

University of Delaware
Department of Languages, Literatures & Cultures
PEER REVIEW POLICY and PROCEDURE
May 2016

DLLC Peer Review POLICY

This policy refers to and is intended to supplement the minimum requirements set forth in the UD Faculty Handbook Section 4.3.5 on Evaluation of Faculty Members.

From the [Faculty Handbook, Section 4.3.5](#) (minimum guidelines paraphrased)

I. Minimum frequency of evaluations:

TT

- Instructors and assistant professors: every two years
- Associate professors: every three to five years
- Full professors: every five to seven years

CT

Per [Section 4.1.6 of the Faculty Handbook](#), CT faculty will be reviewed according to the following schedule, starting at two-year intervals for the six-year probationary period and culminating in a review every five years if renewed in year thirteen:



DLLC clarification/additional: Exceptions to Peer Review schedule

- Peer review may be omitted for faculty members on terminal leave or retiring in the next year.

- If a faculty member's leave/sabbatical coincides with the year of the peer review, the faculty member must request, with the chair's support, a postponement from the Office of the Dean.
- If a faculty member is up for renewal or promotion in the same year of their peer review, their regular peer review will be omitted.
- If a TT faculty member is hired at a rank that differs from the Assistant Professor rank, their process for peer evaluations may vary. Please also note that some CT faculty members have been given credit for years in which they have worked in a Temporary Appointed position, which may impact where they currently stand in the peer review process. Those faculty members whose process may differ from what is outlined above, will have that information outlined in their initial hire/contract letters.

II. Committee makeup: The chair designates peer review committees.

DLLC clarification/additional policy:

- Per the DLLC bylaws, the chair's Peer Review committee selections are discussed with the Executive Committee.
- Peer Review committees shall consist of a minimum of three committee members, at least two from within DLLC.
- All reviewers must be at same rank as or higher than the faculty member under review.
- Committees reviewing a CT faculty member must include a CT member.
- At least one committee member must be in the same language group as the faculty under review if possible.
- Faculty with joint appointments may choose to include a letter from the director of the other affiliated program for inclusion in the dossier.

III. 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.

DLLC clarification. The faculty member under review may only initiate an appeal after receiving the initial review.

If an appeal is granted, the chair will name a new committee within a month. The new Peer Review will be conducted using the original dossier, but with a new classroom observation.

IV. Dossier makeup: 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.

DLLC clarification: All dossiers will be reviewed in accordance with the individual workload of the faculty member. That is, a dossier for a faculty member with a 100% teaching load would not include a separate service or research component. Teaching-related service, together with teaching-related scholarship (if undertaken by the faculty member under review), would be included in the teaching dossier. If the workload includes research or service for the period under review, those components will be included under separate headings in the dossier.

DLLC Peer Review PROCEDURE

I. DOSSIER PREPARATION

General guidelines

- All online dossiers should include only material from the period under review.
- Please consult the [DLLC Evaluation Metric](#) for a list of teaching, scholarship, and service-related activities and numeric values.
- Please consult [CTAL's Guidelines for Documenting Teaching](#) for additional recommendations on preparing the teaching dossier.
- The faculty member may include other documentation from the period under review in the dossier but does not have to do so. Should the Peer Review Committee require other documentation, it will request it.
- As of February, 2017, all dossiers will be submitted electronically using UDAcademe. Hard copies of books or other evidentiary materials not available in electronic form should be submitted to the head of your committee in a plastic envelope or box with your name, current rank, and dossier submission date.

Calendar: The DLLC chair will publish a Peer Review calendar each spring for the following academic year.

Contents

TENURE TRACK FACULTY: The dossier should include the following materials from the period under review, in the following order:

1. The faculty member's CV.

2. A narrative statement on scholarship, teaching, and service, typically 1-3 pages long.
3. A research dossier including:
 - a) a list of all work published and/or accepted for publication: 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
 - d) evidence of grants and awards
4. A teaching dossier including:
 - a) a chronological list of all courses taught, with enrollments and evaluation scores (question ID 6250 on the online evaluation form).
 - For mixed 400/600 and Honors/regular courses, graduate and honors evaluations are to be averaged in with the total number of students in the class. (i.e. If 5 of 20 students are Honors, their evaluations will be worth 25% of the overall average for the course). This option is available in the UDSIS [online evaluation report](#) by clicking “Report combined courses together” at the bottom of the Reports menu.
 - b) a complete pdf of all student evaluations and comments from all courses taught. This may be pulled from the UDSIS [online evaluation report menu](#) by choosing “PDF Detailed Summary for Fac. Appraisal.”
 - c) syllabi and selected sample course materials (lesson plans, activities, exams, student work) for all courses
 - d) a list of major teaching-related activities
 - e) evidence of grants and awards related to teaching
5. A section detailing service activities, including:
 - a) a list of major service contributions to the department and the field
 - b) evidence of service-related honors and awards

CONTINUING TRACK FACULTY: The dossier should include the following materials from the period under review, in the following order:

If the workload includes research or service for the period under review, those components will be included under separate headings in the dossier. Otherwise, the CT dossier should contain the following:

1. The faculty member’s CV.
2. A narrative statement on teaching and (if relevant) service, typically 1-3 pages long.

3. A teaching dossier including:

- a) a chronological list of all courses taught, with enrollments and evaluation scores (question ID 6250 on the online evaluation form).
 - For mixed 400/600 and Honors/regular courses, graduate and honors evaluations are to be averaged in with the total number of students in the class. (i.e. If 5 of 20 students are honors, their evaluations will be worth 25% of the overall average for the course). This option is available in the UDSIS [online evaluation report](#) by clicking “Report combined courses together” at the bottom of the Reports menu.
- b) a complete pdf of all student evaluations and comments from all courses taught. This may be pulled from the UDSIS [online evaluation report menu](#) by choosing “PDF Detailed Summary for Fac. Appraisal.”
- c) syllabi and selected sample course materials (lesson plans, activities, exams, student work) for all courses
- d) a list of major teaching-related activities
- e) evidence of grants and awards related to teaching
- f) if major teaching-related scholarly activities have been undertaken, provide a list of all work published and/or accepted for publication: for the latter include a copy of the letter of acceptance
- g) copies of works published or accepted for publication
- h) A section detailing teaching related service activities, including:
 - a list of major service contributions to the department and the field
 - evidence of service-related honors and awards

II. REVIEW PROCESS

Duties of the Peer Review Committee chair

The chair of the Peer Review Committee will convene the committee as soon as the dossier is available and assign members to dossier and classroom evaluation.

The chair will communicate to the committee:

1. the period covered by the review
2. the workload (percentage research/teaching/service) of the faculty member under review
3. the deadline for completion of the report. When initial reports in the relevant categories have been drafted, the Committee should meet to go over the drafts and arrive at a final version of the report.

Teaching evaluation

Teaching evaluation shall be based on both the teaching dossier and a classroom observation. Two members of the Peer Review committee will conduct a classroom visit documented in accordance with DLLC classroom observation guidelines.

III. REPORTS CONTENTS AND FORMAT

1. Headings: memo format, addressed to the Department Chair, with signatures appearing on the first page.
2. Length: approx. 2-3 pages.
3. Organization: The report should be organized to reflect the dossier, addressing the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service, in that order. Evaluative language for each section of the report:
 - On track to meet advancement expectations as defined in the P&T document
 - Needs some support to meet expectations, specifically _____
 - The faculty member does not appear to be on track to meet expectations

For full professors the language would simply indicate continued productivity.
4. In the case of tenure track and non-tenure 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 should make specific recommendations regarding future activity, with an eye toward facilitating the faculty member's progress toward promotion.
6. The Committee may not move reported activities from one category to another without the permission of the faculty member being evaluated.