


The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

	Policy:	
	Peer Evaluation Committee	
	Revision: 27 November 1998	Effective: 27 November 1998

Policy

The SBS Peer Evaluation Committee serves two functions: (1) to conduct enhanced reviews of those tenured faculty members who receive overall unsatisfactory evaluations from their units and request such a review at the college level, and (2) to audit each year 1/5th of the senior faculty evaluations as part of the ABOR-mandated Dean's Level Audit, which is charged with determining the adequacy, fairness, and integrity of the evaluation process. Only individuals already holding tenure are eligible to serve on this committee. **Because of the nature of the tasks undertaken by this committee, most of its work will be conducted over the summer months. Hence individuals serving on the committee must be willing and able to carry out the committee's charge over the summer.** The committee will consist of three members. In achieve continuity, members will serve two-year staggered terms.

The college estimates that the number of enhanced reviews that may be held in any one year will be very small, and often there will be none. Approximately 33 individual faculty evaluation dossiers will be reviewed by the committee each year, from four units. In reviewing the dossiers from each unit, the committee members will consider the following six questions:

- (1) whether the unit has adopted sensible and fair guidelines, consistent with SBS and University post-tenure review guidelines, in conducting its reviews,
- (2) whether the unit has adopted sufficiently rigorous, clear, sensible and fair standards for satisfying the various ranking categories, and whether these standards and categories are

consistent with SBS and University post-tenure review guidelines,

(3) whether the unit has set standards, particularly in the case of teaching performance, that will enable it to identify as unsatisfactory those faculty who fall below the kind of performance that ABOR expects faculty to meet, rather than protecting its faculty by setting standards so low that compliance with the standards is virtually guaranteed,

(4) whether the unit has applied its procedures and criteria fairly to the individual faculty members whose dossiers are reviewed,

(5) whether the unit has adopted standards reasonably in line with expectations across the college for performance at the various rating categories, and

(6) whether the unit has delivered a set of evaluations that are reasonably spread across the various ratings categories, given the level of performance of its faculty.

Knowledge