**Faculty Handbook Update Log (September 2022-present)**

*In October 2022, multiple minor corrections were made to the Handbook, including updating hyperlinks, creating consistent capitalization patterns, making previously approved additions and deletions, making minor corrections and adding Oxford commas.*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Revision 10/2022:

[**3.1.14 Use of Innovative Technology and Online Course Formats**](https://facultyhandbook.udel.edu/handbook/3114-use-innovative-technology-and-online-course-formats)

Online course sections shall not be used to replace faculty, and faculty shall not be required to teach online course sections unless an emergency situation as defined by the University of Delaware, local, regional, or national authorities arises which requires that a majority of courses within a specified region temporarily be taught fully online.

Revision 12/2022:

**Article IV, Section B of the Constitution of the Faculty of the University of Delaware**

Each Unit, with the exception of the Graduate College and Honors College, shall elect a number

of senators equal to the whole number part of the ratio of ~~fifty (50)~~ sixty (60) times the number

of voting faculty (defined in the Constitution, Section III, Item 2 above) for that Unit to the

number of such voting faculty of the University, with the added proviso that each Unit shall be

granted at least two (2) senators. Should application of this recipe yield other than ~~fifty (50)~~

sixty (60) elected senators, the Senate shall review and approve recommendations to adjust

this total to yield ~~fifty (50)~~ sixty (60).

Revision 2/2023:

**3.1.14 Use of Innovative Technology and Online Course Formats**

The University of Delaware is committed to the use of innovative and online technologies to enhance and extend learning in undergraduate and graduate programs, both on and off campus. The University has a long history of academic excellence founded on ~~traditional classroom~~ in-person instruction, which should remain the ~~educational standard on the Newark campus~~ default modality. ~~It is increasingly clear, however, that innovative online techniques and courses can enhance learning for students on campus and extend learning to students at a distance. Therefore, online, and other technologically enhanced and innovative methods of instruction are encouraged when appropriate for increasing educational effectiveness.~~ However, when appropriate to increase educational effectiveness, access, or equity, online modalities and other technologically enhanced methods of instruction are acceptable. ~~For purposes that require it, the University defines "online" course sections or programs as having 80% or more of their content delivered online, which follows an industry standard definition. It is recognized that most courses currently incorporate some lesser amount of content delivered online, either as an integral part or as supplementary, and are thus considered to be "web-facilitated," "blended," or "hybrid."~~ As with ~~more traditional~~ in-person courses and programs, the development of online courses and programs must be based on sound educational principles. It is up to the faculty member and their academic unit (e.g., department and/or college curriculum committees) to ensure the appropriate incorporation of effective online techniques. As are all courses and programs, online and hybrid courses and programs shall be reviewed and approved by the Faculty Senate if they have not been approved previously as in-person versions. Additionally, online course sections and programs shall be subject to the same periodic review and assessment by academic units as are in-person versions.

Student enrollment limits on online course sections shall be determined by the academic unit, as they are for in-person courses. ~~Online course sections preferably will be taught by full-time University faculty to maintain educational quality and consistency. Online course sections shall not be used to replace faculty, and f~~ Non-full-time faculty shall not be used to replace full-time faculty in the assignment of online instruction. Faculty shall not be required to teach online course sections unless an emergency situation as defined by the University of Delaware, local, regional, or national authorities arises which requires that a majority of courses within a specified region temporarily be taught fully online. ~~On occasion, it may be desirable to employ entities outside of the University (i.e., third party contractors) to assist in facilitation of online programs.~~ Faculty must maintain responsibility and control over online course content and assessment. ~~The use of third-party contractors shall be restricted to student recruitment and retention, program marketing, design and technology support, and similar activities.~~ Third party contractors shall not be used for primary instruction or final assessment of student learning.

Revision 3/2023:

**Article IV, Section A of the Constitution of the Faculty of the University of Delaware**

A. The Senate shall consist of the elected Senate officers; the elected faculty senators of the units; the elected President of the University of Delaware Chapter of the American Association of University Professors; (Rev May 2019) the President of the University; the Provost; the Deans of the Colleges or Schools in which faculty have primary appointments; other senators appointed by the President and Provost from the University's Administration who hold faculty status; the Vice President for Student Life; two elected professional librarians; and ~~four~~ six elected student senators (~~two~~ three graduate students and ~~two~~ three undergraduate students) of the University. Each member of the Senate (hereinafter called a senator) shall have the right to vote. In no case shall the number of non-elected senators exceed ~~twelve~~ fourteen. For each upcoming academic year, the Senate office must be notified by August 15 as to the names/positions of those chosen by the President and/or the Provost for that academic year. (Rev May 2019) (Rev. of titles, 11/15/93; rev. Fac. Sen. 2/10/97; 9/15/97) (Rev 11/18)

Revision 5/2023:

**2.1 Academic Organization & the Roles of Academic Officers**

***Department Chairpersons, School Directors, and their equivalents*** are appointed by the president and provost for a five-year term upon the recommendation of a college dean. This section pertains to all department chairpersons, school and other academic directors, and their equivalents who are directly responsible for assigning faculty workload and performing annual faculty evaluations. Anyone being considered for reappointment shall be reviewed shortly before the expiration of their term, or sooner under special circumstances. A copy of the review policy for chairpersons and their equivalents must be made freely available to faculty in each college or school. After the required review is conducted, these appointments can be renewed for an additional five-year term, provided that a formal vote of the faculty is taken as described below, and the result is positive as indicated. Chairpersons and their equivalents may be reappointed more than once, provided that they are reviewed as described above and receive a positive vote by the faculty as described below before each reappointment.

A formal secret ballot vote of the faculty, within the affected unit (department, school, or program) is required for a dean to recommend the appointment or reappointment of a chairperson or equivalent administrator. Appointments or reappointments can be recommended by a dean only if the person under consideration has been deemed acceptable by a positive vote by at least a majority of those faculty in the unit who are eligible to vote as defined by the unit’s bylaws. After the conclusion of the formal vote of the faculty, the numerical result(s) of the vote of the faculty must be communicated to all the faculty eligible to vote and then to the dean of the college and by the dean to the provost upon the occasion of any recommendation for appointment or reappointment. Chairpersons and their equivalents are renewed annually by the college dean and serve at the pleasure of the president, the provost, and the dean. Therefore, the president and provost have the authority to replace chairpersons or their equivalents at any time after consultation with the appropriate dean, if such action is in the best interests of the department, program, school, or the University. If an interim chair or equivalent position is to be recommended or appointed by a dean for more than one year, then a positive secret ballot vote by a majority of the faculty in the affected unit who are eligible to vote is also required, and the numerical results must be communicated to all faculty eligible to vote prior to the interim appointment. Tenure as a faculty member, if held, is a separate right, and chairs or their equivalents may be either tenure track or continuing track and need not be full professors. (Rev. 3/2022, Rev. 5/08 Office of the Provost, AAUP, and Faculty Senate)

**4.4.11 Promotion Dossiers**

It is the individual's responsibility to present the best case for promotion since he or she is most clearly involved in the outcome. It is extremely important that the dossier be well organized and carefully prepared because superfluous or confusing information may obscure more than it enhances one's qualifications and achievements. 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's responsibility to include evidence of this work in his/her dossier and to clearly identify when and where this work was performed. (Rev. 5/10/07).

**All dossiers should be organized under the following headings in this order:**

1. Introductory Material
   1. Contents and Guidelines
      1. [**Recommendation for Promotion Form**](http://www.udel.edu/facsen/forms/RecPromo.html)
      2. A table of contents
      3. A copy of the University, college, and department promotion and tenure criteria
   2. Application for Promotion
   3. Candidate's letter requesting promotion
      1. A curriculum vitae
      2. Candidate's statement (optional)
   4. Two and Four Year Reviews for Faculty Seeking Promotion to Associate Professor
      1. Reviews conducted by the corresponding department committee
      2. Reviews or evaluations conducted by the department chair
   5. Internal Recommendations
      1. The department committee's recommendation
      2. The chairperson's recommendation
      3. College committee's recommendation (if any)
      4. Dean or director's recommendation or endorsement
      5. University committee's recommendation
      6. Any appeal materials (appeals and rebuttals)
   6. External Recommendations

1. List of the external reviewers who were nominated by the candidate versus those nominated by the department, and the criteria used to request from specific reviewers

2. Procedure for choosing external reviewers (See Section 4.4.12) (Rev 3/5/19)

1. Letters of evaluation from peer reviewers together with supporting material. These letters will be numbered sequentially for reference. (Rev. 5/2016)
2. Evidential Materials
   1. Teaching

Teaching is an extremely important factor in promotion decisions and one must incorporate into the dossier several kinds of evidence. Possibilities include:

* + Teaching narrative with self-evaluation and teaching philosophy.
  + Teaching innovation statement highlighting the candidate’s efforts to: develop new course(s) and content; utilize novel pedagogy in instruction; create and incorporate curricular content that connects the subject matter to societal impact through community engagement or innovation; instruct students on processes associated with creating, delivering and capturing value from new ideas, including technology commercialization; and/or engage students in collaborative efforts to solve complex real-world problems.
  + In-person classroom observation and evaluation in course(s) taught by the candidate, done by university faculty and/or staff, chosen for their pedagogical expertise.
  + A collection of recent syllabi, examinations, assignments, and/or other teaching materials. The candidate might annotate these materials to indicate what learning goals they address, how and why they are used, and their effectiveness.
  + Attendance in teaching workshops, possibly with reflections on how the workshop informed and improved teaching.
  + Incorporation of best practices (perhaps as evidenced in empirical studies) into the classroom.
  + Evidence of student learning (e.g standardized test results, samples of student work, pre/post assessment).
  + Testimonials from a selection of former and current undergraduate and/or graduate students. The procedures for drawing the sample should be clearly described.
  + Teaching awards (e.g., Faculty Senate Excellence in Teaching).
  + Sample comments from student course feedback (collected using institutional measures). The means by which these samples were selected should be provided.
  + Quantitative student course feedback (collected using institutional measures) properly tabulated and summarized. The procedures used in administering the feedback should also be described in context. Where available, comparable departmental measures should be provided. Student course feedback can reflect unconscious bias and may not reflect student learning. Such measures should only be considered in conjunction with other indicators of teaching quality. (Rev 4/24/19)
  1. ~~Scholarship~~ Research/Creative Activities
     1. Evidence of scholarly attainment ~~including~~ which may include:
        1. Published Materials. Books, refereed and other articles, conference proceedings, works of art, recordings, and other permanent additions to the candidate's field are to be listed in the dossier. For all of these works, the candidate should make clear the extent to which the work has been peer reviewed. For collaborative works, the candidate's contributions (e.g., percent effort, specific activities performed, etc.) should be clearly indicated. Different fields have entirely different traditions that determine the order of names associated with these works (e.g., alphabetically or by seniority) and the significance of the order of the names should be clearly stated in the dossier. The rationale for the choice of journals chosen for publishing one's work should be clearly indicated, as well as the level to which the works have contributed to the field.
        2. Intellectual Property, Sponsored Research Outputs, Use & Licensing, Entity Creation, Patents, trademarked works, trade secrets, novel designs, open innovations, startups, social ventures and other creative outputs reflecting the translation of the candidate’s scholarly and creative activities into forms for making broader (societal) impact may be documented in the dossier, if appropriate. Evidence for the societal or disciplinary usage/benefit of the work should be included to validate the significance of the candidate’s contributions.
        3. Awards and prizes.
        4. Lectures/presentations/performances at other institutions or conferences, specifying if these were local, national, or international, and whether they were peer-reviewed or not.
        5. Scholarly products of mutually beneficial community engagement may include, policy documents, publications in disciplinary and interdisciplinary referred journals, publications in community engagement referred journals, presentations and grants, curricular innovations, executive summaries, exhibitions, and performances.
        6. Unsolicited External Evaluations. There are other kinds of information that can be interpreted as external evaluations, although not of the same kind as derived through solicitation. This material, which should also be included in the dossier since it too describes the candidate's accomplishments, includes among others: articles citing the individual's work and the reasons for its importance; reprinting of articles or parts of books in collections of distinguished contributions to a subject, and so forth.
        7. Professional Activity Prior to University Employment. It is expected that for promotion, the candidate must offer clear evidence of substantial scholarly achievement made after the awarding of the doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree or postdoctoral work. The research involved for that degree or postdoctoral  work was one of the reasons for initial employment; promotion, on the other hand, must consider evidence of scholarship accomplished subsequent to that performed for the degree or postdoctoral  work. However, this  requirement does not mean that publications based on the dissertation or postdoctoral work should be totally ignored. Additionally, new publications based on previously collected large datasets may have merit in certain disciplines. Through mentoring, departmental P&T guidelines, letter of appointment, and the peer review process, each department is responsible for making clear to new faculty members what work will (and will not) count toward the promotion and tenure decision. (Rev May 2019)

Like research, any prior teaching or service plays its role in the hiring contract, the level of monies involved, and the responsibilities attached to it. Prior activity plays little or no role in the promotion except to form a meaningful context against which later development and accomplishments can be judged. There must be evidence of continuing productivity.

* + - 1. Prestigious Grants. The acquisition of research or other grants, such as Guggenheim or NSF awards, is obviously a testimony to a person's competence and reputation and should be described in the dossier. The candidate's contribution, and the funds coming to the candidate, should be clearly indicated, especially in projects with multiple principal investigators.Reviews of Published Materials, Performance, or Exhibits.
      2. Unpublished Material. Unpublished material may in some circumstances be an important indicator of a candidate's competence and achievements. Its evaluation, however, must be especially thoughtful. In particular, if it is to be a formal part of the dossier, it should be sent to outside reviewers for a critical assessment of its merits. The comments are meant to apply to unpublished manuscripts as well as so-called "in house" publications, such as research reports that are not subject to an external review process.
      3. Other Evidence of Scholarship Appropriate to the Profession. This type of evidence, if important for a department, should be indicated in the department's promotion and tenure document.
  1. Service
     1. Service includes innumerable types of activities rendered for the benefit of the department, college, university, community, profession, or nation. This may include a candidate’s efforts to advance the University’s mission by promoting a culture of creativity, innovation and entrepreneurialism (i.e., efforts aimed at promoting experimentation, creative expression and other activities associated with the creation, delivery and capture of value from new ideas). This may also include scholarly community engaged service that is mutually beneficial, co-created, co-implemented and co-disseminated. Willingness to undertake various types of service activities ~~work~~ and competence in performing them ~~it~~ are taken into account in the promotion process. Evaluating service is difficult. Promotion and tenure committees need to know when there has been an outstanding level of service that has taken appreciable effort or service that has been done in some way that can be noted as excellent. Other than that, the main concern is that a person has fulfilled his or her service commitment under the criteria of the academic unit concerned and that the unit is satisfied. Administrative responsibilities can be considered as part of the service component, but they may not be used as a substitute for accomplishment in a scholarly discipline. (Section 4.4.9 Rev. 5/2016)