

**PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES:
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
(revision approved December 2006)**

The University of Delaware Faculty Handbook, Section 4: Personnel Policies for Faculty, Promotion and Tenure, governs the University Promotion and Tenure process. That document states (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-1-facpt.html>):

Departments, units, and colleges may make additions to and clarifications of this document to address their special circumstances. These elaborations, which must be approved by the University Committee on Promotions and Tenure and by the Provost, will constitute the departmental document.

Departmental documents should also include the procedure for choosing the departmental promotion and tenure committee and should specify required levels of achievement for each rank, such as excellence in research or teaching or in both. Appropriate modes of scholarly publication may also be specified.

In this context, the basic objectives of the Department's promotion and tenure criteria and procedures are to establish and maintain faculty excellence, to treat candidates with fairness, decency, and respect, and to accomplish these objectives on a basis that is roughly comparable to the other divisions of the University. To avoid redundancy and confusion, this document contains only those elaborations to the faculty handbook that are unique to the Department of Business Administration. It is the responsibility of the candidate to familiarize him/herself with the procedures detailed in the University Faculty Handbook (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-promtenure.html>). The preamble of that document outlines the roles of the various faculty committees and university administrators (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-1-facpt.html>), along with the specific responsibilities of the Departments.

I. STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION

The uniqueness of the Department of Business Administration derives from the fact that the faculty teaches, conducts research, consults, and interacts not only with students and other academicians, but also with business, government, and community groups. The Department is highly multidisciplinary. As such, there is a variety of scholarly outlets appropriate for faculty research. The faculty teaches in a number of programs, including professional and executive programs, and in many different formats. Because of the breadth of professional disciplines we must serve, and the necessity of promoting the Department and College among the university, business, and government communities, we consider an array of activities as critical to our mission.

Consistent with the University Faculty Handbook, Minimum Standards for Promotion (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-2-standards.html>), the Department P&T Committee and the Department Chairperson will base their promotion and/or tenure recommendations on the following areas of evaluation and performance requirements by rank.

A. Areas of Evaluation

Scholarship includes the creation and dissemination of new concepts or methodologies for problem solving in business, government and not-for-profit organizations. Testing and validation of such concepts and methodologies, studies of interactions between society and business, and other efforts which advance knowledge of organizational administration, are also

included under scholarship.

Teaching includes communication of professional knowledge, insights, concepts, and skills. It also includes guidance in the structuring of a study program for students' professional development. Effective teaching is marked by relevance, soundness, rigor, and depth.

Service includes substantive contributions to the operations of the Department, College, University, profession, government, business organizations, and not-for-profit institutions.

B. Performance Requirements by Rank

The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee will adhere as closely as possible to the following guidelines in making its recommendations to the Chairperson. However, we recognize that unique circumstances will arise. The Committee will treat each case on its own merits, noting in the recommendations when special circumstances exist.

Assistant Professor:

Initial tenure-track appointment is typically at the level of Assistant Professor. The University Faculty Handbook defines minimal requirements for promotion to this rank under Section 4, Personnel Policies for Faculty, Promotion and Tenure. In recommending promotion to this rank, the Department of Business Administration follows these University requirements.

Promotion to Associate Professor:

To be promoted to Associate Professor in the Department of Business Administration, the candidate's record must be evaluated as "**excellent**" in scholarship, and at least "**high quality**" in teaching and service. All promotions to associate professor require excellence in scholarship because assistant professors are hired with this expectation, and they are provided with ample resources and opportunities for its realization.

In judging the value of a candidate's scholarly contribution, the quality of work is most important. To be rated as "**excellent**" in scholarship a candidate 1) must have established a significant research program, which is normally evidenced by publication in the leading journal(s) in the candidate's field, as part of a record of publications in recognized refereed journals (see Section V-A); 2) should have received strong support from the external reviewers; and 3) should have provided evidence that the flow of scholarly contributions will continue beyond promotion. Although single authored publications are not required, candidates who present a record largely composed of multi-authored publications must carefully document their contribution to this work.

Publications completed prior to joining the Department of Business Administration, other than that required for completion of the candidate's degree, can support the case for promotion and tenure, provided that productivity since the date of appointment has been at a level commensurate with the promotion guidelines specified in this document.

The effectiveness of a candidate's teaching is evaluated with respect to soundness, rigor, quality, depth, and applicability of course material to the level of the students. A case for a "**high quality**" rating in teaching must be documented and supported with strong evidence from several teaching categories listed in section V-B of this document.

The service category is important, and includes activities that benefit the university, the community, and/or the profession. In evaluating service, the quantity and the quality of a candidate's contribution is taken into account. To receive a rating of "high quality" in service, a candidate must demonstrate that he or she has effectively discharged assigned service responsibilities.

Promotion to Professor:

Promotion to this rank requires sustained high quality performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. In evaluating a candidate for this rank, the committee employs demanding standards, and requires continued achievement beyond that necessary for promotion to Associate Professor.

To be promoted to Professor in the Department of Business Administration, the candidate's record must be considered at least "**high quality**" in all categories and "**excellent**" in either scholarship or teaching. In the application for promotion, the candidate may identify the area that he or she feels is worthy of an "**excellent**" rating. If this is done, the candidate should make a clear argument for such a rating.

To be rated as "**excellent**" in scholarship a candidate 1) must have established and maintained a significant research program, which is normally evidenced by publication in the leading journals in the candidate's field, as part of a continuing flow of numerous publications in recognized refereed journals (or their equivalent); 2) should have received strong support from the external reviewers; 3) should have provided evidence that the high flow of quality scholarly contributions will continue beyond promotion; and 4) should have provided evidence of an established reputation in the his/her discipline.

For a rating of "**high quality**" in scholarship, a candidate 1) must have demonstrated a commitment to scholarly research as evidenced by a continuing flow of publications in recognized refereed journals (or their equivalent); 2) should have received positive external reviews; and 3) should have provided clear indications that scholarly research will continue following a positive promotion decision. Although single authored publications are not required, candidates who present a record largely composed of multi-authored publications must carefully document their contribution to this work.

To be rated as "**excellent**" in teaching, a candidate must have achieved a consistent and continuing record of outstanding teaching. The effectiveness of a candidate's teaching should be evaluated with respect to soundness, rigor, quality, depth, and applicability of course material to the level of the students. In addition, a candidate should have demonstrated initiative in the teaching area, and continuing concern for the success of the department's teaching mission. A case for "**excellent**" teaching must be thoroughly documented with exceptionally strong evidence from several of the teaching categories listed in section V-B.

Similarly, a case for "**high quality**" teaching should be documented and supported with strong evidence from several teaching categories.

The service category is important. To receive a rating of "**high quality**" in service, a candidate must have demonstrated initiative and commitment in the performance of

assigned service responsibilities.

II. CANDIDATE'S RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Department of Business Administration adheres to all the rights and responsibilities of the candidate for promotion and tenure, as specified in the University Faculty Handbook Section 4. D. 3 (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-3-rights.html>). That section details the candidate's responsibilities, a schedule for application for promotion, and the candidate's rights to appeal recommendations at all levels of the promotion process. It also specifies the confidentiality of the promotion process and dossier. The candidate is responsible for meeting the deadlines for application and preparation of the dossier, as stated in the Faculty Handbook (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-8-schedule.html>). The dossier must be completed following the outline provided in the Faculty Handbook (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-9-dossier.html>), with the appropriate evidentiary material, as outlined in the Faculty Handbook and Section V of this document. It must be delivered to the Department office by the date stated in the schedule. The required application form is included as a link in the Promotion Dossier outline (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/PromotionForm.pdf>).

The candidate may add evidential material to the dossier after the submission deadline. This material must be clearly marked as supplemental, dated as of the day added, and placed in a separate supplemental section. The candidate may not otherwise alter the information that has been previously included in the dossier, and considered in the evaluation process.

III. DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSIBILITIES

The Department of Business Administration adheres to the department's responsibilities, as set forth in the University Faculty Handbook, (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-4deptresp.html>). The criteria for promotion are set forth in the preceding Section I. The procedures particular to the Department of Business Administration are detailed below. The Promotion and Tenure Committee must consider, but is not restricted to, the information included in the dossier. However, no information will be solicited from other sources without the candidate's knowledge.

A. Completion of the Dossier and solicitation of outside review.

Because the Department of Business Administration is multidisciplinary, we are organized into areas based on discipline. Each Area has a faculty Head, who is in the best position to assist with the preparation of a candidate's dossier. Department procedures rely on the candidate's Area Head (or other representatives from the candidate's area appointed by the P&T Committee in the case of the Area Head's absence) to facilitate preparation of the dossier, as detailed below.

1. Scholarship Peer Review.

Following the procedures specified in evidential materials for scholarship section of the Faculty Handbook (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-9-dossier.html>), the Department implements the following procedure:

- a) The candidate provides a list of several potential external reviewers. This list cannot contain anyone with whom the candidate has previously worked, graduate advisors, or individuals with whom the candidate has had a close personal relationship. The candidate may not at any time contact potential reviewers regarding the review.

- b) Faculty in the candidate's area provides a list of additional potential reviewers.
- c) The candidate has an opportunity to comment on any of the potential reviewers.
- d) A department representative, usually the Area Head for the candidate's area, then attempts to contact and obtain commitments from 6 potential reviewers (when possible, approximately half from the candidate's list, and half from the department list).
- e) The Department Chair sends a letter (see Appendices 1a &b) to each committed reviewer, along with the candidate's CV, and five samples of scholarly work provided by the candidate.

The Department will place the external review letters in the appropriate section of the candidate's dossier (Section 1, D) organized as follows:

A. Introductory Materials

- 1 Final list of potential reviewers, noting which names were suggested by the candidate
- 2 A memo from the candidate, with any comments the candidate has about the potential reviewers.
- 3 Copy of the cover letter sent to reviewers (See Appendices 1a & b of this document).

B. External Review Letters (6), each separated with a tab and numbered sequentially for reference.

- 1 Letter
- 2 Reviewer's CV

This section of the Dossier is to be held in confidence, and will be removed prior to returning the Dossier to the candidate.

2. Teaching Peer Review

In accordance with the Faculty Handbook, <http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-9-dossier.html>) paragraph III. A. 2, the candidate's Area Head, as a representative of the Promotion and Tenure committee, will solicit two faculty peer reviews of the candidate's teaching. The reviewers may include faculty within the candidate's area, as well as faculty from other disciplines. The peer review normally includes an evaluation of the candidate's course portfolio (e.g. objectives, requirements, and materials), and a classroom visitation. The purpose of the peer evaluation is to assess such factors as pedagogical skill, knowledge of the subject matter, organization and preparation, ability to communicate course material to students and to stimulate intellectual curiosity, effort devoted to teaching, and contributions to the curriculum (e.g., through the development of new courses).

The department will insert these reviews in the Dossier under a separate tab in section 1. D. This section of the Dossier will be held confidential, and will be removed prior to returning the Dossier to the candidate.

3. Teaching: Student Comments

The Department of Business Administration solicits comment from past students. The procedure is as follows:

- 1 Check Student Information Services for courses taught by the candidate for the past five years.
- 2 Give the list to the candidate to verify that all courses have been listed.
- 3 Randomly pick three students from each course taught by the professor, making sure that there is no duplication.
- 4 Send out a letter to each student requesting input (Letter is included in Appendix 2).
- 5 If a letter is returned for a bad address, select another student from that course, and send the letter.
- 6 If the response rate is not adequate, reminder letters are sent out to students that have not responded.

The department will place the student letters under a separate tab in the Dossier under section 1. D.

IV. PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

Preamble: Serving on the Promotion and Tenure Committee is one of the most important responsibilities of a tenured faculty member. These procedures are designed to insure that all cases that come before the Committee are handled in a professional and objective manner.

A. Committee Chairperson:

The Committee shall be chaired by a full professor, if available. The Chairperson for the new academic year shall be elected at a spring meeting of the previous academic year. In the event that no full professor is available, an associate professor may be elected to serve as chair.

B. Committee Composition:

The P&T Committee is composed of all tenured faculty members within the Department of Business Administration at or above the rank to which the candidate is applying for promotion. Tenured faculty members on leave are exempted from participation, but may elect to participate. In the event that there are fewer than three faculty members of qualifying rank, the committee shall appoint a faculty member from another department at the appropriate rank (e.g. full professor to review promotion to professor).

C. Schedule:

The Committee shall not be rushed to complete its deliberations. Thus, a series of meetings shall be scheduled and published to members of the Committee, and meetings shall be adjourned without action if a quorum is lost.

D. Absences:

With the exception of faculty members on sabbatical or leave of absence, all members are expected to attend all meetings of the Committee. Meetings shall be scheduled at a time that all members can attend. Faculty members on sabbatical or leave of absence are eligible to attend Committee meetings, and to vote.

E. Quorum:

To conduct business, a quorum is necessary. A quorum is defined as 80 percent of the tenured

faculty members in the Department of Business Administration who are not on sabbatical or leave of absence. If a faculty member on sabbatical or leave elects to attend a meeting, he/she shall be added to the list of eligible tenured faculty members in determining the 80% quorum requirement.

F. Preparation and Discussion:

All Committee members should be fully prepared prior to the Committee meetings. The discussion will begin with an objective review of the candidate's case by a faculty member from the candidate's area, usually the Area Head. Committee members are encouraged to express their views candidly. Each member of the P&T committee makes a decision dictated by his/her own conscience, based on her/his own independent evaluation of the evidence presented in the dossier, and on discussions during the meeting. For purposes of clarification, the Committee may seek additional information about a candidate's qualifications.

G. Criteria:

All candidates shall be evaluated on the basis of the approved Promotion and Tenure Criteria of the Department of Business Administration.

H. Vote:

Following open discussion, any member of the committee can make a motion to open the vote. The motion will summarize the committee discussion, and identify the criteria upon which the vote in favor or against promotion is to be made. If no one advances a motion in favor of promotion, then a motion to deny promotion is made, and the rationale for the denial is specified. The motion must be seconded to open the vote, and three quarters of those present must agree to vote before a vote is taken. A secret paper ballot vote will be taken. The options are:

- Agree with the stated motion
- Disagree with the stated motion
- Abstain

I. Confidentiality:

Meetings of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are open only to members of the Committee. All deliberations are confidential. There shall be no communication other than the written recommendation(s), with these exceptions:

- A member of the Committee, generally a tenured faculty member in the candidate's academic area, may be authorized and instructed to convey information orally to the candidate.
- The Chairperson of the Committee or a Committee member designated by the Committee Chairperson is permitted to communicate the vote orally to the Department Chairperson.

J. Committee recommendation:

The committee is responsible for clearly communicating, via a memo inserted in the Dossier, its vote and a thorough rationale for this vote, in accordance with the Faculty Handbook (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-4-deptresp.html>). The Chairperson of the committee is responsible for assuring that the recommendation of the P&T committee is prepared, and that all members present for the discussion and vote have signed the letter. The Chairperson may delegate

the drafting of the letter to the candidate's Area Head, or another member of the candidate's discipline if the Area Head is not available. However, it is the Committee Chairperson's responsibility to assure that the letter is completed, and inserted in the candidate's dossier. Should they arise, signed minority opinions may be forwarded as appendices to the Department Committee's recommendation. The Committee Chair must also indicate the committee's recommendation on the candidate's application for promotion.

V. PROMOTION DOSSIER: EVIDENTIAL MATERIALS

Evidential Materials appropriate for inclusion in the Dossier are outlined in the Faculty Handbook (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-9-dossier.html>). This section identifies additional material, and how the evaluation and interpretation of that material may be unique to the Department of Business Administration.

It is important to note that in all three of the performance evaluation areas, faculty in Business Administration interact with individuals and organizations at all levels of age and experience-- students, business managers, government officials, and other academicians. Evaluators will take this into account in weighing the evidence presented in the dossier. The following are suggested as examples of the kinds of evidence the candidate may submit to document accomplishment in the three evaluation areas. The evidence can originate from undergraduate and/or graduate students, individuals from business and/or government, and/or other academicians.

A. Evidence of Scholarly Accomplishment

Scholarship activities fall into the following two categories, ranked in order of importance:

Category I: Scholarly Publications

The most important indicators of a faculty member's achievements in scholarship are:

- Papers published in refereed professional journals, or in refereed edited volumes. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide evidence of the quality of these journals and volumes.
- Scholarly books and monographs published.
- Impact of a faculty member's work (e.g., citations, reprinting in edited volumes, etc.).

Category II: Other

Indicators of less importance are

- Invited chapters in books.
- Papers published in the proceedings of professional meetings.
- Papers presented at professional meetings.

For the most part, presentations and proceeding papers should eventually lead to scholarly publications, which would then receive credit under Category I. Thus, they receive little credit in this category.

Presentations to departmental colleagues and graduate students receive no separate credit in the scholarship category; however, they often provide evidence helpful in judging the quality of a faculty member's work. Likewise, professional service activities (e.g., organizing sessions at

professional meetings, serving on editorial boards of professional journals, etc.) receive no credit in the research category; yet, when these activities are highly visible, they offer additional evidence of a faculty member's reputation and standing in the profession.

The preceding categories are not necessarily exhaustive. In evaluating scholarship, the Committee considers all pertinent evidence of a candidate's contribution to the department's scholarly mission, even though it may not fit neatly into any of the foregoing categories.

B. Evidence of Teaching Accomplishment

Required Evidence - Student Course Evaluations

Candidates must present a semester by semester summary of course evaluation data for each course taught. In presenting course evaluations, candidates may submit any comparative information they deem appropriate. If the candidate has taught one or more undergraduate or graduate core courses, ratings of each of these core courses should be compared to the ratings received by other tenure track faculty teaching the same core course. Because individual course evaluations are confidential, the Department Chair will provide to the candidate comparative data for inclusion in the dossier.

Because student course evaluations measure teaching performance imperfectly, highly positive scores on these evaluations are not sufficient for a rating of "excellent". Moreover, highly positive scores on student course evaluations are not required for a rating of "excellent", provided the other forms of evidence are especially strong and convincing. For a rating of "high quality" in teaching, it is expected that student course evaluations be consistent with scores achieved by colleagues in comparable courses. However, if the other forms of evidence are sufficiently compelling, a rating of "high quality" can be justified, even when the scores on a candidate's course evaluations fall below that which is typical in the department.

Optional Supplementary Evidence (listed in no particular order)

- Publications related to teaching (e.g., textbooks, cases, etc.).
- New course development.
- Teaching innovations and enhancements to the curriculum.
- Documentation of teaching improvement/development work (e.g., use of Center for Teaching Effectiveness instruments as additional measurement to supplement regular course evaluations).
- Evidence of accepting teaching assignments consistent with Department needs.
- External peer review by faculty outside the College or from other universities. This may include evaluation of syllabi and course materials, and/or a visit to the classroom. External peer review may be suggested by the candidate, or other faculty in the candidate's discipline, but it is up to the department to select and invite external faculty for a peer review.
- Written comments from the student course evaluations. Candidates should include all written comments for a given course section.
- Direction of graduate research and undergraduate honors theses.
- Teaching awards or similar recognition of outstanding teaching contributions.
- Student advisement, especially when it contributes to students' professional or career development.

The preceding categories are not necessarily exhaustive. In evaluating teaching, the Committee considers all pertinent evidence of a candidate's contribution to the department's teaching objectives, even though it may not fit neatly into any of the foregoing categories.

C. Evidence of High Quality Service

The various types of service activities are listed below, but not in any particular order of importance. We do not expect individuals to carry out activities in all categories. We expect that some faculty will specialize in certain types of service efforts to the exclusion of others. In evaluating service activities, the Committee values most highly those efforts that are active, successful, and important, and that demonstrate leadership and initiative.

Service to the University

- Work on department, college, and university committees.
- Administrative assignments within the university.
- Seminar presentations or lectures to members of the university community.

Service to the Profession

- Service as a journal or book editor, membership on editorial boards, or work as a referee for professional journals; reviewer of grant proposals, scholarly research monographs, or textbooks.
- Organizing professional meetings or conferences.
- Serving as a chairperson or discussant at sessions of professional meetings or conferences.
- Descriptive book reviews published.
- Substantive contributions to colleagues' research efforts.

Service to the Business Community and Government

- Participation on boards, commissions, or societies at the local, state, or national level.
- Presentations or lectures on management issues.
- Organizing symposia or lecture series directed to the community.
- Professional services provided to community groups, businesses, or government agencies on behalf of the University.

The preceding categories are not necessarily exhaustive. The Committee considers all pertinent evidence of a candidate's contribution to the department's service mission, even though it may not fit neatly into any of the foregoing categories.

VI. TENURE

To be eligible for Departmental recommendation for tenure at the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate must meet all the requirements set forth in this document for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. In addition, the candidate must meet any requirements set forth in the letter of appointment (see Faculty Handbook <http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IVD-12-tenure.html>).

VII. PRIOR VERSIONS

Consistent with the Faculty Handbook (<http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-11changes.html>), those faculty during the probationary period prior to the granting of tenure have the right to be reviewed under the policy and procedure in force at the time of hiring, rather than under any revised policy or procedure subsequently adopted. Any candidate for tenure who wishes to be considered under the policy and procedure in force at the time of hiring must inform the Department Chair, in writing, at the

time of his initial application for promotion. A copy of the prior policy can be obtained from the department office, and must be included in the candidate's dossier.

APPENDIX 1a

Letter to External Reviewer for Promotion to Full Professor

Dear Dr.

As part of the review process of candidates for promotion at the University of Delaware, we call upon leading scholars in the candidate's field to comment on the candidate's scholarly work. Recently, you were contacted by Professor ... and agreed to evaluate the work of Dr. ..., who has applied for promotion to the rank of full professor. I greatly appreciate your willingness to help in this serious endeavor.

University and department guidelines specify that candidates for full professor must have "established reputations in their discipline." These guidelines further specify "there should be unmistakable evidence of significant development and achievement since the last promotion." Our department guidelines also stipulate that in evaluating a candidate for promotion to full professor, demanding standards that require continued achievement beyond that necessary for promotion to associate professor are used.

I have enclosed Dr. ... curriculum vitae and five papers that he/she has selected. For your convenience, we have highlighted articles on the curriculum vitae that have been published subsequent to Dr. ...'s last promotion. The promotion review committee would appreciate your candid comments concerning the relevance, significance and impact of Dr. ...'s work in general, and specifically of his work since his last promotion. Your assessment of the methodology employed and the quality of presentation will also be useful. To encourage candor in your review, your letter will be available only to those who are part of the review process and not the candidate.

In order that we may fully document our review process, we will need to receive a current copy of your curriculum vitae along with your review letter. We would appreciate receiving your review by August 1, 2####

Once again, I would like to thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Professor and Department Chairperson

APPENDIX 1b
Letter to External Reviewers for Promotion to Associate Professor

May 2, 2006

Dr.

Dear Dr

As part of the review process of candidates for promotion at the University of Delaware, we call upon leading scholars in the candidate's field to comment on their scholarly work. Per your recent communications with ..., I appreciate your willingness to assist us in evaluating the work of ..., a candidate for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

I have enclosed Dr.... curriculum vitae and five papers that he/she has selected. The promotion review committee would welcome your candid evaluation of these materials. We are interested in your comments concerning the relevance, significance, and impact of the candidate's work. Also, specifics on the methodology employed and the quality of presentation will be useful to us.

Unless you indicate otherwise, your letter will be considered highly confidential and available only to those who are part of the review process and not the candidate.

In order that we may fully document our review process, please send a copy of your resume or vitae. We would appreciate receiving your review by August 6, 2#### if possible.

Thank you very much for providing this important service. Your efforts are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Professor and Department Chairperson

APPENDIX 2
Letter Soliciting Comment from Previous Students

<<Date>>

<<Title> <<FirstName> <<LastName>
<<Address1>
<<City>, <<State> <<PostalCode>

Dear <<Title> <<LastName>:

As part of our evaluation of faculty for promotion at the University of Delaware, we seek comments concerning the effectiveness of their teaching from a number of former students. Your name was selected as part of a sample of students who had Dr. () for a class during the past few years. Dr. (), an (Assistant/Associate) Professor in the Department of Business Administration, is being evaluated this year for promotion to the rank of (Associate/Full) Professor with tenure.

In particular, we would appreciate receiving your evaluation of the impact that Dr. ('s) teaching had on you. Your comments may include: the contribution of the course to your learning useful information, Dr. ('s) attitude toward students, his general level of teaching skills, and the relevance of the course material. Your comments need not be confined to these specific areas, but we ask that your comments be as specific as possible.

To be useful, we would like to have your evaluation by (September 1). Your letter will be held in strictest confidence and will be available only to those faculty members and administrators who are directly involved in the promotion evaluation process.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this very important matter.

Sincerely,

<< Chair's Name>>
Department Chairperson

??/jg