

University of Delaware Associate in Arts Program Promotion Document

Final Approval April 2019

AAP Faculty Vote Approval of Revisions (20-0): March 14, 2023

AAP Faculty Vote Approval of Final Version (18-1): April 26, 2024

Statement of Values and Mission

The University of Delaware Associate in Arts Program (AAP) is an interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary associate degree program that includes coursework in humanities, history, social sciences, natural sciences, and languages, and, therefore, employs a diverse faculty. With campuses located in northern and southern Delaware, the AAP serves primarily the state's students by affording them the opportunity to complete coursework for associate degrees while they complete breadth and general education requirements for the College of Arts and Sciences and the University. AAP students constitute a socio-economically and educationally diverse body of learners. The majority enjoy an uninterrupted transition from the AAP to a bachelor's degree program in the junior year, pursuing various majors on the Newark campus. Faculty who teach in the AAP commit a majority of their time and effort to preparing students to succeed in their transition to continue their education or to enter the workforce.

Promotion and Workload

This policy statement defines the standards and the procedures for promotion for AAP faculty of all disciplines. It governs the promotion of these faculty members to associate and full professor. The evaluation for promotion, like the evaluation criteria for contract renewal, will be based upon each candidate's contractual workload assignment, which may vary. However, as the AAP's mission requires that teaching be our priority, all candidates within the Program will be expected to privilege teaching as they prepare materials in the promotion process. As faculty of the AAP are all on the Continuing Track (CT), promotion in the AAP concerns non-tenured faculty, and promotion does not confer tenure.

Promotion to Associate Professor

Since appointment to the rank of assistant professor, the candidate will have demonstrated excellence in teaching, as well as high-quality performance in service. The candidate may also present evidence of scholarship that informs their teaching, service, or academic discipline, though such scholarship is not mandatory for promotion.

Teaching: Excellent teaching fully engages instruction and pedagogy. To be promoted to associate professor, candidates should demonstrate both mastery and innovation in the required pedagogy to connect with students and offer them a path to success. Excellent teaching includes a significant commitment to supporting students as they progress through the Program.

Excellence in teaching will be documented by:

- Teaching Philosophy
- Syllabi for courses taught
- Graded assignment(s) for courses taught
- Self-reflection regarding teaching, including reflection on and response to student feedback
- Narrative of teaching innovations
- Evaluation of teaching by colleague(s)
- Discursive and numerical student evaluations

Excellence in teaching may also be documented by:

- Annotated syllabi documenting changes over the years/semesters
- Professional development
- Written testimonials from former students
- Mentoring of students
- Teaching awards and nominations
- Any other evidence of excellent teaching

Service: Because it is crucial to the success of the Program, high-quality service contributions are required of candidates, who must demonstrate their participation on relevant Program, college, and/or university committees in addition to developing, executing, or participating in programming that benefits the Program, college, university, community, and/or their profession.

High-quality service contributions may be documented by:

- Curriculum Vitae
- Committee appointments
- Letters from community partners, colleagues, and/or the campus faculty coordinator, attesting to the merits of the candidate's service to the Program, campus, college, university, community, and/or profession
- Any other evidence of high-quality service

Scholarship: If the candidate has produced any kinds of scholarship that inform one's teaching, service, or academic discipline, the candidate may present evidence of this achievement, though it is not mandatory for promotion.

Scholarship in the Program is defined broadly and may include:

- Pedagogical or discipline-specific research and publications, including notes and reviews
- Conference and other public presentations
- Performances and readings
- Significant revision to curriculum and course development
- Grants and awards
- Directorships
- Chaired panels

- Editorial positions
- Development and/or leadership of workshops or trainings on pedagogy or service
- Demonstrated integration of published evidence-based practices into teaching
- Publication of teaching material and guides

Promotion to Full Professor

The rank of professor is reserved for individuals who demonstrate a reputation in the primary contracted area of responsibility, and who, since the promotion to the rank of associate professor, have demonstrated excellence in teaching and service. Candidates are also generally required to provide strong evidence of significant scholarly contributions in the primary contracted workload assignment. For those in the AAP, this may include pedagogical scholarship and any other kinds of scholarship that inform one's teaching, service, or academic discipline.

Teaching: Excellent teaching fully engages instruction and pedagogy. To be promoted to full professor, candidates should demonstrate both mastery and innovation in the required pedagogy to connect with students and offer them a path to success. Excellent teaching includes a strong and consistent commitment to supporting students as they progress through the Program. Moreover, candidates will demonstrate a commitment to curricular and pedagogical engagement and innovation, looking for ways to connect the teaching to a larger discourse.

Excellence in teaching will be documented by:

- Teaching Philosophy
- Syllabi for courses taught
- Graded assignment(s) for courses taught
- Self-reflection regarding teaching, which includes reflection on and response to student feedback
- Narrative of pedagogical engagement and innovation, which explains how teaching connects to the larger discourse
- Evaluation of teaching by colleague(s)
- Discursive and numerical student evaluations

Excellence in teaching may also be documented by:

- Annotated syllabi documenting changes over the years/semesters
- Professional development
- Written testimonials from former students
- Mentoring of students
- Teaching awards and nominations
- Any other evidence of excellent teaching

Service: Candidates for full professor must demonstrate excellence in service, which extends beyond that required for promotion to associate professor and should include the candidate assuming leadership roles within their service obligations. Candidates should document their significant engagement in developing and/or executing programming and initiatives that benefit the Program, college, university, community, and/or their profession.

Excellence in service may be documented by:

- Curriculum Vitae
- Committee appointments
- Leadership positions
- Letters from community partners, colleagues, and/or the campus faculty coordinator, attesting to the merits of the candidate's service to the Program, campus, college, university, community, and/or profession
- Any other evidence of significant high-quality service

Scholarship: Candidates are generally required to provide strong evidence of significant levels of scholarship in the primary contracted workload assignment. The Promotion Committee must refer to the individual workload agreement for each year of the candidate's performance to evaluate the quality and quantity of scholarship. As AAP is a multidisciplinary program that centers on teaching and service, scholarly or creative contributions take many forms and frequently have a practical, rather than a theoretical, focus. In addition to pedagogical scholarship, this would include any other kinds of scholarship that inform one's teaching, service, or academic discipline.

Significant high-quality scholarship is broadly defined and may be documented by:

- Pedagogical or discipline-specific research and publications, including notes and reviews
- Conference and other public presentations
- Performances and readings
- Significant revision to curriculum and course development
- Grants and awards
- Directorships
- Chaired panels
- Editorial positions
- Development and/or leadership of workshops or trainings on pedagogy or service
- Demonstrated integration of published evidence-based practices into teaching
- Publication of teaching material and guides

Promotion Timeline

April 30: Deadline for written notification (email suffices) to the program director and the chair of the Promotion Committee of the candidate's intent to apply for promotion.

Candidates are strongly encouraged to discuss their proposed candidacy with the program director and committee chair well in advance of this deadline.

May 7: Deadline for the candidate to submit to the promotion chair the following: a current curriculum vitae, letters from peer-review committees and from the program director since appointment or most

recent promotion, a list of ten proposed external reviewers at or above the rank being sought, and a list of no fewer than ten former students to be contacted for feedback.¹

May 30: Deadline for the Promotion Committee to vote on a recommendation to the candidate regarding the wisdom of seeking promotion at that time. The committee chair is to convey the numerical vote and the committee's recommendations in writing to the candidate no later than the day following the meeting.

If the vote is unfavorable, the candidate may appeal within five working days, and a new vote will be taken. Both the original vote and the vote on appeal (if any) are advisory. The final decision to seek or not to seek promotion at a given time rests entirely with the candidate.

June 15: Deadline for the candidate to submit to the promotion committee chair a dossier for external reviewers.

September 1: Deadline for the candidate to submit to the promotion committee chair and the program director a complete dossier. This dossier will be circulated to all members of the Program who are currently at or above the rank being sought.²

September 28: Deadline for a meeting and vote by all members of the Program at or above rank. The Promotion Committee will present each candidate and make a recommendation at this meeting in advance of a discussion and vote.

October 1: Deadline for the committee recommendation letter, which includes a final vote by the department promotion committee and the final vote of faculty who are at or above rank being sought. The committee chair is to report the vote in writing to the candidate as soon as possible after the meeting. If the vote is unfavorable, the candidate may appeal within five working days, and the appeal process will proceed as per university guidelines, as outlined in the Faculty Handbook, 4.4.4.

October 10: Deadline for a second vote following the candidate's appeal, if any.

October 15: Deadline for submission of the program director's letter.

Candidates should refer to the Faculty Handbook and the College of Arts and Sciences' Policy on Promotion for the deadlines beyond the departmental level, and the college-wide and university-wide promotion policies that apply to continuing-track faculty.

¹ External Reviewers: These ten proposed external reviewers should be at or above the rank being sought, and they should be able to objectively attest to the performance of the candidate.

The list should specify the candidate's relationship (if any) with all potential reviewers. The committee chair, in consultation with committee members, will then propose another list of ten external evaluators who could provide letters attesting to the performance of the candidate. Evaluators must be external to the Program but need not be external to the university. The candidate will be given an opportunity to comment on the names on the committee's list, and the committee chair will give great weight to the candidate's assessment of their suitability. Using both the list generated by the candidate and the list generated by the Promotion Committee, the committee chair, in consultation with committee members, will identify and receive letter-writing commitments from five external reviewers. At least two of the outside evaluators asked to furnish review letters will be from the committee's list but not present on the candidate's list.

Student Reviewers: The candidate must submit the names of no fewer than ten students from whom the committee may solicit letters attesting to the quality of the candidate's teaching, advisement, sponsorship of student activities, and other student-related work. The committee chair will also choose students at random from the candidate's class rosters, and the candidate will not be informed of their names. Letters will be solicited from an equal number of students from the candidate's list and from the Program's random list.

Except for the letters solicited by the Promotion Committee from external reviewers and students, only materials provided by the candidate will be included in the dossier.

² By September 1, the complete dossier will be made available to all AAP faculty currently at or above the rank being sought, who will read and assess the materials and vote on the candidate's case by September 28 at a meeting called by the Promotion Committee. This vote will be recorded in the Promotion Committee's letter.

Composition of the Promotion Committee

The Promotion Committee shall be a standing committee elected by the faculty that consists of three full-time AAP faculty members, the majority of whom must be at or above the rank being sought by the candidate. The three-year terms of the standing members should be staggered where possible to maintain continuity, and the committee members will elect a chair to a two-year term. Because the Promotion Committee is a standing committee, and the AAP has a small and multidisciplinary faculty, it may become necessary to augment the committee based on the candidate's discipline or the rank sought. Therefore, the committee members, in consultation with the director and the committee chair, may decide to add one member from the AAP faculty (or the Newark campus) who works directly in the discipline of the candidate or is at the desired rank. Under these circumstances, the committee chair will work with the program director to coordinate and secure the participation of an additional member from the discipline. Augmenting the committee by adding one faculty member in the candidate's discipline within the AAP or one faculty member within the candidate's discipline (or at the appropriate rank) from the Newark campus assures the committee will have the best possible opportunity to understand the candidate's disciplinary pedagogy, service, and scholarly contributions. This committee

composition will also allow both the institutional memory that a standing committee provides and the flexibility to address each candidate fairly.

Confidentiality

Confidentiality is of the essence in carrying out promotion evaluations, and information is to be conveyed to the candidate only by the committee chair. This stricture holds true for preliminary reviews in the spring as well as for binding votes in the fall, and it extends to discussions at committee meetings, numerical votes, and all other aspects of the promotion process. Although it may sometimes be necessary for faculty and committee members to discuss promotion questions in venues other than official meetings, the times and places for such discussions must be selected with due regard for the privacy of the candidates and the evaluators.