



Faculty Handbook

[Table of Contents](#) | [A-Z Index](#) | [Updates](#)

Section 4: Personnel Policies for Faculty

Workload and Evaluation

- Consistency between Workload Policy and Other Policies
- Approval of a Unit Workload Policy
- Faculty Workload Policies
- Faculty Evaluation and Merit Assessment Option for Summer Work
- Evaluation of Faculty Members
- Categories of Faculty Activity

;

◀ Previous

▲ Up

Next ▶

Copyright © 2004 by the University of Delaware. All rights reserved.



Faculty Handbook

[Table of Contents](#) | [A-Z Index](#) | [Updates](#)

Section 4: Personnel Policies for Faculty

Workload and Evaluation

Consistency between Workload Policy and Other Policies

The University strives for consistency among the following policies:

- Workload assignment policies;
- Promotion and tenure policies and decisions;
- Faculty appraisals by the department chairperson or college dean, et. al.;
- **Merit salary award policies;**
- Initial contract and contract renewal decision policies.

Faculty holding tenure track positions are expected to perform the activities enumerated in the unit's approved Promotion & Tenure document.

[◀ Previous](#)

[▲ Up](#)

[Next ▶](#)

Copyright © 2004 by the University of Delaware. All rights reserved.



Faculty Handbook

[Table of Contents](#) | [A-Z Index](#) | [Updates](#)

Section 4: Personnel Policies for Faculty

Workload and Evaluation

Approval of a Unit's Workload Policy

The members of the unit, in consultation with the unit administrator, and following their own by-laws, will prepare and adopt a workload policy that accurately represents the composition of each component of the workload.

Upon approval by the department of the workload policy, the unit administrator will forward the policy and make a recommendation to the dean with respect to the feasibility and appropriateness of the policy. The dean will either forward the approved policy to the AAUP Contract Maintenance Officer or return it to the unit for revision (see below). The AAUP Contract Maintenance Officer will review and either certify that the workload policy conforms to the bargaining contract provisions or return it to the unit for revision (see below). Following certification, the policy will be forwarded to the University Provost for review and action. Certification will be required before the policy is transmitted further. The University Provost will either approve a unit's workload policy or return it to the unit for revision (see below). Approval of a proposed workload policy by the University Provost constitutes the final step in the review process.

If the policy is not deemed feasible or appropriate at any stage of the review, it will be returned to the faculty of the unit with specific comments and suggestions. The faculty of a unit shall, after having considered such comments and suggestions, adopt a final workload policy.

A unit's final workload policy and plan can be returned by the appropriate administrator to the unit for revision if it is not congruent with academic program needs or does not comply with all university policies or the collective bargaining agreement. Academic program needs include course requirements of the academic unit, teaching availability of full-time faculty, the non-instructional responsibilities of the academic unit and the contributions of the unit within the college and the university. (Article 11.3, Collective Bargaining Agreement, 2002-2005).

Units may modify their policy at any time by the procedure outlined above. [Approved by the Provost and the AAUP Executive Committee, 05/02/2002]

[◀ Previous](#)

[▲ Up](#)

[Next ▶](#)

Copyright © 2004 by the University of Delaware. All rights reserved.



Faculty Handbook

Table of Contents | A-Z Index | Updates

Section 4: Personnel Policies for Faculty

Workload and Evaluation

Faculty Workload Policies

"The central mission of the University of Delaware is to cultivate both learning and the free exchange of ideas. To this end, the University provides excellent undergraduate and graduate courses of study in a variety of disciplines. The University faculty has a strong tradition of distinguished scholarship, research, and teaching, which is grounded in a commitment to increase scientific, humanistic, and social knowledge for the enrichment of the larger society" (A Mission Statement for the University, Faculty Handbook, approved 1993).

Faculty workload is assigned in support of the academic programs of our departments, schools and colleges. Within this framework, all academic units must have written and approved workload policies. The procedures for development and approval of unit workload policies are stipulated in "Approval of a Unit's Workload Policies."

A unit's workload policy must be congruent with academic program needs and in compliance with all university policies and collective bargaining guidelines.

Evaluation of academic program needs must include course requirements of the academic unit, teaching availability of full-time faculty, the non-instructional responsibilities of the academic unit, and the contributions of the unit within the college and the university.

It is recognized that, depending upon their responsibilities and priorities, academic units will vary in the relative balance of teaching, research and service assignments to faculty.

Periodic Review of Workload Policies: Over time the needs of academic departments/units will change necessitating periodic review and possible modification of workload policies. Departments/units may modify their policies at any time following the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook. The recently approved Collective Bargaining Agreement (July 1, 2002-June 30, 2005), Article XI, 11.3 stipulates that: ".beginning July 1, 2002, all academic departments must review their workload policies to maintain congruence with academic program needs (following procedures outlined in 11.2 above) as well as to assure compliance with all university policies and collective bargaining guidelines." It is further stipulated that: "By June 30, 2003, academic units and chairs must present their workload policies, whether revised or not, for review and approval by the appropriate dean, the AAUP Contract Maintenance Office, and the Provost."

Workload policies must also be reviewed as part of the unit's regularly scheduled Academic Program Review and/or periodic review for accreditation or re-accreditation.

Alignment of Workload with Other Policies: The University seeks alignment and consistency between workload policies and other policies related to faculty contributions and evaluations.

As stipulated above in "Consistency between Workload Policy and Other Policies," the University strives for consistency among workload policies, promotion and tenure policies and decisions, faculty appraisals by the department chairperson or college dean, merit salary award policies, and initial contract and contract renewal decision policies.

Expectations of All Faculty: All faculty, whether tenure track or non-tenure track, must meet general University expectations. These expectations include participation in and contributions to:

- Regularly scheduled undergraduate and/or graduate instruction;
- Advisement, mentoring, and academic supervision of students;
- Faculty governance and the development and effective conduct of the academic program as defined by departmental and college by-laws;
- Other responsibilities expected of all faculty on the basis of approved departmental and

college by-laws or as set forth by the College or University Faculty Senate or as otherwise stipulated in University policy.

The Administration and the AAUP will come to agreement on a unit-by-unit basis on the general University expectations that apply to faculty on non-administered workloads.

Expectations of Tenure-Track Faculty: Faculty holding tenure track positions are expected to perform the activities enumerated in the unit's approved Promotion and Tenure document.

Research and publication are a significant part of each faculty member's total contribution as a member of the academic community. Faculty members must be engaged in some form of creative activity in their academic fields, and it is expected that creative activity will be evidenced by publication or other forms of scholarly output, which not only signifies the completion of scholarly inquiry but makes it available to other scholars. The number and frequency of publications [or other forms of scholarly output] will vary with the individual, the field of study, and the proportion of time devoted to research; however, no faculty member can be excused from research and scholarly productivity on the grounds that all available time is devoted to other activities.

Conversely, teaching, advising, committee responsibilities, and community service are not to be neglected on the ground that research and publication have a higher priority. Each faculty member is expected to make a balanced contribution to the University.

Administered Workloads: Twelve credit contact hours or 18 teaching contact hours per week per semester constitutes a 100% workload for the semester for the academic year as described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article XI.

In practice, however, the University adheres to a policy of "administered" teaching loads, particularly in the case of tenure-track faculty. Under this arrangement department chairpersons and deans are encouraged to vary the teaching loads of individual faculty members so long as the total teaching obligations are met with the teaching personnel available. This flexible arrangement makes it possible for the chairpersons to make assignments of individual faculty members on a semester-to-semester basis to stimulate research and scholarship or to provide for unusually heavy committee assignments.

The policy of administered workloads carries a responsibility for the effective implementation by the departmental chairperson or other academic unit head. Workloads are to be administered to reflect an optimal utilization of the talents and contributions of the faculty in accord with the academic program needs of the department and the faculty's opportunities for continued professional development and achievement. Unit workload policies must stipulate how the policy of administered workloads will be implemented.

Administered workloads are not automatic, but must accord with the actual contributions of the faculty members who are assigned such workloads. Thus, workload assignments to support research and scholarship must, over time, be reflected in research and scholarly productivity commensurate with that workload responsibility.

When a faculty member's administered workload assignment does not comport with his/her actual research and scholarly contributions, the chair may increase the teaching or service components of that faculty member's workload. In such an instance, the faculty member may request a review of his/her research quality and productivity and the chair will appoint an ad-hoc committee for that purpose. The composition of the review committee will be decided by the chair and its recommendation will be advisory. Alternatively the chair may appoint such a committee, in the absence of any request from the faculty member. In all cases, the faculty member will have the opportunity to submit any evidence deemed appropriate to the committee's tasks. The recommendation(s) of the ad-hoc committee are advisory; the chair has final responsibility for any change in a faculty member's workload.

(Approved by the Provost and the AAUP Executive Council, 12/01/03)

Workload Policy Statement and the Composition of Workload: The workload policy statement must describe the expectations of faculty regarding teaching, scholarship and service, the composition of faculty workload in that unit, and the basis for that composition.

The composition of workload must be congruent with all University policies and Collective Bargaining guidelines. The composition must also be congruent with the mission and academic program responsibilities of the unit, the terms of appointment of the faculty member, and the contributions of the unit within the college and the University. For tenure-track faculty, the composition of workload also must be consistent with promotion and tenure guidelines. For these reasons and given that units implement a policy of administered workloads, the composition of workload varies among and within academic units.

The policy statement must include a description of the composition of workload that reflects the application of a consistent metric for assignments of annualized efforts in teaching, scholarship and service. The metric must

conform in all respects to University policies and the Collective Bargaining Guidelines.

Workload policies must describe the following:

- The composition of the typical administered workload for tenure-track faculty, stipulating the correspondence by distribution of effort to the total workload of 12 credit hours or 18 teaching contact hours per semester ;
- The conditions for variation from that typical workload for tenure-track faculty; that is, how the policy of an administered workload will be implemented;
- The composition of the typical workload for each type of non-tenure track faculty within the unit (instructional, clinical, public service), stipulating the correspondence by distribution of effort to the total workload of 12 credit hours or 18 teaching contact hours per semester;
- The conditions for variation from that typical workload, if any, for each type of non-tenure track faculty in the unit;
- The differences in workload responsibilities for faculty on different types of appointments (such as 9-month, 10-month, 11-month, 9 plus 1, 9 plus 2 appointments).
- The manner in which workloads will be administered for sponsored program responsibilities and assignments to other restricted sources of support, and for other special circumstances appropriate to the unit that might reduce instructional workload. A college approved instructional buy-out policy should be referenced as appropriate. (Approved by the Provost and the AAUP Executive Committee, 06/13/02)

◀ Previous

▲ Up

Next ▶

Copyright © 2004 by the University of Delaware. All rights reserved.



Faculty Handbook

Table of Contents | A-Z Index | Updates

Section 4: Personnel Policies for Faculty

Workload and Evaluation

Faculty Evaluation/Merit Assessment Option for Summer Work

While most full-time faculty have 9-month academic year appointments, all faculty have year-round responsibilities. The "Conditions of Employment" section of the Faculty Handbook stipulates:

All regular members of the teaching staff of the University are fully engaged for the whole year of fifty-two weeks. While normally members of the teaching staff are required to teach for only nine months annually, responsibilities of faculty to the University do not cease during the summer months. The summer period is provided for reading, study, research, and travel related to the professional development of the faculty member as well as for providing a reasonable period for relaxation.

Many faculty on 9-month academic year appointments utilize the summer to concentrate on programs of scholarship and research, both externally sponsored and unsponsored. Indeed, the books, articles, papers, technical reports, professional presentations, and other creative contributions produced are the result of continuing effort throughout the year and often across many years. These achievements are important elements of the faculty's record of scholarly and research achievement, and they are reviewed and accorded weight in decisions on contract renewal, promotions and tenure, and merit allocations.

If specifically permitted by approved departmental workload policies, a faculty member on a 9-month academic year appointment has the opportunity to request that performance in a summer program of sponsored or unsponsored scholarship and research will be included in the annual faculty evaluation. The request from the faculty member to the department chair must be made on an annual basis during the workload planning process.

If the request is granted, the agreement must be documented as part of the individual's workload plan for the subsequent year. Documentation must include a statement of the summer program of scholarship and research and the expected products of that program, and it must stipulate the duration of the summer program up to three months.

A chair may turn down a faculty member's proposal on substantive grounds related to the content of the proposal, the appropriateness of the proposed program as part of the workload for the faculty member, or the department's needs and priorities. No request from a faculty member for inclusion of a summer research program in evaluation and merit can proceed without the chairperson's approval and the inclusion of this program in the faculty member's workload plan.

When it is a part of the individual's annual workload plan, this summer program of scholarship and research must be considered in computing the overall percentage distribution of faculty effort in teaching, research, and service for the year, with a weighting appropriate to the agreed duration of the summer program up to three months. For those with an approved summer program, the computed overall distribution of faculty effort must be accorded appropriate weight in the annual evaluation and in the application of the department's approved metric for merit allocation.

For example, a faculty member on a 9-month academic year appointment may have a workload distribution of 50% teaching, 40% research/scholarship, and 10% service. If the faculty member's request for a 2-month summer research program is approved and included in the workload plan, the revised workload distribution for purposes of evaluation would be 41% teaching, 51% research/scholarship, and 8% service.

The request by a faculty member on a 9-month academic year appointment for approval of a summer program of scholarship and research must be entirely voluntary and it must be renewed on an annual basis. The department chairperson or other academic administrator may not assign such an obligation, nor may such an obligation be adopted by a department as a standard expectation of all faculty in that department. An approved summer program of scholarship and research must have no impact on the faculty member's workload assignments during the two academic semesters. Under no circumstances will the responsibilities associated with the approved summer program be transferable with responsibilities during the academic year. During the period of an approved summer scholarship and research program, the faculty member is not eligible to teach for compensation or carry out other

responsibilities inconsistent with the approved program. (Approved by the Provost and the AAUP Executive Committee 05/24/02).

 Previous

 Up

Next 

Copyright © 2004 by the University of Delaware. All rights reserved.



Faculty Handbook

Table of Contents | A-Z Index | Updates

Section 4: Personnel Policies for Faculty

Workload and Evaluation

Evaluation of Faculty

Purpose

Annual evaluations provide administrators, faculty, professionals, and staff an opportunity to meet with their immediate supervisors for a personal review of activities and accomplishments and a planning session for future objectives and goals. Leadership at the unit level can have a most direct and significant effect.

Peer evaluations, which come less frequently, attempt to put wider resources into the review processes, resources that are represented by one's colleagues and their collective experience and wisdom. Since promotion and tenure recommendations are heavily dependent on peer evaluations, it is essential that candidates have early indications from their colleagues regarding their progress in the areas of teaching, research/creative/scholarly activity, and service. The chair's role in these latter activities is to facilitate and coordinate the processes and to provide leadership wherever appropriate.

Annual Evaluation of Faculty

The intent of the annual evaluation procedure is to:

- 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.

In addition to the above, these appraisals form the basis for merit pay increases. Annual appraisals are not intended to take the place of either development or committee evaluations for promotion or tenure or of the periodic peer review of faculty.

Each year, the department chair meets in person with each faculty member in the department, including permanent part-time faculty, to discuss the faculty member's development during that year and plans for the coming year. The period covered in this meeting is the twelve-month period of time since the last appraisal.

Prior to their annual meeting, the chair and the faculty member complete a draft of the *Faculty Appraisal and Planning Form*. During the discussion, the faculty member is shown a copy of the mid-ratings (median) for the entire department as established by the chair's preliminary evaluation of the department's faculty. In some cases, the rating of an individual faculty member may be changed as a result of this discussion. After all faculty have met with the chair, final mid-ratings (median) for the entire department are calculated and recorded on each faculty member's form. If the faculty member takes exception to any of the chair's ratings, the faculty member's rating for that item is also recorded on the form. After the interview has been completed, the chair and the faculty member sign the final copy. The faculty member's signature does not indicate agreement or disagreement with the appraisal, but simply that it was discussed in detail with the chair.

The data required at the top of the form are self-explanatory. Full-time is checked if the person is full-time with the University and if all University responsibilities are being evaluated in the appraisal and planning form even though the individual may not be 100 percent funded by the department. Part-time personnel, or personnel whose appraisals and planning form covers only part of their University responsibilities, are designated by indicating the proportion that is devoted to the department and is being appraised. For faculty with joint appointments, their appraisals and plans are combined on one form, after the evaluating chair has consulted with the second chair. Otherwise, two separate forms, based on separate evaluations and requiring separate interviews must be prepared.

For each of the three areas, teaching, research/creative/scholarly activity, and service, the percent of the faculty members effort assigned to that area is indicated. These percentages are very important because readers, in interpreting these appraisals, weigh each area according to the percent of effort assigned to that area for the individual faculty member.

For each area or item, the chair writes a narrative appraisal of the faculty member's relevant activities and then rates the person's performance on that activity. The criteria to be used as the bases for these judgments are the criteria for performance of faculty members at each rank as codified under the promotion criteria accepted by the department, college, and University promotion and tenure committees, and by the Provost's office, and should take account of the individual faculty member's particular responsibilities

A 9-point scale for the ratings anchored at the end points with the terms *unsatisfactory* and *outstanding* is utilized. N/A (Not Applicable)

should be used only in those cases where there is no requirement for that individual to engage in that particular activity. In other cases, N/R (Not Rated) may be used. For example, a new Ph.D. might be given N/R in research/creative/scholarly activity because that individual's research program is too new to be evaluated meaningfully, but should not be given N/A because assistant professors, even new ones, are expected to engage in research/creative/scholarly activity.

Faculty members may add other materials to support their ratings on their activities, especially where they believe that a different appraisal should have been given. Chairs also may add materials they consider appropriate. Along with a copy of the *Faculty Appraisal and Planning Form*, copies of additional materials should be provided to the faculty member, the chair/department, the dean, and the provost.

It is recognized that no chair or any single individual can duplicate the judgment of several committees, nor can performance during a single year determine one's promotion, nor can these procedures match the extensive and intensive evaluation that takes place when a person comes up for promotion. Faculty appraisal and planning sessions provide an opportunity: 1) for faculty members to inform their chairs more completely and accurately about their activities; 2) for chairs to give the faculty their best judgments on how well the faculty have fulfilled their responsibilities during the year prior to appraisal; and 3) for the faculty member and chair to discuss the faculty member's plans for the coming year. The intent is to determine mutually acceptable goals that develop the faculty member's strength or correct any weaknesses.

Peer Evaluation of Faculty

On recommendation of the Faculty Senate and approval by the administration, "faculty members at all ranks should be subject to periodic reviews at reasonable intervals of time." The intervals are at least every two years for instructors and assistant professors, every three to five years for tenured associate professors, and every five to seven years for full professors. These reviews are to be conducted by duly established committees of faculty.

In addition, the department chairperson reviews annually each department member on a Faculty Appraisal Form. This review is discussed with the faculty member, and the form is signed by both the faculty member and the department chairperson.

Principles Guiding the Peer Evaluation of Faculty Members: Faculty members at all ranks shall be subject to periodic reviews at reasonable intervals of time.

Reviews of individual faculty members will normally originate with the individual department. (Since the academic organization of the University varies, references to department should sometimes read division or college, and references to chairperson should sometimes read director or dean.) Such reviews should involve a substantial number of faculty members but not the chairperson.

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 departments or 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.

Appropriate administrative officers may make independent evaluations within the review process.

Upon completion of the review, the faculty member will be apprised of the results. Faculty members shall be required to include their contract renewal reviews as part of their dossier for promotion and tenure; this should include the evaluations or reviews conducted by the established committees of the faculty and by the corresponding administrative office (e.g., department chair). (Rev. 5.10.07)

Faculty members are fully entitled to the rights of appeal. Reviews of individual faculty would not be a substitute for competency hearings of tenured faculty. They may serve, however, as a basis for instituting such hearings. In the event of a competency hearing, due process would be observed, with the burden of proof residing with those instituting the hearing.

Periods of Peer Evaluation: Instructors and assistant professors will be reviewed at least every two years but normally no more often than once a year. Not later than the sixth year of service, assistant professors must be reviewed for promotion.

Tenured associate professors should be reviewed at least once within every three to five year period of service but normally not more often than every two years. Non tenured associate professors should be reviewed in the year prior to their eligibility for tenure.

Full professors should be reviewed at least once every five to seven year period of service, but normally not more often than every two years.

Department Responsibility: The department chairperson organizes and coordinates reviews of faculty.

Reviews of instructors and assistant professors should be conducted with the participation of associate and full professors in the department. In no case should faculty members be reviewed without the participation of at least two members of their department, one of whom, if possible, must be a rank at least one step higher than the person under review.

Associate professors should be reviewed by professors in the department. In those departments where fewer than two professors are available to conduct such a review, the chairperson of the department may request professors from other related departments to serve on the review body.

Full professors should be reviewed by a committee of at least three of their peers. In small departments, professors from other related departments may be asked to serve at the request of the chairperson.

These provisions specify minimum requirements. A department may choose to constitute the whole department, or any other designated authority, to serve as a review body. A department may choose to include in the review body faculty members at the same rank or lower rank of the person being evaluated so long as such persons do not constitute a majority of the body.

Submission and Evaluation of Documents and Other Evidence: The faculty member under review should assemble a dossier of materials that he or she regards as appropriate and convincing evidence of his or her abilities in the three major areas of evaluation (see below). The faculty member should be notified of the date that the dossier is required by the chairperson. This date should be in sufficient time before the review date, which should also be specified.

The review body or the chairperson of the department may request additional evidence from (a) the faculty member under review; (b) other sources within the University, such as experts in related fields, committee chairpersons, and colleagues; (c) similar sources outside the University. In all instances under (b) and (c), the faculty member should be informed that such evidence is being requested. If any evidence is requested in confidence, the faculty member must be told the source of such confidential information. He or she may then communicate to the review committee in writing his or her position as to the qualifications of that source.

The review body should evaluate the evidence and the faculty member's abilities in each of the three major areas. A report summarizing the reasons for or against a favorable judgment should then be forwarded to the dean of the college along with the chairperson's independent evaluation. A copy of the report of the review body, of the chairperson, and of any other administrator may be delivered to the faculty member under review upon request.

Administrative Evaluations: Appropriate administrative officers, such as chairpersons, deans, provost, vice-provost, and president may review the dossier of each faculty member reviewed whenever a recommendation for sabbatical, promotion, and/or tenure is made by the department, or whenever there is a significant and substantial change in the status or conditions of employment of any faculty member. Further evidence may be solicited in accordance with the same procedures stipulated under "Submission and Evaluation of Documents and Other Evidence" above.

Reporting Results of Reviews: Each faculty member is entitled to a personal interview with the chairperson of the department and, upon request, a written report of his or her review. Wherever possible, the interview and report should carry specific indications where evidence has been satisfactory or, when it has not been, specific recommendations for improvement before the next review.

Appeals: A faculty member may appeal the decision of the review body by requesting another review within a semester of the first review, and he or she may request a new committee. This request may be rejected by the department, but is subject to appeal to the appropriate college and University committees.

Modified and approved by Provost and AAUP 12/3/04

[◀ Previous](#)

[▲ Up](#)

[Next ▶](#)

Copyright © 2006 by the University of Delaware. All rights reserved.



Faculty Handbook

Table of Contents | A-Z Index | Updates

Section 4: Personnel Policies for Faculty

Workload and Evaluation

Categories of Faculty Activity

The three major areas of faculty activity are (1) Teaching and Instruction; (2) Scholarship and Research; and (3) Public, Professional and University Service. Precise demarcation between the three major areas is often difficult and sometimes impossible; in any case, all activities of a faculty member must be considered as an integrated whole. Faculty activity in each of the areas may vary from year to year, or even semester to semester, according to the interests and abilities of the faculty member, and according to the needs of his or her department, college, or the University as agreed to by the chairperson and dean.

Teaching: Under this category shall be included all scheduled classes (and academic advising involved therein), seminars, laboratories, thesis and research supervision, clinical and field activities, advisement and any other instructional activity.

Scholarship and Research: Under this category shall be the following:

- Research, usually presented through publication of scholarly work or through appropriate colloquia, seminars, conferences, and lectures.
- Creative development in those fields in which the faculty member receives public recognition for his or her professional contributions to society or to the University. Included are such activities as plays (composition or production), music (composition or performance), art exhibitions, patents, etc.
- Professional development involving the presentation of papers or chairing sessions at professional meetings, serving as an officer or committee member of a professional organization, editorial duties, professional consulting, and other similar activities. Alternatively these activities can be considered under the Service section for those units that specify such professional development activities under Service in their P&T document.

Public, Professional and University Service: Included in this category shall be:

- University service, such as nonacademic advisement of students (career, professional, or personal); activities such as living/learning experiences, for which no academic credit is given; departmental committees and special assignments; college senates, committees, and special assignments; University Senate, committees, and special assignments; service to the University of Delaware Chapter of the AAUP; administrative and quasi-administrative appointments; and participation in student affairs related activities (Rev. 5/02)
- Public and Community service (local, state, regional, national, international), such as technical assistance or consultation for public or community organizations, election or appointment to boards, commissions, committees, legislative bodies, or the like outside the normal professional calling of the faculty member in the teaching or research function.
- Professional service to the faculty members' discipline and its organizations such as service for professional associations.
- Creative activities *outside* the normal professional calling of the faculty member; for example, participation in orchestras or ensembles, shows of paintings, musical or literary productions, and the like, which enhance or improve the University as a community of learning.

Workload Adjustments for Faculty Senate Responsibilities: In April 1991, the Faculty Senate recommended "that the President of the Faculty Senate receive a one-course load reduction each semester and the President-elect receive a one-course per year reduction as long as these reductions do not result in the elimination of all classroom

teaching duties for the individuals in question." Whether such reductions are appropriate in the context of a department's teaching needs for a given year should be discussed at the time the faculty member and chair undertake conversations about the faculty member's workload for the upcoming year. The final decision rests with the chair who may find consultation with the dean valuable when making such a judgment.

[◀ Previous](#)

[▲ Up](#)

[Next ▶](#)

Copyright © 2004 by the University of Delaware. All rights reserved.