

ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE FACULTY WORKLOAD & MERIT POLICY

Approved by ELI CT Faculty on November 17, 2025 (see Document History)

General Statement

The faculty of the English Language Institute consists of the professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors who hold primary appointments in the Institute (ELI Bylaws 2.0).

The ELI offers a wide range of courses and programs to culturally and linguistically diverse students, including international undergraduate and graduate students, visiting scholars, professionals, multilingual local residents, and teachers of English worldwide. ELI operates year round, providing instruction on the University calendar, the six-session Intensive English Program (IEP) calendar, and customized schedules for special groups. An academic unit of the College of Arts & Sciences, ELI courses are non-credit bearing, although ELI faculty sometimes teach for-credit courses on behalf of other University departments. ELI is a partner in the MA TESL (Teaching English as a Second Language) degree, in which ELI faculty may serve as instructors, advisors, cooperating teachers, and administrators.

Standard Teaching Expectations

All full-time CT faculty at the ELI are hired on 10-month contracts and must meet general University expectations. These expectations include regularly scheduled instruction (specific to ELI), and “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; and 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” (UD Faculty Handbook, Section 4.3.3).

Faculty members are expected to advise students and to participate in other teaching-related duties such as attendance at department functions (e.g., meetings, retreats, special program functions); participation in curricular planning, course development and course materials; and presentations of teaching-related materials at conferences.

According to the UD Faculty Handbook “Workload Policy Statement and the Composition of Workload” (Section 4.3.3), “Twelve credit contact hours or 18 teaching contact hours per week per semester constitutes a 100% workload for the semester for the academic year.”. However, in accordance with the UD Faculty Handbook (4.3.3), the ELI Director will “administer” the teaching load for full time faculty members to stimulate their research, if desired, and to help them meet service requirements, including the requirements for promotion and successful completion of peer reviews.

ELI CT faculty hold 10-month contracts. Therefore, a university standard teaching assignment,

as defined above, constitutes 90% of faculty workload for the year (i.e., 9/10 months), with the remaining 10% generally allocated to service and spread throughout the year.

Consequently, the standard administered teaching load for ELI CT faculty is defined as one of the following:

- 1) Two IEP classes per teaching session for five sessions (equivalent to one academic year)
- 2) 12 credit hours of University courses per semester, or its equivalent.
- 3) A combination of courses across more than one type of ELI program, by mutual agreement of the Director and faculty member.

Variations from the Standard Teaching Load

Since ELI CT faculty teach the equivalent of five out of six IEP sessions in an academic year, variations from the standard administered teaching load are calculated in terms of IEP courses:

- 1) Supervision of student teachers (EDUC 750) is a teaching activity; such supervision may replace one of the faculty member's regular courses or, alternatively, be compensated as an overload, depending on the number of students.
- 2) The following Department positions will entail a course reduction equivalent to the weight of the responsibilities involved and the duration of the assignment:
 - a. Holding an administrative leadership role (usually a 0.5 course reduction in a session)
 - b. Coordinating a special program largely integrated with regular IEP courses (usually a 0.5 course reduction in a session)
 - c. Coordinating a special program partly integrated with regular IEP courses (usually a 1.0 course reduction in a session)
 - d. Coordinating a complex special program (usually a 1.5 or a 2.0 course reduction in a session)
 - e. Chair and major contributor in curriculum revision (varies with responsibilities but usually 1.0 course in a year)
 - f. Chair or co-chair of a major task force (varies with responsibilities, but usually 1.0 course in a year)
 - g. Providing up to 12 tutoring appointments per week in exchange for 1 IEP class
 - h. Other special administrative assignments falling well outside of normal teaching and service workload (to be negotiated with the Director)
- 3) Those faculty members wishing to include extraordinary scholarship and/or service in their workload may negotiate their workload with the Director. If approved, this shall result in a reduction of the teaching load and consideration in the annual evaluation.

TABLE 1¹
SAMPLE WORKLOAD COMPONENT PROPORTIONS

	No “Summer Research” (10-month appointment)	2-month “Summer Research” (10-month appointment)	10-month appointment with 0.5 course reduction for extraordinary service (No “Summer Research”)
Teaching	10 equivalent courses in IEP = 90%, 9 months	10 equivalent courses in IEP = 74%, 9 months	9.5 equivalent courses in IEP = 85%, 8.5 months
Service	1 month = 10% service	1 month = 10% service	Regular service (1 month) and coordinate largely integrated program (0.5 months) = 15% service
Scholarship	Not required, 0%	2 months = 16% scholarship	Not required, 0%
Totals	10 months 100.0%	12 months 100.0%	10 months 100%

¹ Table 1 is a model only; actual proportions could vary with individual workload assignments.

Standard Service Expectations

Each member of the faculty is expected to serve the Institute, College, University, profession and broader community in ways best suited to the faculty member’s talents and the needs of the Institute, college and university. General service obligations include participation in faculty governance and in the effective development and conduct of English Language Institute programs. Examples of specific general service activity include testing students, coordinating graduation ceremonies, and participation in cultural events. In addition, faculty members generally serve on two Institute, College, and/or University committees, though this may vary somewhat depending on the roles and responsibilities within given committees. Members who contribute extraordinary service would, with the approval of the Director, be eligible for a reduction in teaching load. Members with nominal committee responsibilities may serve on more than two committees within a typical service administered load. Normally, service activities constitute 10% of a faculty member’s workload (see examples of variation in Table 1).

Scholarship

ELI faculty are encouraged, but not required, to pursue scholarship. In accordance with section 4.3.4 of the Faculty Handbook, CT faculty members may request, but are not required, to incorporate time spent on “summer research” into their overall percentage distribution of their workload. This will affect only the statistical weight accorded to each component of the

workload (see Table 1). A faculty member wishing to apply for the “summer research option” must submit a written proposal to the Director prior to the annual review in which the individual’s workload plan for the following year is determined. The request must be documented as follows: a statement of the research and scholarship program, its expected results, and its duration. Note that since ELI faculty’s two-month non-teaching period may align with any one of the six IEP sessions, “summer” scholarship could in fact take place in any season without affecting the faculty member’s teaching load for the remaining 10 months of the contract year. The Director may approve or disapprove the proposal based on its content, its appropriateness for the faculty member’s workload, and/or the department’s needs and priorities. Those who wish to renew this option must submit a new request each year. Faculty may propose research programs of varying lengths, each of which would alter the proportions assigned to all workload components. Additional scholarship-related course release to engage in projects that are not feasible in the “summer” option may be awarded at the Director’s discretion.

Use of Workload

Each faculty member will meet with the Director each spring to develop an individual workload plan for the following academic year. That plan must be consistent with the unit’s approved workload policy. Annual evaluations, merit distribution, peer reviews, and promotions must all be based on the *individual* workload plans for the years under review. At any time during the review period, faculty members may request a modification of their workload to adjust to new opportunities and expectations that arise. Examples include a new project, search committee, or scholarship opportunity. Workload adjustments must be mutually agreed upon in writing.

Assignment of Evaluation and Merit Scores

Merit increases are awarded on the basis of each faculty member’s three 9-point scale appraisal ratings as assigned by the director. See the Collective Bargaining Agreement for further details.

The Director’s evaluation of faculty members is based on the following criteria:

Teaching

The category of teaching includes classroom or tutoring instruction; course development; Institute seminars and workshops presented; personal instructional development (seminars attended, courses taken, etc.); and student advisement. Teaching is to be evaluated on the basis of the following data:

- 1) Student course evaluations.
- 2) Classroom observation of CT faculty by the Director or their designee (required) at least once each year. Faculty may be exempted from observations in the academic year immediately following a successful 6th- or 13th-year peer review or promotion. Following a successful 13th-year peer review, faculty must be observed at least twice in every five-year period.
- 3) Observation by colleagues or outside observers (optional) of faculty at their request. The

Institute will provide class coverage for colleagues needing to observe other teachers.

- 4) The classroom faculty's personal written appraisal of their teaching performance.
- 5) A selective sample of representative teaching and assessment materials that they (re)designed for their course(s), such as *one or two* original or redesigned activities, presentations, assignments, or examples of Canvas content.

Using this information, the Director will evaluate each faculty member based on the UD standard scale and these ranges:

Range	Descriptor	Sample criteria
< 4	Unsatisfactory	Teaching that consistently fails to reach the ELI's minimum standards; little or no engagement in professional development or mentoring activities.
4.0-5.9	Satisfactory	Adequate teaching that meets without exceeding the ELI's minimum expectations for faculty; minimal engagement in professional development and/or mentoring activities.
6.0-7.9	Meritorious	Effective teaching that meets and sometimes exceeds ELI's expectations; evidence of improving teaching methods, course materials, course offerings, assessments or curricula; consistent engagement in professional development and/or mentoring activities.
8.0-9.0	Excellent	Highly effective teaching that meets and often exceeds ELI's expectations; evidence of significant impact on teaching methods, course materials, course offerings, assessments, or curricula; impactful engagement in professional development and/or mentoring.

Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities

The faculty member's contribution to research, scholarship, and creative activity will be evaluated based on their quantity of relevant activity, an assessment of how successful the faculty member was in meeting their goals for the year, and an assessment of the quality of the work and its relevance to the faculty. Faculty members are encouraged to include any reviews or evaluations of their scholarly, research, and creative activity along with their annual letter to the Director.

The following is a non-exhaustive list of items a faculty member may include under the category of scholarship, listed in order of ascendancy in terms of weight the Director should assign to each item. Other meritorious accomplishments in research, scholarship, and creative activities may be included in the faculty member's annual appraisal.

1. presentations at regional or local conferences (e.g., PennTESOL-East)
2. presentations at major regional conferences (e.g., WATESOL, NJTESOL, NAFSA Regionals)

3. presentations at major national and international conferences (TESOL, NAFSA, JALT, etc.)
4. research-based papers presented at professional conferences
5. keynote or plenary addresses at professional conference
6. articles (non-juried) in professional publications
7. development of tests used across the Institute curriculum
8. unpublished manuscripts
9. principal or major contributing writer for a curriculum
10. juried articles
11. published digital, video, or multimedia works
12. funded grant proposals
13. chapters in an edited book
14. scholarly or professional books (edited)
15. published textbooks
16. monographs published by a professional society
17. scholarly or professional books (authored)

The Director will evaluate each faculty member based on the UD standard scale and these ranges:

Range	Descriptor	Sample criteria
< 4	Unsatisfactory	No evidence of attempt to meet the faculty member's stated goals in scholarship.
4.0-5.9	Satisfactory	Some progress on the faculty member's stated goals in scholarship, leading to a minimal number of accomplishments with lower weightings.
6.0-7.9	Meritorious	Consistent progress on the faculty member's stated goals and optionally other opportunities in scholarship, leading to the expected number and range of accomplishments.
8.0-9.0	Excellent	Considerable progress on the faculty member's stated goals and optionally other opportunities in scholarship, leading to accomplishments of high weight, impact, and quality.

Service

This area describes service at the public, professional, College, University, and department levels. The faculty member's contribution to service will be evaluated based on the quantity of their activities, an assessment of how successful the faculty member was in meeting their annual goals, and an assessment of the quality of the work and its relevance to the field. Faculty are encouraged to submit any letters from colleagues who can support their performance in these areas.

Public and professional service includes but is not limited to:

- Efforts on behalf of professional organizations (e.g., offices held; service does not include presentations or conference attendance, which are addressed in scholarly activity and teaching, respectively)
- Special programs or presentations (e.g., special presentations at public schools or with community organizations; participation in an ESL-related program or committee for the public schools or some other agency)
- Service-learning activities involving ELI students
- Conducting peer reviews for journals and publishers
- Conducting external reviews for peer review or promotion of non-ELI faculty
- Conducting accreditation or program reviews for other units
- Providing professional consulting services to other universities or organizations
- Serving as a series or journal editor

University and College service includes but is not limited to:

- Advisement to student groups on campus;
- Active participation in University, CAS, or AAUP-UD senates or committees or task forces
- Special assignments on behalf of the University outside of the ELI
- Participation in University forums or conferences
- Membership of a search committee in another department

Department service includes but is not limited to:

- Proposal grant preparation and/or administration
- Coordination of special programs (major vs. minor levels of work based on program intensity, objectives, lack of integration into intensive program, and complexity)
- Active participation on ELI committees, per bylaws
- Participation in new-student orientation activities
- Leadership or participation in special projects or task forces;
- Leadership or participation in organizing retreats, guest speaker presentations, ELI colloquia, or training workshops
- Administrative duties (interviewing students, placement testing, etc.)
- Major role in curriculum revision
- Major role in preparation of the annual ELI magazine
- Major role in Listening Lab development
- Special administrative assignments
- Chair or membership of a search committee
- Extra-curricular activities, cultural activities, or trips with students outside teaching schedules

Other accomplishments in service that are meritorious may be included for consideration in the faculty member's annual appraisal.

The Director will evaluate each faculty member based on the UD standard scale and these ranges:

Range	Descriptor	Sample criteria
< 4	Unsatisfactory	An overall lack of engagement in service and failure to meet the faculty member's obligations and stated goals.
4.0-5.9	Satisfactory	Minimal accomplishment of faculty member's service obligations.
6.0-7.9	Meritorious	Accomplishment of service obligations and consistent progress on faculty member's goals in service (including any additional opportunities or changes to service workload during the review period), at least at the department level and often at the college, university, or professionals levels.
8.0-9.0	Excellent	Accomplishment of service obligations and considerable progress towards and impact in service at the department level as well service to the college, university, and/or profession.

Faculty Review Process

After all necessary information has been gathered, the faculty member and director will follow all specified UD HR guidelines and the prevailing CBA.

Appealing Annual Evaluation Decisions

The Policy Guide for Department Chairs and Academic Program Directors notes, with regards to annual evaluations, “that no chairperson 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 which takes place when a person comes up for promotion [or peer review].” In other words, based on the evidence of student evaluations, class observations, the faculty member’s year-end report, and other evidence a faculty member may choose to submit (such as peer observations), the Director makes their best qualitative assessment of a colleague’s performance for the year. Faculty may disagree and have opportunity on the form to indicate where their assessment differs from that of the director. In other words, there may be times when the Director and faculty colleague may simply have to agree to disagree.

However, if a faculty member feels strongly that the Director has not acted in good faith to render a fair and equitable evaluation, and if reasonable attempts to work out a remedy with the Director have failed, then the faculty member should contact the AAUP.

The AAUP will use the information provided by the faculty member to determine the merits of the case. If there are grounds for further action, ELI’s Director will be asked to meet with the

faculty member and the AAUP to address the issue(s) raised. If the case is not resolved at that meeting, then the AAUP will meet with the relevant university administrator and the Director to address and resolve the issue(s).

Revisions

The ELI's workload policy is subject to review at least every three years. However, amendments can be initiated at any time by a petition from four voting CT faculty members. The Workload policy of the English Language Institute may be amended by a two-thirds majority of the entire voting CT faculty provided that previous notice of intention to amend has been published in the meeting agenda and distributed to the faculty at least one week prior to the meeting in which the proposed amendment(s) will be considered. Changes to this document must receive final approval from the Provost's Office and AAUP-UD.

Document history:

In 2024, the CBA required that workload and merit policies be combined into one aligned policy. This revised document was developed by the ELI CT faculty and ratified unanimously by a vote on November 11, 2024. Subsequent to revisions requested by AAUP-UD, revisions were approved unanimously by a vote on November 17, 2025.

Workload: Approved by ELI faculty on June 20, 2003 Approved by Provost on August 8, 2003

Merit: Adopted April 13, 1991; amended February 7, 2001, amended again February 5, 2003; updated January 6, 2014.