

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCES

University of Delaware – College of Engineering

PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

June 2024

(Previous Revisions: November 1984, December 1995, March 1998, December 1999, November 2006, February 2008)

I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

The objectives of the promotion and tenure policies of the Department of Computer and Information Sciences are:

- to help ensure the excellence of the faculty,
- to clarify the expectations of the faculty with respect to promotion and tenure, and
- to help ensure fairness and consistency in the evaluation process.

In short, the goal is an excellent faculty in which each individual member is treated with fairness and respect. It should be understood at the outset that promotion (and also tenure in the case of tenure-track faculty) requires the candidate to do more than simply meet minimally acceptable standards in research, teaching, and service. Rather, in the case of tenure-track faculty, for promotion to associate professor and for the awarding of tenure, the candidate is required to demonstrate excellence in either research or teaching and high quality performance in all areas, while for promotion to full professor, the candidate is expected to have a national or international standing within the profession, and to exhibit excellence in research and excellence or high quality in teaching. In addition, the candidate is expected to have made service contributions that are commensurate with their rank. In both promotion situations, the promise of continued high level scholarship must be present. In the case of continuing non-tenure-track faculty, for promotion to associate or full professor, the candidate is required to demonstrate excellence in teaching and initiative/leadership with respect to the undergraduate program in computer science. In addition, the candidate is expected to have made service contributions that are commensurate with their rank.

While the criteria and procedures enumerated in this document establish as objective and equitable a base as is possible for evaluating faculty achievements, ultimately the recommendation made is based upon judgements that can and will vary with time, university conditions, individuals' backgrounds, and professional specializations. Nevertheless, it is the intent that these criteria and procedures be used to ensure that uniform and fair procedures be objectively applied to all promotion candidates, and that faculty members have sufficient opportunity to present their accomplishments, to suggest objective evaluators of their work, and to appeal decisions that they feel were not based on a full and careful review.

II. PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

This section enumerates the promotion and tenure criteria of the Department for tenure-track faculty. These same criteria also serve as the framework for periodic peer reviews of faculty.

A. For appointment to assistant professor

Appointment at this rank requires the doctorate or comparable evidence of preparation for a career in research and teaching. It is expected that the candidate exhibits substantial promise of future growth and accomplishment in research and teaching, and that the candidate be prepared to make appropriate contributions in the area of service.

B. For promotion to associate professor with tenure or for the granting of tenure to an associate professor without tenure

This section details the requirements for the following situations:

- Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor with tenure.
- The granting of tenure to an associate professor without tenure.

The remainder of this section applies to both situations.

The candidate should be in rank (at the University of Delaware or at a comparable institution) long enough to have accumulated a record that provides for a fair review. Prior work at equivalent rank at a comparable institution, is considered on the same basis as the candidate's accomplishments at the University of Delaware. The candidate must offer clear evidence of substantial scholarly achievement made after the awarding of the doctorate or other terminal degree and in a pattern indicative of strong prospects for future research productivity. If prior work done in another setting, such as a research lab, is to be considered, this will be specified in the offer letter.

The candidate should show excellent achievement in scholarship or teaching and high quality performance in all areas. In evaluating research, teaching and service, the following factors will be considered.

Research: While the precise mix of indicators may vary from one candidate to the next, it is expected in all cases that there be a recognizable pattern of excellent or high-quality research. In most cases, the primary indicator of the quality of the candidate's research is publications in refereed journals and/or refereed conference proceedings.

Other major indicators that may be (but need not be) present are: the publication of refereed research monographs, the publication of books or book chapters related to the

candidate's research, and the production of innovative, original computer hardware or software.

It is expected that the candidate will have actively engaged in the pursuit of external research funding when relevant funding is available. If such funding has been acquired, that funding is also a major indicator of the quality of the candidate's research. Other significant indicators that may be (but need not be) present are: Invited papers, presentations, colloquium talks at other universities and at research labs, and service on journal editorial boards or on program committees for professional conferences. Lesser weight shall be attached to non-refereed publications, unless the significance of such work is established through outside evaluations conducted by the department. The number of publications is secondary to their quality. Candidates are encouraged to identify a small number of key publications and to indicate the quality of the conference proceedings and/or journals, and, when appropriate, the number of citations and any other evidence which will assist the university committees in evaluating the impact on the professional community. The candidate should describe his/her contributions to co-authored work, as indicated in the Faculty Handbook (<https://facultyhandbook.udel.edu/handbook/4411-promotion-dossiers>, see A.A).

The candidate is also encouraged to provide a concise statement, usually of two or three pages in length, of the qualities embodied in these key publications and of plans for the future. These details must be part of the annotated bibliography document submitted by the candidate.

It is also expected that the candidate contributes to the supervision of graduate students as appropriate for his or her subdiscipline. Most often this involves serving as the primary advisor for PhD (or, in some cases, MS) students, and such supervision constitutes a significant indicator of the quality of the candidate's research.

The evaluation of all research activities is to be based upon the quality (and to some extent quantity) of the activities, the quality of the media through which the research is disseminated, and the opinions of external experts from outside the University.

Letters from external experts are crucial as they 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.

Obtaining contracts and grants through a peer review process to carry out scholarly research or engineering development, while largely regarded as molding promise for future work, also reflects upon the quality of those activities. It is expected that the candidate will develop and maintain active research programs. Clear evidence of the sustainability of this research is expected, in conformity with national trends, although specific funding levels will not be employed as a condition for promotion or the granting of tenure.

Teaching: It is expected that the candidate exhibits excellent or high quality teaching performance at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Teaching performance (both inside and outside the classroom) is measured by student evaluations of teaching, unsolicited student feedback, peer reviews, documentation of course development provided by the candidate, and solicited comments from former students. Candidates should also demonstrate a sincere effort in monitoring their teaching with the goal of overall improvement when room for improvement exists.

It is important that the candidate provide an in-class environment that facilitates learning and the sharing of ideas. The candidate should challenge students intellectually and relate course material to other fields, issues, or student experiences. During in-class interactions, the candidate should be well-prepared and demonstrate a deep knowledge and enthusiasm about the subject matter. The candidate should be involved with students both inside and outside the classroom, and should have had a positive impact on students' educational and career goals and their achievements.

The manner in which individuals provide an effective and rewarding teaching environment will vary. However, such an environment is typically nurtured by practices such as providing a clear sense of organization in the proper and timely preparation of syllabi, assignments, and exams, providing clear expectations of student responsibilities, providing timely feedback of student performance on assignments and exams, and being readily available to students outside of class. It should be understood, though, that teaching is a holistic activity that must be evaluated as a whole, and the presence or absence of one or more of the elements listed here neither subtracts from an overall excellent performance nor adds to an unsatisfactory one.

Service: Performance is measured by the quality and quantity of the candidate's participation on University, College and Department committees, and participation in the activities of professional societies. It is expected that candidates will have served on at least one committee - University, College or Department - each year and will maintain membership in their major discipline societies.

It is recognized that different faculty have different strengths and weaknesses. It is consistent with the intent of these criteria for the candidate to submit evidence of accomplishments beyond those of normal performance expectations. For example, awards, service and consultations to government agencies and professional societies, and editorships, although not required in the normal performance of duties, are highly valued by the Department.

C. For promotion to professor

Candidates for promotion from associate professor to professor should be in rank at the University of Delaware or at a comparable institution (e.g., university or research laboratory) long enough to have accumulated a record that provides for a fair review. If the candidate has

served as an associate professor (or equivalent) at a comparable institution, then the candidate's accomplishments at this rank at the earlier institution will be considered on the same basis as the candidate's accomplishments at the University of Delaware.

The candidate must demonstrate substantial evidence of sustained excellence in research, along with the promise of future sustained excellence. In addition, the candidate must provide evidence of excellence or high quality in teaching, and of an appropriate level of service. In evaluating research, teaching and service, the following factors will be considered.

Research: The guidelines in Section B to be followed.

Promotion to professor requires, in addition to the requirements for promotion to associate professor, demonstrated international stature in research and demonstrated significant accomplishments in teaching, professional and scholarly activities according to the criteria in Section B. This promotion requires clear evidence, including that obtained through the peer review process, of leadership in the development of computer and information sciences.

Teaching: The guidelines in Section B to be followed along with the following guidelines:

It is important that the candidate be actively involved in the maintenance of the Department's curriculum. Such involvement, may, for example, include the design of new courses or the continuing refinement of existing courses.

Service: The guidelines in Section B to be followed along with the following guidelines:

Leadership within the University may be exhibited by such activities as chairing Department, College or University committees. Leadership in the department may also be exhibited by providing active guidance to other faculty in the department. Leadership to the profession may be exhibited by such activities as serving as a journal editor, serving on conference program committees, serving as a national or international lecturer, organizing a conference, or serving on funding agency panels or advisory committees.

It is recognized that different faculty have different strengths and weaknesses. It is consistent with the intent of these criteria for the candidate to submit evidence of accomplishments beyond those of normal performance expectations. For example, awards, service and consultations to government agencies and professional societies, and editorships, although not required in the normal performance of duties, are highly valued by the Department.

III. PROMOTION CRITERIA CONTINUING TRACK FACULTY

This section enumerates the promotion and tenure criteria of the Department for continuing non-tenure-track faculty. These same criteria also serve as the framework for periodic peer reviews of faculty.

A. For appointment to assistant professor

Appointment at this rank requires a doctorate. It is expected that the candidate exhibits high-quality performance in teaching with the promise of future growth and accomplishment in undergraduate education, and that the candidate be prepared to make appropriate contributions in the area of service.

B. For promotion to associate professor

The candidate should be in rank at the University of Delaware long enough to have accumulated a record that provides for a fair review. The candidate should demonstrate excellence in the areas below, in accordance with the candidate's assigned workload:

Teaching: Teaching performance (both inside and outside the classroom) is measured by student evaluations of teaching, unsolicited student feedback, peer reviews, documentation of course development provided by the candidate, and solicited comments from former students. Candidates should also demonstrate a sincere effort in monitoring their teaching with the goal of overall improvement when room for improvement exists. Involvement in the maintenance of the Department's curriculum refers to the refinement or revision of introductory courses. Initiative with respect to the undergraduate program can take a variety of forms, including (but not limited to) significant revisions to course content and interacting with other departments to update and revise service courses as deemed appropriate.

It is important that the candidate provide an in-class environment that facilitates learning and the sharing of ideas. The candidate should challenge students intellectually and relate course material to other fields, issues, or student experiences. During in-class interactions, the candidate should be well-prepared and demonstrate a deep knowledge and enthusiasm about the subject matter. The candidate should be involved with students both inside and outside the classroom, and should have had a positive impact on students' educational and career goals and their achievements.

The manner in which individuals provide an effective and rewarding teaching environment will vary. However, such an environment is typically nurtured by practices such as providing a clear sense of organization in the proper and timely preparation of syllabi, assignments, and exams, providing clear expectations of student responsibilities, providing timely feedback of student performance on assignments and exams, and being readily available to students outside of class. It should be understood, though, that teaching is a holistic activity that must be evaluated as a whole, and the presence or

absence of one or more of the elements listed here neither subtracts from an overall excellent performance nor adds to an unsatisfactory one.

Service: Performance is measured by the quality of the candidate's participation on Department committees. We will also measure college and university committees when applicable, albeit such participation is neither required nor expected. Normally, the candidate will have served on a committee related to undergraduate education, such as the Department undergraduate committee.

Research: In most cases, the primary indicator of the quality of the candidate's research is publications in refereed journals and/or refereed conference proceedings. Other major indicators that may be (but need not be) present are: the publication of refereed research monographs, the publication of books or book chapters related to the candidate's research, and the production of innovative, original computer hardware or software.

Candidates are encouraged to identify a small number of key publications and to indicate the quality of the conference proceedings and/or journals, and, when appropriate, the number of citations and any other evidence which will assist the university committees in evaluating the impact on the professional community. The candidate should describe his/her contributions to co-authored work, as indicated in the Faculty Handbook

(<https://facultyhandbook.udel.edu/handbook/4411-promotion-dossiers>, see A.A).

The candidate is also encouraged to provide a concise statement, usually of two or three pages in length, of the qualities embodied in these key publications and of plans for the future.

It is recognized that different faculty have different strengths and weaknesses. It is consistent with the intent of these criteria for the candidate to submit evidence of accomplishments beyond those of normal performance expectations. For example, service on University committees, service on external committees, and receiving a grant related to undergraduate education, although not required in the normal performance of duties, would be highly valued by the Department.

C. For promotion to professor

Candidates for promotion from associate professor to full professor should be in rank at the University of Delaware long enough to have accumulated a record that provides a fair review. The candidate must provide evidence of sustained excellence in the areas below, in accordance with the candidate's assigned workload:

Teaching: The guidelines in Section B to be followed.

This promotion requires clear evidence of the candidate's involvement in the maintenance of the Department's curriculum which refers to the refinement or revision of core-courses. Leadership in undergraduate education can take a variety of forms but should be at a level significantly above the initiative expected for promotion to associate professor. Examples of such leadership include (but are not limited to) developing good assessment strategies, developing programs for attracting and retaining minority and female students in computer science, developing critical course technology for other instructors that significantly enhances the teaching and/or learning experience and developing programs that produce better advising in the Department.

Service: The guidelines in Section B to be followed.

Normally, the candidate is expected to have chaired a Department, College or University committee.

Research: The guidelines in Section B to be followed.

This promotion requires clear evidence, including that obtained through the peer review process, of leadership in the development of computer and information sciences.

It is recognized that different faculty have different strengths and weaknesses. It is consistent with the intent of these criteria for the candidate to submit evidence of accomplishments beyond those of normal performance expectations. For example, service on University committees, service on external committees, and receiving a grant related to undergraduate education, although not required in the normal performance of duties, would be highly valued by the Department.

D. For appointment to Instructor

Appointment at this rank typically requires the masters degree in computer science. It is expected that the candidate exhibits high-quality performance in teaching with the promise of future growth and accomplishment in undergraduate education, and that the candidate be prepared to make appropriate contributions in the area of service.

E. For Promotion from Instructor to Associate Instructor

See faculty handbook for promotion of Instructor to Associate Instructor.

F. For Promotion from Associate Instructor to Senior Instructor

See faculty handbook for promotion of Associate Instructor to Senior Instructor.

IV. COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE AND VOTING

A. Composition of the Promotion and Tenure Committee

For the purposes of eligibility to vote, the term “voting faculty” shall mean all full time faculty with a primary appointment in the department including all ranks of instructor and professor.

The composition of the Departmental P&T Committee (or the P&T Committee) is specified below and is different depending on whether the case is a Tenure Track Faculty Promotion or a Continuing Track Faculty Promotion.

For Tenure Track Faculty, the P&T committee shall be made up of all Tenure Track faculty with primary appointments in the department who are at or above the rank being sought by the candidate. Discussion shall be open to all voting faculty members in the department, but only members of the P&T committee as described above may vote on the promotion and tenure cases.

For Continuing Track Faculty, the P&T committee shall be made up of all voting faculty with primary appointments in the department, regardless of rank or title. All members of the voting faculty shall be eligible to engage in discussions and vote on promotion cases for Continuing Track Faculty. A majority of the P&T committee must be at rank or above to comply with the faculty handbook (Section 4.4.6). In the event that the majority of the voting faculty are not at rank or above, members of the faculty not at rank will be removed from the voting pool by seniority within the department where the junior most faculty will be removed first until a majority of the voting pool is at rank or above. Seniority will be determined by date of hire into a position with departmental voting rights.

The P&T committee will vote on the recommendation for promotion (and tenure when applicable) and the departmental report.

As per COE P&T document - Each member of the College of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee may participate in the discussion and vote on the candidates from his/her own department at the College level, but may not participate nor vote at the department level.

B. Composition of the Select Subcommittee for Promotion

The process of gathering relevant information, making the recommendation for promotion, and writing of the report, which will be voted upon by the P&T committee, will be the responsibility of a select subcommittee for promotion, henceforth called the subcommittee.

After a candidate announces their desire to seek promotion, the executive committee will choose one of its members to serve as the default chair of the subcommittee. The executive committee will select two additional members chosen from the Department's Voting Faculty to form the subcommittee for this candidate. Members of the subcommittee will be chosen to provide an appropriate combination of faculty ranks, and possibly some particular subfield specific experience and knowledge. The subcommittee members should be at or above the rank that the candidate is seeking. When appropriate, the executive committee can choose to nominate a non-executive member to serve as the chair of the P&T subcommittee. When possible, the subcommittee for a CT candidate is expected to contain at least one CT faculty member.

V. DEPARTMENT PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES

The Department will follow University and College policies on promotion, which can be obtained from the Department office. The text that follows elaborates on the departmental promotion and tenure procedures. The complete Promotion Procedures Calendar is given in Appendix I. Any faculty member may request to be considered for promotion by notifying the Department Chair and the Department Executive Committee no later than the date specified in the faculty handbook (April 30th as of May 2023 version) prior to the academic year in which they wish to be considered. It is recommended that a candidate should seek the advice of senior faculty on the appropriateness of such an application before submission, but the final decision on whether or not to submit an application rests with the faculty member (however, tenure-track faculty in their terminal year may not apply for promotion).

A. Tenure-track Faculty

Notification from individuals who desire to be considered for promotion must be in writing to the Department Chair and Executive Committee. By the date specified in the faculty handbook (May 15 as of May 2023 version), the candidates must submit a curriculum vitae, a research statement, an annotated bibliography of the candidate's research publications, copies of five of their major publications, and the names of at least eight external reviewers who are recognized authorities in the candidate's research area(s). Typically, at least five of these reviewers should be faculty members at rank or above from comparable institutions, and the majority should be full professors. While these reviewers may or may not be personally acquainted with the candidate, all of these reviewers should be able to write authoritative and objective appraisals of the candidate's accomplishments. Candidates must not contact potential reviewers about the promotion process at any time.

Following the receipt of a promotion application, the subcommittee, as described in Section IVb, will be formed.

Requests for at least eight external reviews will be sent by the subcommittee drawing upon the names submitted by the candidate plus those added - with the candidate's knowledge - by the subcommittee. The letter requesting such reviews will request evaluation of the candidate's research program and contributions to the field and will specify the rank to which the candidate seeks promotion. The reviewers will also receive the candidate's vita, research statement, major publications and annotated bibliography. The reviewers will be asked to analyze and critically evaluate the candidate's research and contributions in the field, to compare it to others in the same field at a comparable career stage, and also to comment on the candidate's potential for future development. Review letters will be treated as confidential to the full extent allowed by law.

It is suggested that the candidate obtain advice from senior faculty, particularly the Executive Committee and the Department Chair, on the proper construction of the dossier and for suggestions on ways in which it may be improved, including the addition or deletion of material. However, the final decision on the content of the dossier and the responsibility for preparing the dossier, rests with the candidate. All dossiers should be organized under the headings as shown in Faculty Handbook Section 4.4.11.

Following the receipt of the complete dossier and a sufficient number of **external** reviews (at least five), the subcommittee will prepare a written promotion recommendation (addressed to the Department Chair) and a copy will be forwarded to the Department faculty. The voting faculty, meeting as a committee-of-the-whole, except for the candidate, shall consider the promotion recommendation and the report. The recommendation will be voted on by secret ballot by the P&T committee. If the case is accepted, the report will be considered next in light of the vote on the promotion case itself. The voting faculty may instruct the subcommittee to revise and/or resubmit its report at a later date. Both the recommendation and the report must obtain two-thirds majority of the eligible voters in attendance. Neither the candidate nor the Department Chair is eligible to vote and neither is counted in determining the number of votes which constitute a two-thirds majority.

The subcommittee's final report will include a statement of the numerical vote, along with any signed minority opinions by department faculty. The final report will be forwarded to the Department Chair who will prepare his or her own evaluation of the candidate. A copy of both the report and the Chair's report will be forwarded to the candidate and to the Faculty. Within one week of receipt of the reports the candidate may respond to them in writing to the author(s) of the report(s). The candidate may also meet with the Department Chair and/or either the subcommittee or (time permitting) the Faculty. Based on the input from the candidate (if any is provided), the Department Chair and the subcommittee may choose to reconsider their reports. The Department Chair will forward the Chair's letter and the subcommittee's final report to the Dean, according to the approved Administrative Calendar for that academic year.

Only the candidate has a right to withdraw an application for promotion and this may be done at any step in the process. At any step in the process after the dossier and reports are submitted to the Dean, the Department may choose to add new material to the dossier, e.g., additional

paper acceptances and accompanying explanation, but only with the concurrence of the candidate.

B. Continuing Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Notification from individuals who desire to be considered for promotion must be in writing to the Department Chair and Executive Committee. By the date specified in the faculty handbook (May 15 as of May 2023 version), the candidate must submit a curriculum vitae, statement that touches on their philosophy and accomplishments in each of the areas in which they have non-zero workload (backed with appropriate evidence), the teaching portion of this statement should contain course materials that support the teaching philosophy, a summary of student evaluations that includes tabulated data for key questions compared to department means, if deemed appropriate a self-assessment narrative of this data, student evaluation comments, and the names of at least four external reviewers. While these reviewers may or may not be personally acquainted with the candidate, all of these reviewers should be able to write authoritative and objective appraisals of the candidate's accomplishments. Candidates must not contact potential reviewers about the promotion process at any time. For promotion to Full Professor, at least two reviewers should be external to the University.

Following the receipt of a promotion application, the subcommittee, as described in Section IVb, will be formed.

Requests for at least four external reviews will be sent by the subcommittee drawing upon the names submitted by the candidate plus any added - with the candidate's knowledge - by the subcommittee. The letter requesting such reviews will request evaluation of the candidate's case and will specify the rank to which the candidate seeks promotion. The reviewers will also receive the candidate's vita, a summary of the candidate's workload, a summary of student evaluations that includes tabulated data for key questions compared to department means, a self-assessment narrative if provided by the candidate, and a teaching statement with course materials that support teaching philosophy. Candidates whose workload includes 10% or more in areas of research or service must provide appropriate evidentiary materials. The reviewers will be asked to consider the provided evidentiary material and analyze and evaluate the candidate's case critically. The reviewers will be asked to compare the candidate to others in the same field at a comparable career stage, and also to comment on the candidate's potential for future development. Review letters will be treated as confidential to the full extent allowed by law.

It is suggested that the candidate obtain advice from senior faculty, particularly the Executive Committee and the Department Chair, on the proper construction of the dossier and for suggestions on ways in which it may be improved, including the addition or deletion of material. However, the full decision on the content of the dossier and the responsibility for preparing the

dossier, rests with the candidate. All dossiers should be organized under the headings as shown in Faculty Handbook Section 4.4.11.

Following the receipt of the complete dossier and a sufficient number of peer external reviews (at least 2), the subcommittee will prepare a written promotion recommendation (addressed to the Department Chair) and a copy will be forwarded to the Department Faculty.

The voting faculty, meeting as a committee-of-the-whole, except for the candidate, shall consider the promotion recommendation and the report individually. The recommendation will be voted on by secret ballot by the P&T committee. If the case is accepted, the report will be considered next in light of the vote on the promotion case itself. The voting faculty may instruct the subcommittee to revise and/or resubmit its report at a later date. Both the recommendation and the report must obtain two-thirds majority of the eligible voters in attendance. Neither the candidate nor the Department Chair is eligible to vote and neither is counted in determining the number of votes which constitute a two-thirds majority.

The subcommittee's final report will include a statement of the numerical vote, along with any signed minority opinions by department faculty. The final report will be forwarded along with the dossier to the Department Chair who will prepare his or her own evaluation of the candidate. A copy of both the subcommittee's report and the Department Chair's report will be forwarded to the candidate and to the Full Faculty. Within one week of receipt of the reports the candidate may respond to them in writing to the author(s) of the report(s). The candidate may also meet with the Department Chair and/or either the subcommittee or (time permitting) the Full Faculty. Based on the input from the candidate (if any is provided), the Department Chair and the subcommittee may choose to reconsider their reports. The Department Chair will forward the Chair's letter and the subcommittee's final reports to the Dean, according to the approved Administrative Calendar for that academic year.

Only the candidate has a right to withdraw an application for promotion and this may be done at any step in the process. At any step in the process after the dossier and reports are submitted to the Dean, the Department may choose to add new material to the dossier, e.g., additional paper acceptances and accompanying explanation, but only with the concurrence of the candidate.

VI. Amendments to the P&T Document

Amendments to the P&T document are possible and can be presented to the faculty in writing for a vote. A proposal to hold a vote to change the P&T document must first be presented for discussion at a faculty meeting. A proposal must specify the exact modifications to be made. Amendments require a 2/3 majority vote. Amendments specifically pertaining to the Promotion and Tenure of Tenure Track faculty will be voted on by the Tenure Track faculty. Other amendments will be voted on by the full voting faculty in the department. Determination of

the voting class shall be at the discretion of the departmental executive committee. If the proposal is approved (by simple majority vote), the vote on the change to the P&T document shall take place two weeks or more after the meeting. Any changes approved by the Department must then be approved by the relevant College and Faculty Senate committees before they go into effect.

APPENDIX I – PROMOTIONS PROCEDURES CALENDAR

(Please refer to our current schedule <https://cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/sites.udel.edu/dist/9/2591/files/2015/01/CISC-PT-1jsdune.pdf>)

Timeline	Activity
April 30th	Candidate gives the written notification to the chairperson of their intent to apply for promotion
May 15	Candidate turning in the preliminary materials
June 1-June 15	Letters requesting peer evaluation are sent
September 1	Candidate turns in complete dossier
September 20 - September 30	Meeting to discuss subcommittee recommendations
1st October	Dept. P&T committee recommendation forwarded to the Chairperson
15th October	Recommendation transmitted to the college P&T