

ANNUAL FACULTY PEER REVIEW

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA LANCASTER

PURPOSE

As stated in the *Regional Campuses Faculty Manual*, the University of South Carolina is committed to annual review of all faculty. On the University of South Carolina Lancaster campus, each faculty member must undergo an annual peer review. The peer review process is designed to provide an opportunity to document the professional development of the faculty member, and to provide regular and constructive evaluations of the performance of the faculty member. Annual Peer Review also provides an opportunity to assess the contributions of the faculty member to the mission of USC Lancaster.

EXEMPTIONS FROM ANNUAL FACULTY PEER REVIEW

Each faculty member is required to undergo annual faculty peer review. Faculty members preparing files for first or third-year review, the tenure and promotion process, or post-tenure review may be exempted from the annual faculty peer review process. Those faculty members should refer to the *Manual* and to USC Lancaster's policies for the specific requirements of these reviews. Administrators subject to administrative review by faculty may elect not to undergo annual faculty peer review in addition to administrative review.

PREPARATION OF THE ANNUAL FACULTY PEER REVIEW FILE

Annually each faculty member shall complete a Faculty Information Form (FIF) detailing the faculty member's professional activities conducted during the previous calendar year. The FIF is arranged according to the criteria for tenure and promotion found in the *Regional Campuses Faculty Manual*, and the faculty member is encouraged to consult the *Manual* closely in the preparation of the FIF. The criteria stated in the *Manual* recognize three broad areas: Effectiveness as a Teacher and/or Librarian, Scholarship, Service. In documenting effectiveness for these criteria, the faculty member should focus specifically on their contributions to the mission of USC Lancaster in the performance of each of these areas.

EVALUATION OF TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

The Local Tenure and Promotion Committee evaluating the annual peer review files of tenured and tenure-track faculty will evaluate faculty on three categories, and average these evaluations according to the weights below. Candidates for tenure or promotion should consider that this scale is based on USC Lancaster expectations for annual peer review only, and does not necessarily reflect the level of performance expected for tenure or promotion, at either the local or the system level:

| | |
|-----|---|
| 60% | Effectiveness as a Teacher and/or Librarian |
| 20% | Scholarship |
| 20% | Service |

EVALUATION OF FULL-TIME INSTRUCTORS

Full-time instructors do not have a scholarship component to their job responsibilities and their evaluations by the Instructor Peer Review Committee will be given the following weights.

| | |
|-----|---|
| 80% | Effectiveness as a Teacher and/or Librarian |
| 20% | Service |

Full-time instructors who have scholarship accomplishments to report have the option of choosing to be evaluated by the Local Tenure and Promotion Committee with the same weights as tenured and tenure-track faculty. A faculty member wishing to be evaluated in this way should indicate that preference by checking the appropriate box on the FIF.

For a description of the current criteria for each of these areas, please refer to the most recent edition of the *Regional Campuses Faculty Manual*. It is important that the faculty member include activities in each relevant section of the FIF, and the faculty member is encouraged to present limited narrative providing context and explaining the importance of the most significant activities included in the file. Faculty members should note that within the category of service, USC Lancaster sets a high priority on service to the community.

PROCEDURES AND DEADLINES

Annual peer review shall be conducted according to the following schedule:

- January 31** The faculty member shall have submitted a completed FIF to the office of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.
- February 15** The office of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs shall have provided the appropriate review committees (hereafter referred to as “the committees”) access to the FIF for each faculty member undergoing annual faculty peer review.
- April 30** By this date, each member of the faculty will have received from the committees a written evaluation on the Peer Review Form (PRF). Each faculty member must sign his or her PRF acknowledging that the evaluation has been completed. This signature does not necessarily constitute agreement with the evaluation, and every faculty member has the right to respond to the annual peer evaluation in writing. The original of the signed PRF shall be given to the faculty member, and a copy shall be given to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, who will maintain the copy as a part of the faculty member’s personnel file.
- May 31** By this date, any faculty member who wishes to respond to the annual peer evaluation in writing must have submitted his or her response to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. Any written response from a faculty member to his or her PRF must be attached to the copy maintained in the office of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

Annual Faculty Peer Review will be conducted each year by the Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Instructor Peer Review Committee as detailed above. Evaluation of the faculty member will be based on the FIF submitted by that faculty member, and the evaluation will proceed in the following manner.

1. After review of the FIF and using the numerical rating system listed on the PRF, each member of the committees will evaluate the performance of each faculty member, producing a numerical rating and brief comments for each of the areas of the criteria.

Each committee member will determine an overall numeric rating for the faculty member, using the weighted scales listed earlier in this document as a guide:

The committee member's overall score for each faculty member need not be an exact average of these percentages, but may take into account exceptionally strong or poor performance in a particular area, providing that effectiveness as a teacher and/or librarian remains the primary consideration.

2. The Chair of each committee will average the ratings of each of the committee members into a single numerical rating for each of the areas included on the PRF. The Chair of the committee will also collate the comments of each committee member and include those comments in the narrative section of the PRF.
3. The appropriate review committee will meet and discuss the average scores in each of the areas, and determine an overall numeric score. This score need not be an exact average of the percentages referenced in step 1 above, but may take into account exceptionally strong or poor performance in a particular area, providing that effectiveness as a teacher and/or librarian remains the primary consideration. The committee should also at this time discuss and justify individual narrative comments and edit those comments for clarity as the committee deems necessary. It is desirable that the committee reach consensus in the preparation of the narrative comments, but when necessary, dissenting comments shall be included.
4. Each member of the appropriate review committee must sign the PRF. These signatures do not necessarily indicate that all members of the committee agree with all comments on the form or the overall ratings, but rather indicate that the committee members have reviewed the PRF and that their comments and ratings have been included in the process.
5. Members of the committees may not participate in their own peer evaluations, and as such, members of the committees will not sign their own PRF's, except to acknowledge their receipt of the finished form at the completion of peer review.