The following documentation is required for academic faculty under consideration for periodic peer review. The following guidelines are only an outline of the procedures for PPR. Please refer to the Faculty Handbook, Section 3.3.9 for details. Below is a diagram of how the overall process works.

1. **INSTITUTE PERIODIC PEER REVIEW COVER SHEET**

   All items on the cover sheet should be completed, even if there is no data or it is not applicable. Enter an “NA” as appropriate, for such situations.

2. **SCHOOL REVIEW ASSESSMENT LETTER**

   The school PPR committee should be comprised of at least three academic faculty of the school in which the faculty member has his or her primary appointment. For faculty with joint appointments or working in interdisciplinary areas, consideration should be given to the inclusion of one member outside the primary unit who would be able to assess the faculty member’s work. The committee will prepare a letter addressed to the reviewee, to include performance commendation, critique of substandard performance, recommendations for corrective action, an overall evaluation score (5 or 3 years), and a record of the committee vote. This letter will be forwarded to the dean with a copy to the reviewee and school chair.

3. **SCHOOL CHAIR’S EVALUATION LETTER (AND FACULTY REBUTTALS, IF ANY)**

   The School Chair’s letter of evaluation should provide: 1) summaries of the faculty member’s annual performance reviews for the years under consideration; and 2) an overall assessment of the faculty member’s teaching, research, and service. Any faculty rebuttals associated with the summaries of the annual performance reviews should be provided following the Chair’s letter of
evaluation. The school chair will write a letter to the unit/school PPR committee assessing the reviewee’s performance, goals and plans for the next five years. Preference is for a summary supported by annual evaluations and rebuttals (if any). If a summary only is provided then the reviewee should be given the opportunity to comment on the summary. The school chair does not vote.

4. COMMUNICATIONS ESTABLISHING REVIEW CRITERIA

The Periodic Peer Review policies assume the default criteria are the unit’s tenure and promotion criteria unless alternative criteria are established between the School Chair and the faculty member. Written communications between the School Chair and the faculty member establish the review criteria; this should occur prior to PPR proceedings. If there is no agreement on criteria, the Faculty member may request a hearing by a committee established by the Faculty of the Unit. The Committee’s decision on criteria is final. When the default criteria are not used, this section should include any written communications between the School Chair and the faculty member describing the alternative review criteria.

5. PERIODIC PEER REVIEW CANDIDATE’S STATEMENT OF COMPLETENESS

The following statement must be included in the candidate’s material.

I do solemnly swear that my vita and all information that I have submitted for periodic peer review is complete and accurate.

________________________________________  ______________
Signature  Date

6. FACULTY MEMBER’S STATEMENT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND GOALS

Five page maximum. The statement should focus on the candidate’s most noteworthy accomplishments for the years under consideration and include goals for the next five years. In the case of individuals undergoing a second or subsequent Periodic Peer Review this will include specific information on how goals from the previous review have been met.

7. CANDIDATE VITA

The COE version of the standard Institute format for promotion and tenure is preferred but not required.

8. CANDIDATE’S SUMMARY OF INSTRUCTION OPINION SURVEY

See separate instructions. If this is a faculty member’s first PPR, all courses taught should be listed. For subsequent reviews, only courses taught within the last five years should be listed.