

Appendix B
Guidelines for UW-Extension Department of Family Development
Peer Review (including Annual Reviews) for Probationary Faculty

1. Introduction

Participation in peer review is a privilege and responsibility of University of Wisconsin faculty. The shared governance structure authorizes departments to set a peer review procedure. The Department of Family Development has created a process to be used by department members. The procedure will allow faculty to have their interpretation of research, program implementation, delivery techniques, and educational materials reviewed by a qualified peer for contributions to scholarship and advancement of the discipline of family development. While assessing the candidate's work, the reviewer should seek evidence of these criteria:

- (a) Successful scholarship.
- (b) Continuing professional development.
- (c) Leadership in program development.
- (d) Effective working relationships with colleagues and clientele.
- (e) Contributions to the profession, department and university.
- (f) Probability of positive future contributions to the profession, department and university.

This review is not currently used for merit purposes.

2. Preparation of Peer Review Information

The probationary faculty member is responsible for complying with these guidelines to ensure that peer evaluation documentation is part of the Department of Family Development permanent file retained by the department chair.

3. Purpose of Peer Review

The purpose of peer review for probationary faculty is:

- (a) To provide guidance, support and objective evaluation to the probationary faculty member regarding professional development and potential for scholarly contributions.
- (b) To provide a process of reflection and interaction to assist and encourage probationary faculty to develop high quality programs in the Department of Family Development; and
- (c) To assist probationary faculty in the tenure process. For further definition of Peer Review, see Appendix H, "Peer Review".

4. Frequency of the Review

Peer review for probationary faculty is an on-going practice. (See definition of Peer Review in Appendix H). Annual Review is conducted every year, at a minimum, by the faculty mentoring team (see definition of Annual Review in Appendix H).

5. Reviewers

The faculty mentoring team completes the Annual Review with probationary faculty members (see definition of Annual Review in Appendix H). Peer Review may be conducted at the request of the faculty member and shared with the mentoring team (see definition of Peer Review in Appendix H).

6. Responsibility

Peer review is a multi-faceted process (annual review is one form of a peer review) for faculty members of the Department of Family Development. It is the responsibility of the probationary faculty member to submit examples of scholarly work to be reviewed; e.g., a work in progress (journal article, curriculum, presentation, abstract), completed program, or an item being submitted for an award. Likewise, it is the responsibility of the probationary faculty member (with assistance from the faculty mentoring team) to identify a plan for areas of development. (For details see Appendix H.)

7. Components of Documentation

(a) Peer Review

The probationary faculty member being reviewed (with assistance from the faculty mentoring team) is responsible for creating a plan on how to use this input and ensuring each completed peer review documentation is part of that probationary faculty member's Department of Family Development permanent file retained by the department chair. At the probationary faculty member's option, the probationary faculty member may share the completed peer review documentation with colleagues, county partners, program area representative, or district director. (For details see Appendix H- Peer Review)

(b) Annual Review

One form of peer review is the annual review. The faculty mentoring team will conduct an annual review with the probationary faculty member. This review may be conducted jointly with the program area annual review if feasible. Completed documentation of the annual review is sent by the faculty mentoring team leader to the probationary faculty member being reviewed and to the Department of Family Development Chair. The probationary faculty member being reviewed (with assistance from the faculty mentoring team) is responsible for creating a plan on how to use this input. At the probationary faculty members option, the faculty member may share the completed documentation with colleagues, county partners, program are representatives or district director. (For details see Appendix H- Annual Review)

8. Documentation Criteria

The faculty senate provides reviewers with guidance in the assessment process. While assessing the candidate's work, the reviews should seek evidence from these criteria identified as applicable to the work being reviewed:

(a) Successful Scholarship

(1) Creative intellectual work:

- How does the work build upon the best knowledge, research, or practice in the field?
- How does the work fill a need for new knowledge, a new approach, or a new method, or the creative adaptation of existing knowledge, approaches or methods?
- How did the work result in the development of new information or the development of new or creatively adapted methods or approaches?
- How is creative intellectual work woven into the program plan, delivery methods for implementation of program, teaching materials, evaluation plans, and demonstrated in professional contributions and leadership?

(2) Reviewed by the scholar's peers who affirm its value:

- Has the scholar's creative, intellectual work been shared in published articles, presentations, exhibits, or in other public venues in which peers independently evaluated this work?
- Has the scholar's creative, intellectual work resulted in the scholar receiving an award, honor, or some other public recognition by peers?
- Are there testimonials, letters of recommendation, or adaptations of the work that are used by others to affirm the value of this work?
- Are there examples of contributions locally, statewide or nationally?
- Does the faculty member share ideas, materials, research and results with colleagues, specialists and other professionals internally and externally?

(3) Added to our intellectual history through communication:

- How has the work been shared with colleagues internally? (success stories, poster sessions, district meetings, professional association meetings, etc.)
- Externally? (presentations, publications-journal articles-hard copy or electronic, symposiums, etc.)
- How has the work *been* added to the body of knowledge?
- Where is the work accessible?

(4) Valued by those for whom it was intended:

- Who is the intended audience?
- What actions did the intended audience take as a result of this work?
- What measurable impacts occurred as a result of the effort (e.g. individual, family, community-knowledge gained, information shared, behavior change, etc.)?

- How was the work valued (e.g. persistence of use, duration of public use, scope, persistence of influence and/or public appreciation)?
- How did others subsequently use the developed materials?
- Did the information provided have implications, either positive or negative, beyond those anticipated for the intended clientele and/or community?
- Were community networks formed and used effectively in promotion and implementing programs?
- Did programs meet the priority educational needs in the county?
- Were diverse and/or new audiences reached?
- Was there appropriate involvement of volunteers, colleagues, community leaders and professionals in implementing programs?
- Did the probationary faculty member have a clearly defined educational role in program implementation?

Positive responses to some questions in each category would imply evidence of scholarly work on the part of the probationary faculty member. The Mentoring Team must use their professional judgment to determine whether the documents offered by the faculty member present persuasive evidence of favorable responses to these questions.

(b) Continuing Professional Development.

- What courses or degrees have been completed?
- Has a professional development plan been created and followed?
- How has the faculty member participated in professional associations or conferences?
- Has a course of independent study been pursued?
- How has the faculty member improved skills and knowledge related to program development including, conducting educational needs assessments, teach, writing, program design, and evaluation?
- How has the faculty member developed professional networks?

(c) Leadership in Program Development

- Is there evidence of innovative educational programs, establishment of local capacity, integration of knowledge from two or more disciplines that brings new insight to the original research, applied research to address issues or problems, communicated research needs or identified new research questions, or developed new approaches to teaching and learning?
- Are there contributions to program development teams?

- Are there clarified objectives, established policy or program direction and/or leadership examples?
 - What are examples of necessary budget and personnel to meet program requirements where applicable?
 - How has the faculty member interpreted discoveries to provide better understanding?
- (d) Effective working relationships with colleagues and clientele
- What is the evidence toward collaboration with colleagues from other UW-Extension programs?
 - Collaborations with UW-Extension specialists and colleagues?
 - University research projects?
 - How has the faculty member collaborated with county and other municipal departments and agencies, nonprofit organizations, and private businesses to develop and deliver educational programs?
 - How has the faculty member contributed to the success of colleagues' programs?
 - How have clientele and office colleagues demonstrated respect for the faculty member?
- (e) Contributions to the profession, department, and university
- To what extent has the faculty member taken an active role in faculty governance—including Department Committees, Faculty Senate and committee assignments made by district directors and state program leaders?
 - What role has the faculty member taken in local, regional, state, national, and international professional organizations?
 - How has the faculty member provided public service related to the educational role?
- (f) Probability of positive future contributions to the profession, department, and university
- The best predictor of future behavior is past behavior
- (g) Other comments: