

# 2021 & 2022 Departmental Peer Evaluation Guidance

## NEW 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 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 below in an appendix.

## 2021 & 2022 Departmental Peer Evaluation Guidance

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 5<sup>th</sup>-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.

## 2021 & 2022 Departmental Peer Evaluation Guidance

**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.

# 2021 & 2022 Departmental Peer Evaluation Guidance

## APPENDIX: DEI ASSESSMENT EXAMPLES

DEI activities may, for example, include efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service, inclusive teaching practices, or research in a scholar's area of expertise that highlights inequalities. Starting in 2021 faculty will report their DEI contributions in each of the primary areas of the faculty annual report: teaching, advising, publications and presentation, research and grants, service, consulting, honors and awards. Recognizing that these contributions can take a variety of forms in different fields, departments need to develop discipline-appropriate expectations in each category.

**Text adapted from the Psychology Department:** These may include, but not limited to, contributing to the Department and DDEI initiatives (attending town halls, serving on committees that advance diversity, equity, and inclusion, supporting the Diversifying Psychology Visit Day, supporting the Diversifying Scholarship Conference, recruiting or supporting recruitment efforts of underrepresented minority students); outreach activities with underrepresented minority students such as mentoring (e.g., participating in the Leadership Alliance Program) or presenting at events in the community; intentional efforts to facilitate inclusion in the classroom environment, with particular attention to students who hold marginalized identities; acting on course evaluation comments related to classroom environment in an effort to enhance inclusivity; designing courses that cultivate inclusion; attending trainings or workshops about enhancing diversity, inclusion, and equity in the academy (including a focus on teaching and classroom settings); creating/employing syllabi that highlight the research of scholars from underrepresented groups, incorporate multicultural perspectives and content, or foster critical thinking about issues of diversity, inclusion, and equity; supporting efforts to recruit and retain underrepresented graduate students and faculty; bringing in outside speakers for lunch talks or colloquium to advance discussions of diversity, equity and inclusion; community activism to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion; being a role model as a member of an underrepresented group. This list is by no means exhaustive; these examples are included to highlight that we believe DEI engagement should be defined broadly. Our goal is to ensure this important work, which is often invisible, is both recognized and shared across the department.

### Additional examples include

- Teaching - use of inclusive teaching practices and materials that allow all students to see their demographic group positively represented in the coursework. Positive response to DEI questions on student evaluations or other departmental methods to evaluate teaching. Engaged in work to decrease any performance or experience gaps in the classroom.
- Advising - list of advisees includes a diverse group of students, especially those underrepresented in the field. Students respond positively when interactions/advising is evaluated, differences are not seen among demographic groups.
- Publications and presentation - If applicable, not only the work that is presented but the venues to ensure material is accessible to diverse audiences, especially those impacted by work.
- Research and grants - If applicable, actively seeks to ensure DEI broadly defined is embedded in research/scholarship practices- methods, results, etc. Grants include DEI and broader impacts contributions.
- Service - Leadership on DEI committees and initiatives; worked to embed DEI in service activities outside of those identified as DEI service; new and/or sustained outreach to marginalized communities.
- Consulting - collaborated with diverse groups or provided professional services to groups marginalized in your field.
- Honors and awards - If applicable, was nominated for or received awards based on DEI work and contributions.

## 2021 & 2022 Departmental Peer Evaluation Guidance

### APPENDIX: ADDITIONAL METHODS FOR ASSESSING TEACHING

The limitations of student evaluations are known to all. The faculty Task Force on peer review compiled a list of methods for assessing teaching outside of course evaluations that are used in various departments and could be incorporated into a department's rubric.

*Examples include:*

- a) Evidence of excellence in classroom teaching (could be evaluated via classroom observation by a colleague or a representative of the Center for Teaching Excellence)
- b) Evidence of excellence in teaching effectiveness and/or course design (could be determined via evaluation of materials related to courses taught such as syllabi, homework assignments, midterm and final exam materials, and grade distribution or other indicators such as awards, curriculum development grants, publicity about one's teaching; invited lectures in other courses)
- c) Evidence of effort to improve teaching (i.e.: participating in programs at the Center for Teaching Excellence; pedagogical training beyond UVA; use of new technologies in class; developing new courses or redesigning existing ones; implementation of "innovative" teaching strategies; prepared narrative on teaching or written self-reflection about student evaluations of teaching)
- d) Evidence of effort to cultivate an inclusive, equitable and/or diverse community within the classroom
- e) Evidence of cultivating a varied and collegial teaching profile (such as teaching courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels; teaching small and large courses; teaching required and elective courses)
- f) Evidence of mentoring (such as undergraduate research/DMP students; mentoring of graduate students including directing or reading dissertations, successful and timely progression of one's PhD students through the program, student's work published in peer-reviewed journals or presented at relevant conferences, and student awards. Note that some departments may consider mentoring graduate students as a 'Research' activity while others may consider it in the 'Service' category).
- g) Evidence of scholarly activity related to teaching (such as publishing works about teaching and pedagogy; publishing curriculum related materials; developing educational websites and online teaching tools; textbook and course material development)

## 2021 & 2022 Departmental Peer Evaluation Guidance

### APPENDIX: SAMPLE RUBRIC FOR PEER EVALUATION - FRENCH

	Self	Rev. 1 <i>initials</i>	Rev. 2 <i>initials</i>
<b>NAME of faculty member:</b>			
<b>NAMES of PEC reviewers:</b>			
1)			
2)			
<b>RESEARCH</b> Is there evidence of a coherent, long-term or multi-year research project, evidence of on-going progress during the year of evaluation, or sustained activity within the research field? Evidence of this progress can be manifested through a sampling of the following activities but is not limited to this activity. <i>N.B. while this evaluation covers the year-to-date, it is understood that the general guideline for good productivity is three publications every three years.</i>			
<b>Good:</b>			
· publication of an article (in a peer-reviewed journal or collection)			
· submission or completion of an article or book chapter			
· conference presentations			
· book reviews, or encyclopedia articles (#. )			
· presentation of work in progress			
· receipt of funding to support research			
· media activity related to area of research			
contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion			
<b>Very good to excellent:</b>			
· receipt of a major award (NEH, Guggenheim, ACLS, etc.)			
· publication of a book			
· publication of a major article in a top-tier journal or with a prominent press			
· publication of an edition or edited collection			
· two or more articles in a peer-reviewed journal (#. ) and/or chapters in peer-reviewed books (#. )			
· keynote lecture at conference			
· guest lecture at a university other than UVa			
· media activity related to area of research for major networks, journals, or newspapers			
· Significant contributions to the understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion issues in our discipline			

## 2021 & 2022 Departmental Peer Evaluation Guidance

<b>Fair to poor:</b>			
· no evidence of a coherent research program in progress			
· little to no scholarly activity.			
<b>RESEARCH Recommendations/Comments/ Feedback</b> (both suggestions and positive reactions) from the PEC committee to the chair:			
<b>TEACHING AND MENTORING</b>			
<b>Good</b>			
· positive student evaluations			
· classroom peer evaluation			
· involvement in seminars or workshops geared to improving teaching			
· substantially revised courses			
· organizing activities for the program,			
· mentoring beyond regular advising, which may include but is not limited to writing letters of recommendation and meeting regularly with undergraduate or graduate students on professional issues not related to courses or seminars.			
· contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion			
<b>Very good to excellent:</b>			
· Major award for excellence in teaching			
· Major grant for teaching project			
· Supervision of dissertation(s) (#.        )			
· Supervision of DMP project(s) (#.        )			
· Member of dissertation committees inside or outside the department			
· Introduction of new ways of teaching			
· Introduction of new course offerings			
· Significant innovations in the teaching of issues relating to diversity, equity, and inclusion in our discipline			
<b>Fair to poor:</b>			
· Consistently poor teaching evaluations			
· Consistently low enrollments in relation to department class size			
<b>TEACHING AND MENTORING Recommendations/Comments/ Feedback</b> (both suggestions and positive reactions) from the PEC committee to the chair:			

## 2021 & 2022 Departmental Peer Evaluation Guidance

<b>SERVICE</b>			
<b>Good</b>			
· Productive participation on assigned departmental committees			
· Appropriate service to the college and university			
· Attendance and productive participation at department meetings			
· Normal service to the profession			
· Advising			
· Contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion			
<b>Very good to excellent</b>			
· Chairing major departmental committees (e.g. Search or P&T)			
· Important service to the discipline (e.g. Editing journals, MLA, ACLS committees, outside review of tenure cases, judge for major grants, conference organization, departmental reviews, reading for journals and presses).			
· Significant contributions that help others deepen their understanding of and find new ways to enhance diversity, equity, and inclusion in our discipline			
<b>Fair to poor:</b>			
· Unsatisfactory performance on committees			
· Uncommonly low service record for rank			
· Active refusal to accept committee service			
<b>SERVICE Recommendations/Comments/ Feedback</b> (both suggestions and positive reactions) from the PEC committee to the chair:			

# 2021 & 2022 Departmental Peer Evaluation Guidance

## APPENDIX: SAMPLE RUBRIC FOR PEER EVALUATION - POLITICS

Colleagues' research, teaching and service are evaluated over a five year period.

1. **Research.** Each member of the department has a professional obligation to engage in scholarly research and writing. Merit pay will apply to performance that exceeds normal expectations. Evaluation of merit should be based on objective criteria, according to the norms of different sub-disciplines, which may vary. Criteria frequently appealed to include but are not limited to: (i) the quality and quantity of peer reviewed publications, (ii) quality and quantity for research grants and grant activities, (iii) awards and recognition for scholarship. Material is considered "published" when it has been accepted in final form (i.e., the next steps are copyediting/proofreading, and the expectation is that the author can no longer make more than minimal changes).

2. **Teaching.** Each member of the department has a professional obligation to perform his or her teaching responsibilities in a conscientious fashion. Merit pay will apply to performance that exceeds normal expectations. Evaluation of merit should be based on objective criteria including, but not limited to: (i) student evaluations, (ii) development of new courses, (iii) teaching of service courses, (iv) quantity and quality of advising, independent study courses, and thesis direction, (v) quality and quantity of graduate mentorship including training and placement of PhDs, and (vi) awards and recognition for teaching.

3. **Service.** Each member of the department has a professional obligation to perform service to the department, college, university, profession and public. Merit pay will apply to performance that exceeds normal expectations. Evaluation of merit should be based on objective criteria including, but not limited to: (i) the importance and time commitment required of service commitment, (ii) time given on professional obligations including review of manuscripts, editorial board memberships and editorships, (iii) public lectures and significant pro bono contributions to government at all levels, and (iv) awards and recognition for service.

4. To aid in transparency all materials being used for peer evaluation will be posted on the Department Collab (or similar) site. This material includes, but is not limited to, CVs and the Department's Peer Review Report.

The committee will rate faculty members in Research, Teaching and Service on the College-mandated scale from 1 (Poor) to 10 (Excellent).