

The background features a large, light blue watermark of the University of Delaware seal. The seal is circular and contains the text 'UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE' around the perimeter. Inside the seal, there are two open books. The left book is labeled 'GRAMM PHILOL RHETOR ETHICA' and the right book is labeled 'METAPH LOGICA MATH PHYSICA'. Below the books, the word 'SOL' is visible. At the bottom of the seal, the year '1743' is prominently displayed between two stars. The seal is partially obscured by the main title text.

# Mentoring for Success: Annual Appraisals, Peer Reviews, P&T

Matt Kinservik  
Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs



# Three Formal Evaluation Processes for Faculty at UD

- Annual Appraisal and Planning Process
- Peer Review/Contract Renewal
- Promotion & Tenure Review

# TT/CT

- These review processes apply to all Tenure Track and Continuing Track faculty members.
- They are described in the Faculty Handbook and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).
- They are supplemented by department-specific policies.

# Each Evaluation is also an Opportunity for Mentorship

- Annual Appraisal and Planning Process
- Peer Review/Contract Renewal
- Promotion & Tenure Review

# These Processes are Separate, but Related

- Annual Appraisal gives annual feedback.
- That feedback should prepare you for your Peer Reviews.
- The Peer Reviews are meant to advise you on your progress toward promotion.

# Appraisal and Planning Process

- Described in Article 12.6 of the CBA
- <http://www.udel.edu/content/dam/udelImages/human-resources/EmployeeRelations/cbas/AAUP.pdf>
- Also described in the Faculty Handbook (4.3.5)
- <http://facultyhandbook.udel.edu/handbook/435-evaluation-faculty-members>

# Goals of the Appraisal and Planning Process (Handbook)

- Provide the faculty member and the chair with an opportunity for personal review
- Provide an accurate means of planning and evaluation of a faculty member's professional growth and development
- Provide each faculty member and the University with timely and documented information concerning the faculty member's achievements and goals

# Goals of the Appraisal and Planning Process (CBA)

- To assess performance based on assigned workload
- To award merit pay



# Departmental Documents

- Merit Metric Document
- Workload Policy
- P&T Policy
- Find them all here:

<http://provost.udel.edu/resources/faculty-policies/college-department-resources/>

# Annual Appraisal and Planning: the Form

- Faculty member submits evidence of achievement through a new online form in January/February.
- This evidence includes narrative statements and evidential material related to research, teaching, and service from the past 12 months (not academic year).
- Department Chair conducts the appraisal at the start of the Spring term.
- Chair reviews material and assigns a score of 1-9 in each category.

# Annual Appraisal and Planning: the Meeting

- Every faculty member is entitled to meet with the chair to discuss the appraisal and planning process.
- This meeting is especially important for new faculty.
- It's your chance to understand the review and rating.
- Just as important (if not more), it's your chance to discuss your workload for the coming academic year and set reasonable goals to keep you on track to advance to your next contract/rank.

# CBA Article 11: Faculty Workload

- Assigning workload is a key part of the chair's responsibilities.
- 11.9 says that a workload plan should be developed in consultation with each faculty member and the process should be pursued "harmoniously."
- 11.9 also says that the chair "retains the final right to determine the workload plan."

# Handbook 4.4.5: Statement on Workload

Workload shall be assigned with the expectation that the faculty member will have the opportunity to meet the criteria for satisfactory peer review, contract renewal, and promotion and/or tenure. An individual's assigned workload during the review period shall be considered in the promotion and/or tenure and peer review process in a manner consistent with the approved promotion and/or tenure and peer review criteria written by each department.

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure are required to report their assigned workload as part of their dossier so that all reviewers—including external reviewers—have a clear sense of their workload in the various areas of their effort and can judge their achievements fairly.

# Faculty Workload Takeaways

- Article 11.4 of the CBA says, “An individual's workload shall be assigned with the expectation that the faculty member will have the opportunity to meet the criteria for promotion and satisfactory peer review.”
- When assigning workload in the annual appraisal and planning process, a chair must consider both the needs of the unit and the needs of the individual faculty member.
- Assignment of workload must never present a barrier to a faculty member meeting expectations for successful peer review, promotion, and the award of tenure.

# Peer Review/Contract Renewal

- Also found in the Handbook in 4.3.5
- There you will find a description of the process, but an insufficient explanation of why it's important or what, exactly, it's meant to achieve.
- Chairs have been given guidance on the process from the Provost's Office

# Peer Review Goals

- The goal is to evaluate performance by means of a thorough review by a committee of your peers (colleagues in your department).
- To recommend (or not) the renewal of your contract.
- To offer feedback to keep you on track to advance to your next contract/rank.



# Peer Review Process

- The faculty member prepares a dossier for the committee to review.
- The committee evaluates the dossier and makes a recommendation on contract renewal to the chair.
- Chair conducts an independent review and makes a recommendation to the dean.
- Dean makes the contract renewal decision.

# Schedule of Peer Reviews: TT Faculty

- 2- and 4-year reviews (dean makes the final decision on contract renewal)
- Post-tenure peer reviews are done on an occasional basis for Associate Professors (every 3-5 years) and Full Professors (every 5-7 years).

# Schedule of Peer Reviews: CT Faculty

- 2- and 4-year reviews (dean makes the final decision on contract renewal)
- 6- and 13-year reviews (provost makes the final decision on contract renewal)
- Every 5 years after year 13

# Promotion & Tenure Policies

- The university's P&T policy is found in section 4.4 of the Faculty Handbook.
- Each college has a P&T policy that must align with the university policy.
- Each department has a P&T policy that must align with the college and university policies.

# Promotion & Tenure Process

- Begins with a candidate declaring the intention to seek promotion no later than April 30.
- Evidential materials are sent to external reviewers in the summer.
- Candidate submits complete dossier by September 1.
- Ends with Provost's decision on March 15.

# Promotion & Tenure Process: Levels of Review

- Department Committee
- Chair
- College Committee
- Dean
- University Committee
- Provost

# Promotion & Tenure Process: Candidate's Rights

- Candidates are provided with a copy of the review letter at every stage.
- Candidates can add new evidential material to the dossier at any or every stage.
- Candidates can appeal the recommendation at any or every stage.

# Recent Changes to the University P&T Policy

- Appeals (4.4.4)
- Statement on Workload (4.4.5)
- Statement on Analytics (4.4.16)
- Revised Guidance on Evidence (4.4.11)
- Expedited Tenure Review (4.4.17)



# Student Course Feedback (4.4.11)

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.**

# P&T Review Platform

- A new P&T review software system is being developed. It's not a commercial product; it's based on the system created at FSU that has been in use for 3 years.
- It is just for review, not for faculty activity reporting.

# Takeaways

- Each evaluation process is an opportunity for mentoring for future success.
- These processes are separate, but related.
- The individual under review is responsible for presenting evidence of achievement.
- All faculty members must know the relevant department, college, and university policies.