

November 2016

PEER REVIEW PROCESS GUIDELINES

The faculty handbook states that “faculty members at all ranks shall be subject to periodic reviews at reasonable intervals of time.” See <http://facultyhandbook.udel.edu/handbook/435-evaluation-faculty-members>. For all fulltime faculty members, reviews are a means of providing constructive feedback outside the context of the promotion and annual appraisal processes. They also serve to support the accountability of all faculty to meet departmental and professional expectations of competency and productivity in teaching, research, and service. Peer reviews for CTs and tenure track faculty may also be used in decisions about contract renewal.

I. Preparation

- A. Chair will notify all faculty scheduled to undergo review by the end of May prior to the review year.
- B. Chair will create peer review committees
 - 1. Committees will consist of three members
 - 2. Department chair will designate one member as chair
 - a. members should be equal or greater in rank than the person being reviewed

II. Faculty Member’s Dossier.

- A. The faculty member under review will prepare a dossier for his or her review committee’s use and inclusion into the final report.

The dossier should include, in the following order:

- 1. The faculty member’s CV.
 - a. cv should indicate the year in which the last review took place and clearly designate activities that have taken place **since** the last review.
- 2. A statement on teaching, scholarship, and service, typically 1-2pp. in total length (300-600 words).
- 3. A section detailing teaching activities, including: a.) a list of courses taught during the review period, semester by semester; b.) a list of evaluation scores from courses taught showing average scores for questions “How would you rate the course overall?” and “How would rate the instructor overall?” along with selected comments from student evaluations; c.) a list of major teaching-related activities (consult the teaching metric for a master list of these); d.) syllabi and sample assignments for courses being taught during the review period e.)grants and awards.
- 4. A section detailing scholarship activities, including: a) a list of all work published and/or accepted for publication during the period under review: for the latter include a copy of the letter of acceptance; b.) copies of works published or accepted for publication; c.) a list of major scholarly activities (consult the scholarship metric for a master list of these); d.) grants and awards.

5. A section detailing service activities, including: a.) a list of major service contributions (consult service metric for a master list of these); b.) honors and awards.

The faculty member may include other documentation in the dossier but does not have to do so. If the faculty member chooses to include other supporting materials (e.g., course syllabi, conference programs), they should be placed after #5 above in a separate section titled "Supporting Materials". The Peer Review Committee may also require other documentation.

III. Review Process.

A. Classroom Observation.

1. One or more of its members will conduct a classroom visit. The time of this visit will be agreed upon in advance.

B. Draft Report and Dossier

1. The committee may not move reported activities from one category to another without the permission of the faculty member being evaluated.

2. When initial reports in the three categories have been drafted, the Committee should meet to go over the drafts and arrive at a final version of the report.

C. Access to Report

1. The faculty member under review will be given the committee's report and chair's letter after they are completed but before being forwarded to the CAS Dean's office. The faculty member has the option of submitting a written response that will become part of the dossier.

2. Committee members may also meet with the reviewee to offer constructive advice and feedback at their discretion.

D. Deadlines for Reports

1. Final Reports and dossier will delivered to the Chair by December 1 for fall reviews and March 15 for reviews scheduled for the spring.

2. Chair's letter plus the materials detailed above are due in the CAS Dean's office April 1.

IV. Format of the Report.

1. Headings: memo format, addressed to the Department Chair, with signatures appearing at the end of the report.
2. Length: approx. 2-5 pages plus the candidate's statement.
3. Organization: The report should be organized to reflect the dossier, addressing the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service, in that order.

3. The report should clearly state the committee's findings. The candidate should be clearly assessed in relation to Department norms and expectations for faculty at the same time in rank.
4. In the case of tenure track and continuing track faculty members who are eligible for reappointment, the Peer Review Committee should conclude the report with its recommendation.
5. In the case of assistant and associate professors, the Peer Review Committee may choose to make specific recommendations regarding future activity, with an eye toward facilitating the faculty member's progress toward promotion.

V. Timeline

May 1—Chair notifies faculty that they will be peer reviewed in the following academic year.

September 1---Candidate statements and dossiers due.

September 15 –Composition of committees finalized, candidate notified

December 1—Committee reports for reviews scheduled for fall due in Chair's inbox

March 15—Committee reports for spring reviews due in Chair's inbox

April 1—Reports including Chair's letter due in CAS Dean's office