

## Appendix B.2

### Annual Review Form For Probationary Faculty

Cooperative Extension  
University of Wisconsin-Extension  
Department of Family Development

Name \_\_\_\_\_ County \_\_\_\_\_ District \_\_\_\_\_

Position \_\_\_\_\_ Rank \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer  
(signature/date) \_\_\_\_\_

The Department of Family Development supports the professional development and scholarly contributions of probationary faculty members. As a result of our support we have undertaken to develop the following criteria for Annual Review of the scholarly work of probationary faculty members. The faculty mentoring team at the request of the probationary faculty member will conduct this Annual Review. All six criteria identified by the Faculty Senate will be used as the basis for the Annual Review including the four major components of scholarship: 1. creative intellectual work; 2. reviewed and valued by peers; 3. communicated and added to our intellectual history; and 4. valued by the intended audience. The faculty mentoring team will identify strengths and areas of development.

However, as strengths and areas of development are identified emphasis may be placed on any one of the four components for concentration and collegial peer review. It is the responsibility of the probationary faculty member to submit examples of scholarly work to be peer reviewed; e.g., a work in progress (journal article, curriculum, presentation abstract), completed program, or an item being submitted for an award by colleagues or specialists with professional expertise in the content area. Peer Review of scholarly work developed by the probationary faculty may also be conducted by the mentor team, utilizing the Annual Review form.

This Annual Review Form is being used for:

\_\_\_ Annual Review of Probationary Faculty on \_\_\_\_\_ (date)

\_\_\_ Collegial Peer Review of work submitted

Description of scholarly work submitted for peer review (newsletter series, teaching packet, evaluation of program, journal article, conference presentation, etc.)

---

---

## **I. Successful Scholarship.**

### **A. 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?

Strengths:

Areas for development:

### **B. 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?

Strengths:

Areas for development:

### **C. 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?

Strengths:

Areas for development:

**D. 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?

Strengths:

Areas of Development:

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.

2. 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?

Strengths:

Areas of Development:

3. 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?

Strengths:

Areas of Development:

4. 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, non-profit 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?

Strengths:

Areas of Development:

5. 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?

Strengths:

Areas of Development:

6. Probability of positive future contributions to the profession, department, and university.

The best predictor of future behavior is past behavior

Strengths:

Areas of Development:

Other Comments: