

2021 & 2022 Departmental Peer Evaluation Guidance

NEW for THIS YEAR

- Peer review committees must use a written rubric and share the rubric and review process with their Department & Dean's office
- DEI contribution included in each section of the Annual Report

NEW for NEXT YEAR

- DEI included in the review process
- Evaluation of teaching not simply by course evaluations
- Add internal appeals process to Peer Evaluation

This document is intended to provide guidance from the Dean's office regarding conducting annual peer reviews. Annual reports and peer reviews serve many purposes beyond simple evaluation. They document and allow us to learn about our colleagues' accomplishments in teaching, research, mentoring, arts practice, and service; faculty recognitions and awards; and other achievements of the year. They allow faculty to receive mentoring and counsel from their peers as they work toward promotion and career advancement.

Peer Evaluation became the means of carrying out annual faculty reviews in 2012. In implementing peer evaluation, the College left departments extensive latitude on implementation, recognizing that what constitutes scholarly success in one discipline can be quite different from another. In recent years, the College in consultation with faculty working groups developed shared principles and practices that apply across disciplines. These shared principles are aimed at ensuring the process is transparent, fair, equitable and minimizes biases.

2021 faculty annual reporting and peer review timeline

1. December 2021: Faculty annual report tool opens
2. January-February 2022: Faculty annual reports due to department
3. March-April 2022: Departments conduct peer review process
4. April 15, 2022: Department peer review reports due to Dean's office

In Spring 2022, for evaluations of the 2021 Annual Reports, all department peer review processes should follow these guidelines:

1. Each department's peer review process should be written, easily accessible to all faculty in the department, and guided by the principles of fairness and transparency. This refers to the department's procedures, including how the committee is appointed or selected, term length, scope of review, etc.
2. Assistant professors (both tenure-track and general faculty) and lecturers should not be asked to serve on peer review committees. Senior or Distinguished Lecturers may conduct peer review for colleagues on the Lecturer track.
3. All departments should establish and share a detailed written rubric to ensure that both the faculty members being evaluated, and the reviewers know and understand the criteria that will be used in the evaluation. This should be shared annually with the faculty in the department.
 - The rubric should include the questions being asked as well as the standards the committee will use to evaluate their peers. For example, what does it mean to be below average, average, above average and excellent for each metric on the rubric. Rubrics should acknowledge and account for disciplinary subfield differences. Departments need not invent from scratch their own rubrics. Excellent and transferable samples are included in an appendix.
4. As the first business of the committee prior to beginning the evaluation process, peer review committees should discuss how they intend to deal with conflicts of interest and review possible biases that could affect the review.
 - The departmental DDEI should be called upon to direct this discussion in the event that they are not already a member of the committee. The Conflict-of-Interest policy should be clearly spelled out, and all conflicted individuals should be recused from all matters where the conflict exists. A personal relationship (e.g., spouse, partner) is automatically a conflict.
5. If the department chair is on the committee, their role should be limited to that of an ex officio, non-voting, observer.
 - The reason for this is that the Chair is tasked with writing the final summary faculty assessment and report, and they therefore already have an independent evaluator function.
6. All faculty should receive written feedback following the review.

Beginning in Spring 2022 and subsequent years, all department peer review reports should include the following:

1. A copy of the department's written peer review *process document* and rubric that is shared annually with the faculty in the department.
2. A peer-based *evaluation of each faculty member's performance*. The evaluation for each faculty member should include
 - A rating for each faculty member in the categories of teaching, research, and service. Individual departments' rating systems should be translated to the following scale: Excellent=9-10; Very Good=7-8; Good=5-6; Fair=3-4; Poor=1-2.
 - Written narrative feedback to be shared with the faculty member. Departments may determine the form and content of this feedback that would be most suitable for them, but we ask chairs and committees to think of this feedback as *formative*. We ask that you write and share it in the spirit of future-looking mentoring, constructive and collegial engagement with one another, and career counsel. The basis for the written comments can be the peer review committees' summaries. Departments may choose to augment a written report with an oral assessment, provided the gist of the conversation is included in the written document.
3. An *evaluation of the department chair* that includes teaching, research, and service as well as their contribution in the role of chair. This will be submitted separately.
4. An *explanation of the weights* given to teaching, research, and service for each of your faculty members. There is no A&S standard for weights, but if no weights are included in the report the following defaults will be used for teaching, research, and service, respectively:
 - TTT faculty: 40/40/20
 - General faculty, teaching track: 80/0/20
 - PRS: 0/100/0
5. 5th year review memos: all 5th-year associate professors should engage with the department chair in a conversation about their progress towards promotion. The substance of these conversations should be documented in a separate memo of conversation to be submitted with the peer review report. Please include potential steps/resources the department and/or Dean's office could provide to assist with the faculty's progress to promotion.
6. AGFM Promotion readiness check. After serving 6 consecutive years at the entry level, an AGFM is eligible for consideration for promotion. Unlike the case for TT faculty, promotion consideration is not required; the faculty member can choose when to request a promotion review. Because of this, general faculty members at this career point may appreciate further guidance and mentoring from their colleagues. We recommend for these cases that the peer evaluation should include a brief "readiness check" in the formative comments. We encourage the Chair to follow up with the individual, as appropriate.

For evaluations of the 2022 Annual Reports and subsequent years, departmental peer review processes should follow the above guidelines as well as these three additional elements:

1. Amend peer review *rubrics to evaluate DEI contributions* starting with 2022 Annual Reports if they are not already evaluating these contributions. The 2021 Faculty Annual reporting form asks all faculty to share their contributions to DEI in the following categories: teaching, advising, publications and presentation, research and grants, service, consulting, honors and awards. This change was made to transition from documenting DEI contributions to evaluating them in the peer review process. Please see the appendix for examples of ways to assess DEI contributions.
 2. Establish and adopt within your department at least *one additional method of assessing teaching performance*, independent of student course evaluations. Please see appendix for recommendations from the faculty task force. In addition, the Dean's office will facilitate sessions with colleagues from the School of Education in Spring 2022.
 3. Establish and share an *internal appeals process*.
- All faculty should have the opportunity to respond to their review and have corrections made if appropriate. Departments should establish an internal protocol if disagreements cannot be resolved. Following is an example from the Chemistry Department: Faculty who disagree with their overall summary evaluation can ask for an appeal. A committee consisting of a (1) past department Chair, (2) research subcommittee Chair, and (3) teaching subcommittee Chair would then work together come up with an independent evaluation and share that with the department Chair and the appealing faculty member. If that second evaluation differs from the department Chair evaluation, and the department Chair does not wish to change his/her evaluation, the faculty member could then petition the Associate Dean for the Sciences for their evaluation to be changed.