

Periodic Review for Faculty on 5-year rolling contracts

Peer Reviews of faculty on 5-year rolling contracts will be conducted at regular intervals of every 5-7 years, as determined by the Director. A review could be called by the Director or the peer review committee outside the 5-7 year parameter, if warranted by special circumstances. Peer Reviews are a form of accountability to the collective full time faculty and represent an opportunity for individual faculty members to share their accomplishments with their colleagues and to demonstrate their continued contributions to the Institute in teaching, service, and, where appropriate, scholarship. According to the University of Delaware Faculty Handbook, "Peer reviews attempt to put wider resources into the (faculty) review process, resources that are represented by one's colleagues and their collective experience and wisdom."

The Director should announce an impending peer review one year prior to the review process commencing to give candidates adequate time to prepare their dossiers.

From the time that the candidate is notified of his/her upcoming review, any changes made to this document regarding required dossier contents shall not apply.

Submission of Dossier: October 15 in the year of the review

Dossier Contents:

Cover Page

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTORY MATERIAL

1.0 Contents and Guidelines

1.1 ELI Guideline for Faculty on 5-year rolling contract undergoing Peer Review

1.2 Letter from Director to Candidate Stating Request for a Peer Review

1.3 Candidate's Opening Statement: (*Recommended* length 3-5 pages)

- Comment on your contributions in each area.
- State the overall weighted averages for each of the categories of Teaching, Scholarship and Service over the period of time under review

II. EVIDENTIAL MATERIAL

1.0 Teaching

- Candidate's Workload Agreements for all years under review (Teaching Section only)
- List of Courses Taught
- List of Presentations
- Year-end reports from candidate to the Director: teaching section (optional)
- Sample of all assessment materials used for one specific course. (*optional for LEP faculty*)
- **Option A:** 3 years of Annual Evaluations with most recent year recommended . (Teaching only)

OR

- **Option B:** List of Professional References
List of Student References
Summary sheets for student evaluations from two most recent years (other years optional)

Candidates for review are not limited to the preceding evidential material. As stated in the Faculty Handbook, "Faculty members under review have the right to supply such evidence that they feel may be necessary to a fair evaluation of their merits. This should not preclude others properly involved in the review process from soliciting and using other evidence, but in every such instance, the faculty member should be informed of the source of that evidence."

2.0 Scholarship

- Candidate's workload agreements (scholarship only) if applicable to candidate for any years under review
- List of Scholarship
- Year-end reports from candidate to the Director: scholarship (optional)
- **Option A:** 3 years of Annual Evaluations (scholarship only)
- **Option B:** Any copies of material to support candidate's scholarship

3.0 Service

- Candidate's Workload Agreements for all years under review (Service Section Only)
- List of Service
- **Option A:** 3 years of Director's annual evaluations
- **Option B:** 3 years of:
Committee reports on candidate's contribution to any/all committees.
Evidence to support candidate's participation in service-related activities outside ELI or UD. (TESOL, Penn-TESOL East, etc.)

The Peer Review Committee shall:

- 1. Make final recommendations by February 28.*
- 2. Inform the Director and the candidate in writing of the recommendation of the Committee concerning the candidate's evaluation. This statement shall be signed by all members of the reviewing group and shall include a list of reason(s) for the action recommended. The statement shall address each of the three areas of activity: teaching, service, and, where warranted by the candidate's workload, scholarship.*

The ELI Director shall:

- 1. Make an evaluation of the candidate independently of the Peer Review Committee.*
- 2. Submit the evaluation of the candidate to the candidate and the CHEP Dean by April 1st.*

Appeal Process for Peer Review

A candidate must receive a detailed list of reasons for a negative recommendation. A candidate who receives a negative recommendation from the Peer Review Committee and/or Institute Director may schedule a meeting with the Committee and/or Director to consider additional evidence, which the candidate may add to the dossier to clarify or enhance it. The Committee and/or Director shall consult with the candidate regarding this additional evidence within 15 days from the time the candidate is informed of a negative recommendation and must render a final recommendation within ten days after the consultation.

Furthermore, the candidate has the option of filing a grievance in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement if he or she feels that a procedural or process error occurred.

Approved by Faculty vote May 2008