

College of Liberal Arts

College Peer Review Process

Faculty have the option to appeal either their Comprehensive Periodic Review (see Handbook of Operating Procedures, HoOP, 4.4.8) or their annual Professional Activities or Merit Review (see HoOP 4.5). The policy below outlines the procedures for any appeals of the above evaluations to a College Peer Review Committee.

Comprehensive Periodic Review

Per guidelines in the HoOP (4.4.8.2.8), evaluations by a departmental comprehensive periodic review committee must be communicated to faculty members and the chair¹. Departments must have established written policies that allow individuals to correct inaccuracies in their evaluation and/or appeal the comprehensive periodic review evaluation within the department. These policies should also clearly articulate what information is communicated to the College when the final outcome of the comprehensive periodic review is submitted to the College. Generally speaking, if the departmental appeal committee changes the original evaluation because of an omission or oversight that is corrected, this information does not need to be communicated to the College. However, if the departmental appeal committee re-evaluates an individual and makes a significant change in the final evaluation that is not due to an omission or oversight, this should be communicated to the College to assist with any subsequent appeals.

The HoOP (4.4.8.2.9) also provides a mechanism for the faculty member, the department chair, or the Dean to request a review by a College Peer Review Committee. The procedure for doing this is outlined below.

1. Requests for a Peer Review Committee initiated by a faculty member or department chair should be made within a reasonable period of time after the comprehensive evaluation is submitted to the College. Generally, this should be within three weeks of the date that these are due in the College (typically September 1) or the date submitted to the College if submitted after the due date. Requests for a Peer Review Committee by the Dean should be initiated at least one month before the results are due in the Provost's office. In all instances, the request for a Peer Review Committee must be in writing and the individual making the request must provide some rationale for the request.
2. After receiving or submitting an appeal request, the Dean will assign the appeal to an associate dean who will notify all parties involved about the request for a Peer Review Committee and the rationale for this request. The associate dean will provide all parties an opportunity to submit additional information to help address the issue(s).
3. The associate dean will attempt to facilitate a resolution that is satisfactory to all parties by sharing additional information submitted by one or more parties. For example, if the additional information addresses the concern(s) of the individual who requested the appeal and that individual is now comfortable with the recommended evaluation, the appeal process can end without forming a Peer Review Committee.

¹ For simplicity, "department" is used to refer to both departments and programs and "chair" is used to refer to both department chairs and program directors.

4. If any of the parties involved still desire to proceed with the appeal, the associate dean will create an ad hoc Peer Review Committee to evaluate the appeal. This peer review committee will:
 - a) adhere to guidelines outlined in the HoOP regarding the composition of members;
 - b) not contain any representatives from the home department of the faculty member;
 - c) carefully review all the materials and may request additional information; and
 - d) provide a written summary of their decision, within any time limits specified in the HoOP, that will be conveyed to all relevant individuals as outlined in the HoOP.

Periodic Annual Review (PAR) or Merit Review

The general procedures for appealing a PAR or merit evaluation mirror those for the comprehensive periodic review.

Prior to submitting PAR evaluations to the College, each member of a department must be given an opportunity to see their own PAR review and the recommended rating of the Departmental PAR Committee. This should be done after the departmental PAR committee completes the reviews and can be done simultaneously with the chair's PAR review (the chair's review and recommended PAR rating does not have to be shared with individuals). Departments must have established written policies that allow individuals to correct inaccuracies in their evaluation and/or appeal the PAR evaluation within the department. These policies should also clearly articulate what information is communicated to the College when the final outcome of the PAR is submitted to the College. Generally speaking, if the departmental appeal committee changes the original evaluation because of an omission or oversight that is corrected, this information does not need to be communicated to the College. However, if the departmental appeal committee re-evaluates an individual and makes a significant change in the final evaluation that is not due to an omission or oversight, this should be communicated to the College to assist with any subsequent appeals.

The HoOP (4.5.1.4) also provides a mechanism for a faculty member to appeal the final PAR or merit rating assigned by the Dean. The procedure for doing this is outlined below.

1. Within ten (10) working days of receiving their final PAR evaluation from the Dean, faculty who wish to appeal (appealer) must notify the Dean in writing of their intention to appeal. The Dean will assign the appeal to an associate dean who will oversee the appeal process.
 - This written notification must include a rationale for the appeal and may include additional information to help support the appeal that was not included in the original PAR form.
 - Any faculty member who does not apply for an appeal within 10 working days must provide good cause as to reasons for missing the 10 working day deadline. The associate dean will evaluate the reason(s) for missing the appeal deadline and decide whether the appeal can proceed.
2. The associate dean who has been assigned to oversee the appeal will contact the department chair and give the chair ten (10) working days to review any additional material provided by the appealer. The chair should then submit a response to the College that discusses the additional information and how it was considered in the departmental process and/or impact the evaluation. The chair should also discuss whether the appealer filed a departmental appeal before the PAR evaluation was sent to the College if this information was not disclosed in the original submission.
3. The associate dean will then share any new information from the appealer and/or department chair with the Dean. The Dean will evaluate whether this new information impacts the original evaluation communicated by the Dean to the faculty member.
 - If the Dean concludes that a different PAR evaluation is warranted, she or he will communicate this to the appealer. The appealer will then have seven (7) working days to either accept this adjusted merit rating or continue the appeal process.
 - If the Dean concludes that the original PAR evaluation is still warranted, this will be communicated to the associate dean who is handling the appeal and the appeal process will continue.
4. In instances when the appeal process continues, the associate dean will create an ad hoc Peer Review Committee to evaluate the appeal. This Peer Review Committee will:

- a) adhere to guidelines outlined in the HoOP regarding the composition of members;
- b) not contain any representatives from the department of the appellant;
- c) carefully review all the materials and may request additional information as outlined in the HoOP; and
- d) provide a written summary of their decision, within any time limits specified in the HoOP, that will be conveyed to all relevant individuals as outlined in the HoOP.

May 14, 2018 – Draft proposal submitted to chairs/directors (Dean's Digest, Vol. 1 #14)

May 29, 2018 – Dean and associate deans reviewed feedback from chairs/directors

June 6, 2018 – Revised proposal implemented and posted on website