholarship, a candidate’s record normally should include one of the following: 1) Publication with a well-respected peer-reviewed press of a book reporting original research, plus evidence of continuing scholarly productivity; or 2) a minimum of 5 peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters, most of which report original research, with consideration given to the balance between quantity and quality.

III.B. *Teaching*

In measuring teaching performance the Department assesses a candidate's record in effectively planning and delivering a course of study to students. Teaching success should be sustained, not isolated, and should reflect a measure of versatility, i.e., contribute to multiple facets of the Department's and/or University's teaching mission. To document contributions to the instructional mission, candidates should provide evidence of some of the following: teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate level, within both the regular and Honors curriculum; courses that contribute to other academic programs including General Education and the array of interdepartmental/interdisciplinary programs within the College and University; periodically directing independent studies, undergraduate research, senior and honors theses, master's theses, and doctoral dissertations; grading graduate comprehensive exams; and serving on MA paper committees and PhD committees.

The Department will make a special effort to estimate the commitment, dedication, and general reputation of the candidate as a teacher beyond classroom performance, taking into consideration formal and informal academic, career, and pre-professional advisement and investment of time in advancing the welfare of students. It will also consider classroom evaluations by peers which consider the subject-knowledge, organization, clarity, ability to stimulate, interest, challenge students and the ability to lead discussions as well as lectures; student course evaluations administered according to the procedures of the program; syllabi, course portfolios and other materials. Additional evidence, whenever appropriate for individual candidates might include teaching citations, supervision of graduate students and Undergraduate Honors theses, and other supportive documents that the Promotion and Tenure Committee deems appropriate.

High quality performance: To be judged high quality, the candidate should provide clear evidence of significant and effective contribution to the teaching mission of the Department and/or the University. Candidates should provide a) a summary of the quantitative results of course evaluations over the period under review; b) a summary of students' qualitative comments from selected courses; c) the results of a random survey of the candidate's former students (currently matriculated as well as alumni) conducted by the Department Chair during the summer prior to the promotion process; d) one or two peer reviews by other Department faculty conducted during the period under review. The results of standardized course evaluations must be viewed in light of several variables that have been shown to affect student evaluations such as class size, grade distribution, instructor race, ethnicity, or gender, and the place of the course in the curriculum. In assessing student evaluations, the Department expects evidence of a rich learning experience.

Excellent performance: In addition to the above, for excellence in teaching, the candidate must demonstrate a well-organized, rigorous and professional approach to teaching as evidence of effective teaching. Indicators of such include winning one of the University's Excellence in Teaching or Excellence in Advising awards or their equivalents within the College of Arts and Sciences; teaching or curriculum development grants; innovations, such as new course development or new teaching approaches and/or technologies; documented service to the profession in advancing teaching; publications and conference presentations on teaching; and innovative use of technology. The Department will also take into account other teaching honors and invited guest lectures, as well as testimonials from former students.

III.C. *Service*

The distribution of service within assigned workloads should be appropriately recognized in promotion and tenure decisions. Service is measured in large part by the quality and quantity of the candidate's participation in Department, College, and University committees and assignments. Service to the broader community, such as speaking to civic groups and schools, and public service will also be considered, as will service to the profession, such as serving as manuscript or proposal reviewers, participating on journal or book series editorial boards, and holding professional association offices.

High quality performance: To achieve high quality service, Assistant Professors need only meet the expectations of the two indicators: 1) Regular attendance at Departmental meetings; 2) Participation in (and contributions to) all Departmental committees to which the candidate is either appointed or elected during the academic year.

Excellent performance: To achieve excellent service, Assistant Professors would perform service at a level above and beyond the criteria for high quality service. For example, a candidate may engage in public or community service beyond the University campus or may engage in national service to the profession.

IV. **Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor**

For promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, the Tenure Track candidate must provide clear evidence of an established reputation for excellence in scholarship and unmistakable evidence of high quality, sustained scholarly productivity commensurate with their years in rank, and sustained levels of performance in the other areas. Securing external funding in any area will be positively evaluated. A Continuing Track candidate must provide clear evidence of an established reputation for excellence in the primary area of their appointment. If a CT workload includes a secondary area, CT Faculty seeking promotion must show at least high quality performance in that area.

IV. A. *Scholarship*

The primary consideration on this dimension is scholarly accomplishments beyond those presented for promotion to Associate Professor. Books, publications in refereed journals, other scholarly articles, works in progress, and presentations at professional meetings will be taken as primary evidence of scholarly contributions, with consideration given to public lectures and invited presentations. (See the earlier discussion of these scholarly products). The nature, quality and quantity of published work since the last promotion should be **at least comparable** to that required for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. Research and scholarship output should be commensurate with the number of years at rank.

Excellent performance: The hallmark of an excellent scholar at the full professor level is a national or international reputation in one's field; hence, special attention will be given to the candidate's scholarly reputation in the discipline as reflected in the external evaluation letters and other indicators that may include, but are not limited to, internal and/or external research awards and receiving external research grants.

High quality performance: Tenure Track faculty are expected to meet the criteria for excellence in scholarship. Continuing Track faculty shall be assessed according to their contract and as reflective

of the minimum requirements above – that is, nature, quality and quantity of published work since the last promotion should be **at least comparable** to that required for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. In addition to meeting the benchmarks for publications stated earlier, candidates should have demonstrated steady scholarly productivity.

IV. B *Teaching*

The primary consideration on this dimension is evidence of teaching performance beyond that presented for promotion to Associate Professor. The instruments for the measurement of teaching performance for promotion to Full Professor are the same as those for promotion to Associate Professor: student course evaluations, peer reviews, unsolicited student comments, verbatim copies of qualitative student evaluations, testimonials from former students, and teaching and advising awards.

High quality performance: High quality performance directly parallels that for promotion to Associate Professor. Teaching success should be sustained, not isolated, and reflect a measure of versatility, i.e., contribute to multiple facets of the Department and/or University's teaching mission. (See the discussion under the section of promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor.)

Excellent performance: Excellent performance requires that a candidate demonstrate extraordinary performance, which will require evidence of the same performance referenced above, as well as evidence of a well-organized, rigorous and professional approach to teaching. Indicators of such include winning one of the University's Excellence in Teaching or Excellence in Advising awards or their equivalents within the College of Arts and Sciences; teaching or curriculum development grants; innovations, such as new course development or new teaching approaches and/or technologies; documented service to the profession in advancing teaching; publications and conference presentations on teaching; and innovative use of technology. The Department will also take into account other teaching honors and invited guest lectures, as well as testimonials from former students.

IV. C *Service*

High quality performance: To achieve high quality service, candidates for Full Professor shall have met some of the following commitments on a regular basis during the period of review: 1) regular attendance at Departmental meetings; 2) participation in (and contributions to) all Departmental committees to which the candidate is either appointed or elected during the academic year; 3) member or chair of at least one significant College committee (such as Promotion and Tenure, Educational Affairs, etc.) during the period of review; 4) member or chair of at least one university Committee or *ad hoc* task force created by the President or the Provost during the period of review; 5) contributions to community service—such as presenting lectures to community organizations beyond campus or student groups on campus, advising registered student organizations, or participating in public service (for example, serving on city, county, or state agencies, advisory boards, or committees; serving on boards of public interest groups that relate to the profession); 6) service to the profession (e.g., coordinating panels for professional meetings, serving on editorial boards of scholarly journals or book series, serving as officers in professional associations, reviewing manuscripts and proposals, serving as external reviewers for promotion and tenure cases at other institutions and so on); 7) receive the College of Arts and Sciences Excellence in Service award.

Excellent performance: To achieve excellent quality service, candidates for Full Professor shall have met several of the above commitments on a regular basis during the period of review, with distinguished service in at least one.

V. Contract Renewal of Continuing Track (CT) Faculty

In accordance with the Faculty Handbook, Section 4.1.6, Continuing Track Faculty shall be subject to peer review for most contract renewals. The 8th year renewal assessment does not require departmental peer review, nor does the annual review for CT faculty on “rolling” 5-year contracts. CT Faculty on such 5-year contracts are subject to full peer review every five years.

During the sixth year of probationary service, a full peer review will be conducted to provide a departmental recommendation on renewal for a subsequent three-year period. This review will proceed in the same manner and using the same processes as other internal peer reviews.

During the thirteenth year of service, a full peer review will be conducted to provide a departmental recommendation on renewal to a “rolling” 5-year contract. This review will proceed in the same manner and using the same processes as other internal peer reviews.

For all contract renewal peer reviews under this section, the CT faculty member shall be assessed in accordance with contracted workload. The peer review committee shall assess the extent to which the faculty member under review has continued to seek excellence in the primary workload area, and high quality performance in the workload area(s). The peer review committee shall provide a recommendation for or against contract renewal, with its reasons fully documented in writing. The Chair shall make an independent assessment and provide in writing a recommendation and the reasons for the recommendation. Both will be forwarded to the Dean.

At any time that a Continuing Track faculty member seeks promotion at the same time as a scheduled contract renewal review, the promotion review shall incorporate the contract renewal review, and a separate renewal review will not be required. In this case, the processes, timelines, and standards established for promotion reviews will be followed. A recommendation in favor of promotion shall be deemed to be a positive recommendation for contract renewal. However, if the PAC and/or the Department Chair recommends against promotion, they shall provide a separate recommendation on contract renewal at the current rank.