

Revised 4/29/94, 2/24/97, 4/18/97, 3/28/00, 4/28/08, 1/22/14, 12/5/14, 4/10/15, 4/27/18, 9/18/18, 01/18/19; 1/17/20; 4/22/21; 12/10/21

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PEER EVALUATION

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS, LANGUAGES, AND CULTURES

PART I: Criteria and Procedures for Peer Evaluation of Tenure System Faculty

This document functions in two ways: a) it describes the value that the Department places on a variety of activities and, b) it sets forth the manner by which each member of the faculty is to be evaluated. The activities are: teaching, scholarship, and service and outreach.

I. CRITERIA AND EVIDENCE

Faculty should present evidence for evaluation in a concise manner, adhering to the guidelines below.

A. TEACHING

1. Definition

Teaching encompasses the development, preparation, and presentation of scheduled courses. Teaching also includes direction of instructional programs (including study abroad), teaching assistants and instructors themselves as well as supervision of theses, dissertations, and independent studies.

2. Supporting Documentation

(See Appendix: Guidelines for Peer Evaluation Fact Sheets)

3. Committee evaluation

The Faculty Evaluation Committee should consider the appropriateness of the syllabus, materials, and assignments, as well as student evaluations and other evidence of effective teaching. In addition, the committee should be sensitive to the burden imposed by new course preparation and extenuating circumstances as noted by the faculty member. Committee members should also consider the amount of individual student supervision and other instructional obligations in their overall judgment of a faculty member's teaching performance.

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PEER EVALUATION
Department of Linguistics, Languages, and Cultures

B. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

1. Definition

Scholarship is the creation of new knowledge or insightful commentary on existing knowledge.

2. Supporting Documentation: (See Appendix: Guidelines for Peer Evaluation Fact Sheets)

3. Committee evaluation

The Faculty Evaluation Committee should consider the scholarly activity of the faculty member with regard to its quality, quantity, and type. For published works, the committee should consider only those items which have actually appeared in print by the end of the calendar year being evaluated. Grant proposals should be considered for the year in which they are accepted or rejected.

C. SERVICE AND OUTREACH

1. Definition

Service consists of contributions, beyond the categories mentioned above, and made to students, the university, the profession, and the public at large. It is understood to refer to those contributions relating to one's professional competence.

2. Supporting Documentation:

(See Appendix: Guidelines for Peer Evaluation Fact Sheets)

3. Committee Evaluation

The Faculty Evaluation Committee should take into account both the amount of time devoted to the service activity as well as the importance of the activity itself.

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PEER EVALUATION
Department of Linguistics, Languages, and Cultures

II. PROCEDURES

- A. Preparation and submission of documents for evaluation will be accomplished in the Spring Semester according to the following procedures:
1. Each faculty member shall submit a Fact Sheet and supporting materials to the Department. These sheets shall summarize information for the past calendar year (January 1-December 31), and shall follow the format and guidelines laid out in the document-“Guidelines for Peer Evaluation Fact Sheets”, which is attached as an appendix to this document.
 2. Faculty shall upload to a FERPA compliant file-sharing program a copy of their current Fact Sheet, the preceding year’s Fact Sheet, and supporting documents.
 3. The purpose for including the Fact Sheet from the preceding year is to give a broader perspective on each faculty member’s accomplishments and to help rectify possible anomalies, as well as to allow recognition of a monograph or similarly substantial piece of work in both the year of its appearance and the subsequent year.
- B. The duties of the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Chair will consist of:
1. A preliminary FEC meeting to discuss and establish guidelines and procedures.
 2. A careful review of faculty records, including the Fact Sheets, the student evaluation forms, and other relevant material included in faculty members' files.
 3. Each FEC member shall review the file of each faculty member (excluding his/her own file or that of a spouse/significant other) and evaluate the faculty member’s performance as I (improvement recommended); M (meets expectations for meritorious performance); or E (exceeds expectations for meritorious performance) in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity, and service and outreach.

FEC members will also provide an overall evaluation, which also uses the I, M, E descriptors. The overall evaluation reflects peer assessment of the faculty member’s performance as a whole in the context of their distribution of responsibilities, (sub)field, and position.

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PEER EVALUATION
Department of Linguistics, Languages, and Cultures

The following shall serve as the criteria for the evaluation.

Teaching

(I) The faculty member does not consistently display best practices in teaching and/or student mentoring. Improvement is recommended to meet the standards expected for their position.

(M). The faculty member conducts courses that consistently display best practices in teaching in that they promote positive learning outcomes for students. The faculty member makes contributions to teaching and student mentoring that are appropriate for their position. The faculty member's performance reflects successful and engaged teaching.

(E). The faculty member has made contributions beyond expectations to student learning through exceptional teaching or student mentorship. Special contributions are made beyond the expectations for their position.

Scholarly activity

(I). The faculty member does not demonstrate adequate engagement with their field and/or does not produce an appropriate amount and/or quality of research. Improvement is recommended to meet the standards expected for their rank and position.

(M). The faculty member demonstrates evidence of meritorious performance through engagement with their field through research. The quality and/or amount of their research is appropriate to their field and commensurate with their rank and current position. The faculty member's performance reflects the production of quality research.

(E). The faculty member has significantly exceeded the amount and/or quality of research that is indicative of meritorious performance by someone at their rank and in their (sub)field.

Service and outreach

(I). The faculty member does not make appropriate contributions in quality and/or amount to the university and/or profession through service work, as expected for their rank and position.

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PEER EVALUATION
Department of Linguistics, Languages, and Cultures

(M). The faculty member makes appropriate and meaningful contributions to the university and profession through service, taking on responsibilities when expected and participating fully in service that is appropriate for the faculty member's rank and current position. The faculty member's performance reflects effective and engaged service and outreach.

(E). The faculty member takes on significantly more responsibilities than are expected for their rank and position. Special, significant and impactful contributions to the university and/or profession are made.

4. The Chair's final recommendation to the dean will involve careful and serious consideration of the FEC's recommendations.
 5. By July 15, the Chair will inform each faculty member, in writing, of the results of their evaluation. Whenever appropriate, such evaluations shall contain constructive and explicit recommendations and clarify expectations of what is needed to make additional progress in the tenure system. This information shall be given in a timely manner, and after receiving it individual faculty members will have an opportunity to discuss their evaluations, as well as their professional progress in general, with the Chair.
- C. If, after receiving the written review, the faculty member disagrees with its content or chooses to provide additional documentation or comment, the faculty member shall have an opportunity to respond to the review. Any additional written faculty comment and/or documentation which is submitted within one month of receipt of the written review shall become part of the documentation for the review.
- D. Faculty will be evaluated in terms of their performance and achievement in the areas identified in Section 1 of these Procedures.
1. TEACHING
 2. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY
 3. SERVICE AND OUTREACH
- E. The above procedures will be used by the Department to inform merit increases that will be effective in the subsequent academic year.
- F. The Chair will also take into account other considerations in accordance with University policy and as indicated by the Office of the Provost; for example:

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PEER EVALUATION
Department of Linguistics, Languages, and Cultures

1. contributing to Lifelong Education
 2. affirmative action
 3. structural adjustments in the salary scale
 4. salary anomalies
- G. A copy of the written review, and the faculty member's response (if any), will be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file. The full documentation will be retained in the department office. The electronic copy of the Fact Sheet and supporting documents will be archived by the Department office.

PART II: Policy for Yearly Evaluation of Fixed-term Faculty

The following procedures will be used by the Department to determine merit increases for fixed-term faculty who are appointed for a full year if eligible for merit increase.

A. Procedures

Each fixed-term faculty member to be evaluated shall submit a Fact Sheet and supporting materials to the Department. These sheets shall summarize information for the past calendar year (January 1 - December 31 or August 15 - December 31 for those in the first year of appointment).

1. List courses taught, number of students, SIRS average, new courses developed, and TAs supervised.
2. Other activities may also be listed as applicable and in accordance with contractual obligations, for example, advising, study abroad activities, sponsorship of student activities, conference presentations, publications or other activities related to their teaching responsibilities.

B. Evaluation

Evaluation takes place by the Departmental Fixed-term Evaluation Committee (FTEC) and separate subcommittees for each person being evaluated.

C. Duties of the Subcommittees, FTEC, and Chair.

1. Both the FT and TS members of the subcommittee are each responsible for observing one of the fixed-term faculty's classes in the fall semester at a mutually agreeable time. Members of the subcommittee should use the

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PEER EVALUATION
Department of Linguistics, Languages, and Cultures

appropriate version of the Class Observation Forms (see Appendix A) to conduct their evaluation. Following this visit, subcommittee members will complete the Observation Form and submit it to the Chair. The faculty member's supervisor or coordinator may also visit the faculty member's class and provide additional comments. The subcommittee's duties include only conducting the classroom observation and completing the observation form.

2. Each FTEC member will use the materials submitted and the report of the subcommittee to evaluate each fixed-term faculty member's performance in the Spring Semester as I (improvement recommended); M (meets expectations for meritorious performance); or E (exceeds expectations for meritorious performance) in the area of teaching. If a fixed-term faculty member has an appointment percentage in service and/or research, the same descriptors are used in these two areas.

FTEC members will also provide an overall evaluation, which also uses the I, M, E descriptors. The overall evaluation reflects peer assessment of the faculty member's performance as a whole in the context of their distribution of responsibilities, (sub)field, and position.

The evaluative criteria are the same as listed in Part I: II B.3.

3. The FTEC members shall present the above evaluation to the Chair at a mutually agreed upon date.
 4. The Chair will make a final determination of merit increases for fixed-term faculty, giving full consideration to the FTEC's recommendations.
 5. The Chair will inform each fixed-term faculty member in writing of the results of their evaluation by July 15.
- E. If, after receiving the written review, the faculty member disagrees with its content or chooses to provide additional documentation or comment, he or she shall have an opportunity to respond to the review. Any additional written faculty comment and/or documentation which is submitted within one month of receipt of the written review shall become part of the documentation for the review.
- F. The following procedures will be used by the Department to determine merit increases for fixed-term faculty who are appointed for only one semester.

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PEER EVALUATION
Department of Linguistics, Languages, and Cultures

1. The faculty member's supervisor will observe at least one class in the first half of the semester. If necessary, the supervisor will provide a written evaluation to the faculty member and send a copy to the chair.
2. If there is no supervisor, the chair or associate chair will do the observation and write the evaluation.
3. If the faculty member has taught for at least two semesters, the supervisor may decide that no observation is necessary.

Appendix A

1. Class Observation Evaluation Form: Face-to-Face

2. Class Observation Evaluation Form: Online Synchronous

3. Class Observation Evaluation Form: Online Asynchronous

Department of Linguistics and Germanic, Slavic, Asian and African Languages

Class Observation Evaluation Form for **Face-to-Face Courses**

Course information:

Instructor:

Class:

Date and time:

Observer:

This form is intended for observation of face-to-face courses

Part I: Class description

(Please request a bulleted point list of class activities from the instructor.)

Adapt this table as appropriate for course content and/or teaching style

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PEER EVALUATION
 Department of Linguistics, Languages, and Cultures

Time (divide into discrete activities – use as many rows as needed)	What happened (what was the activity)	Comments (what strengths did you see; what needs improvement; were the students engaged; etc.)
Ex. 9-9:15	The instructor summarized a difficult grammatical concept that the students had trouble with during the last class.	The summary was clear and the students asked good follow-up questions.
Ex. 9:15-9:30	The instructor gave some background information about a video that the students were going to watch.	The explanation was in the target language and the instructor spoke slowly, used gestures, and had pictures on the PPT slides to help students understand. Unfortunately, he did not give the students a chance to ask questions about unclear points.

Part II: Evaluation

Please comment on each of these areas, if applicable, and give evidence for your judgment.

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PEER EVALUATION

Department of Linguistics, Languages, and Cultures

1. SUBJECT MATTER CONTENT/LANGUAGE SKILL DEVELOPMENT

(e.g., shows good command and knowledge of subject matter OR shows understanding of principles of language teaching and learning as relevant to the class at hand)

2. ORGANIZATION OF THE CLASS AND MANAGEMENT

(e.g., organizes subject matter; evidences preparation; is thorough; states clear objectives; emphasizes and summarizes main points, meets class at scheduled time)

3. RAPPORT AND STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

(e.g., holds interest of students; is respectful, fair, and impartial; provides feedback, encourages participation; interacts with students; shows enthusiasm)

4. TEACHING METHODS

(e.g., uses relevant teaching methods, aids, materials, techniques, and technology; includes variety, balance, imagination, group involvement; uses examples that are simple, clear, precise, and appropriate; stays focused on and meets stated objectives)

5. PRESENTATION

(e.g., establishes classroom environment conducive to learning; maintains eye contact; uses a clear voice, strong projection)

Part III: Summary

What worked well in the class?

What suggestions do you have for the instructor?

Department of Linguistics and Germanic, Slavic, Asian and African Languages

Class Observation Evaluation Form for

Synchronous

Online Course Sessions

Course information:

Instructor:

Class:

Date and time:

Observer:

This form is intended for observation of online courses during their synchronous virtual meeting.

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PEER EVALUATION
 Department of Linguistics, Languages, and Cultures

Part I: Class description

- Please request a bulleted point list of class activities from the instructor as well as description of related asynchronous activities.
- Ask to be added to the class D2L site and review any related pre- or post-synchronous session activities.

Adapt this table as appropriate for course content and/or teaching style

Time (divide into discrete activities – use as many rows as needed)	What happened (what was the activity)	Comments (what strengths did you see; what needs improvement; were the students engaged; etc.)

Part II: Evaluation

Please comment on each of these areas, **if applicable**, and give evidence for your judgment.

1. SUBJECT MATTER CONTENT/LANGUAGE SKILL DEVELOPMENT

(e.g., shows good command and knowledge of subject matter OR shows understanding of principles of language teaching and learning as relevant to the class at hand)

2. ORGANIZATION OF THE CLASS AND MANAGEMENT

(e.g., organizes subject matter; evidences preparation; is thorough; states clear objectives; emphasizes and summarizes main points; meets class at scheduled time)

3. RAPPORT AND STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

(e.g., holds interest of students; is respectful, fair, and impartial; provides feedback; encourages participation; interacts with students; shows enthusiasm)

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PEER EVALUATION
Department of Linguistics, Languages, and Cultures

4. TEACHING METHODS

(e.g., uses relevant teaching methods, aids, materials, techniques, and technology; includes variety, balance, imagination, group involvement; uses examples that are simple, clear, precise, and appropriate; stays focused on and meets stated objectives)

5. PRESENTATION

(e.g., establishes classroom environment conducive to learning and appropriate to online sessions)

Part III: Summary

What worked well in the class?

What suggestions do you have for the instructor?

Department of Linguistics and Germanic, Slavic, Asian and African Languages

Class Observation Evaluation Form for

Asynchronous

Online Courses

Course information:

Instructor:

Class:

Unit/Module:

Observer:

This form is intended for observation of asynchronous online courses.

Part I: Unit description

Talk to the instructor and ask them what they think would be an appropriate unit to evaluate. This could be a lesson, unit, or module, depending on how the course is structured. The most likely option is to assess a full module, but

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PEER EVALUATION
 Department of Linguistics, Languages, and Cultures

work with the instructor. If the module is in a language that you cannot understand, it is recommended that you meet with the instructor to help them walk you through the module.

1. Describe the components of the lesson/unit/module using the table below and adding as many rows as needed.

Component (describe the activity/tool)	Comments (what strengths did you see; what needs improvement)

Part II: Evaluation

Please comment on each of these areas, **if applicable**, and give evidence for your judgment.

1. SUBJECT MATTER CONTENT/LANGUAGE SKILL DEVELOPMENT

(e.g., shows good command and knowledge of subject matter OR shows understanding of principles of language teaching and learning as relevant to the class at hand)

2. ORGANIZATION OF THE CLASS AND MANAGEMENT

(e.g., organizes subject matter; module is fleshed out and well-organized; is thorough; lists clear objectives; activities support objectives; unit includes a summary or evaluation activity; module activities are appropriate for the time allotted)

3. RAPPORT AND STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

(e.g., activities are engaging; the language in the instructions is respectful, fair, and impartial; at least a portion of the activities include immediate feedback; module shows evidence of teacher feedback; activities include communication activities where appropriate; teacher's presence in the unit is obvious)

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PEER EVALUATION
Department of Linguistics, Languages, and Cultures

4. TEACHING METHODS

(e.g., uses relevant teaching methods, aids, materials, techniques, and technology; includes variety, balance, imagination, interaction; uses examples that are simple, clear, precise, and appropriate; stays focused on and meets stated objectives)

5. PRESENTATION

(e.g., materials and activities are displayed in a way that it establishes an online classroom environment conducive to learning and appropriate for asynchronous online learning)

Part III: Summary

What worked well in the unit/module?

What suggestions do you have for the instructor?