DEPARTMENTAL PEER EVALUATION FORM To Be Used By Individual Faculty Members

DATE	VOTE AGAI	NST	
CANDIDATE			
RANK			
DEPARTMENT			-
ACTION SOUGHT (Check)	Reappointment Promotion Tenure	for years of serv for years of serv previous institution the Provost	vice at a
	2		ction sought, the department i

VOTE FOR

- 4 = Candidate surpasses the criteria
- 3 = Candidate meets the criteria
- 2 = Candidate minimally meets the criteria
- 1 = Candidate fails to meet the criteria
- NA = Not Applicable
- NK = Not Known

Note:

- The ratings should be specific to the criteria for the action requested. The criteria to be met increase quantit tively and/or qualitatively from reappointment to promotion (increasing from instructor to assistant to associate to full professor), and, finally, tenure.
- The sequence of items on each page does not necessarily indicate relative importance of factors involved. Refer to Handbook for appropriate priorities.
- This completed form is to be submitted to the Peer Evaluation Group and not forwarded to the Faculty Personnel Committee.

to

A TE	ACHING	(Rating: 4,3,2,1, NA or NK)
1.	Maintains friendly and professional relationship with students	
2.	Treats students with respect.	
3.	Encourages students to exercise freedom of thought and expression	
4.	Is readily available to students outside of class	
5.	Distributes syllabi which clearly establish course objectives and which adhere to	
٥.	per the catalog and cover the material specified	
6.	Uses teaching methods appropriate to the subject	
7.	Meets classes as scheduled	
8.	Demonstrates mastery of subject matter.	
9.	Prepares for classes	
9. 10.		
	Assigns appropriate text book, readings and out-of-class work	
11.	Tests and grades students professionally and fairly	
12.	Revises courses and develops new ones as appropriate	
13.	Includes community-based components in courses (NA if the candidate does no	
1.4	community-based teaching	
14.	Other (explain below)	
15.	Overall rating of candidate's teachings	
Б 1		
Explana	tion of #14 above:	
Additio	nal comments:	
_ ~~		(Poting: 4.2.2.1 NA or NV)
B. SC	HOLARSHIP/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	(Rating: 4,3,2,1, NA or NK)
1.	Exhibits professional work publicly, e.g., gallery exhibits, theatre, stage designs	
2.	Performs professionally in public, e.g., as actor, singer, director, music director,	, technical director, etc
3.	Has performances of his/her creative works	<u></u>
4.	Publishes scholarly books or equivalent works	
5.	Publishes articles or equivalent works in refereed professional journals	
6.	Demonstrates active and continuing involvement in research, including unpublished	
7.	Presents papers at professional conferences	
8.	Presents in the field of their discipline externally to academic institutions or comments of their discipline external to academic institutions or comments.	
9.	Serves as a consultant in the field of their discipline to community/public organ	
10.	Serves as a peer reviewer for a refereed journal, academic conferences, or gran	
10.	Serves on the editorial board for a refereed journal	
12.	Applies for competitive external grants	
12.		
	Is invited to contribute scholarly expertise to assist community/public organiza	
14.	Serves as commentator on others' papers at professional conferences and/or pul	
15.	Chairs committees or sessions at professional conferences	
16.	Attends professional meetings.	

17. 18. 19.	Holds membership in professional organizations. Other (explain below). Overall rating of candidate's scholarship.				
Explana	Explanation of #18 above:				
Additio	Additional comments:				
C. SE	RVICE (Rating: 4,3,2,1, NA or NK)				
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	Maintains regular office hours, an on-campus presence, and is available at other times when necessary, in accordance with the Handbook				
Additio	nal Comments:				

E. ADDITIONAL EVALUATIONS FOR SECOND AND FOURTH YEAR REVIEW ONLY

The purpose of the Second and Fourth Year Review is to assure that faculty members are of sufficient quality that continued employment up to the tenure decision appears to be warranted. But it should be clear to all involved that a positive decision at the Second or Fourth Year Review does not necessarily guarantee an eventual positive Tenure decision, which is normally determined in the candidate's sixth year. Instructions: The Department or PEG is to evaluate the candidate in accordance with the following ratings:

	4 = Highly Probable $3 = Probable$ $2 = Uncertain$ $1 = Improbable$
1.	Candidate will continue to teach effectively through the tenure decision.
2.	Candidate will continue active scholarship through the year of the tenure decision.
3.	Candidate will continue to offer service to the College through the year of the tenure decision
4.	Candidate will continue to work collegially and professionally with his or her colleagues
	through the year of the tenure decision
Additi	onal comments:
	NDITIONAL EVALUATIONS FOR TENUDE RECISION ONLY
	DDITIONAL EVALUATIONS FOR TENURE DECISION ONLY e decisions must be based on the long-term needs and well-being of the Department and the College; a candidate's fulfillment of
	criteria for reappointment and promotion shall be deemed necessary but not solely sufficient to grant tenure.
an the	criteria for reappointment and promotion shall be decined necessary but not solery sufficient to grant tendre.
	Candidate's number of years of FULL-time teaching at Wagner
	Years at other colleges and/or universities as accepted by the Provost/Vice President for Academic
	Affairs at the time of his or her hiring as prior service toward Tenure eligibility, not to exceed three years
	Candidate has received the terminal degree or its equivalent consistent with the
	Handbook and appropriate to his or her discipline
	List others:
Instruc	ctions: The Department is to evaluate the candidate in accordance with the following ratings:
	4 = Highly Probable 3 = Probable 2 = Uncertain 1 = Improbable
1.	Candidate will continue to teach effectively
2.	Candidate will continue active scholarship.
3.	Candidate will continue to offer service to the College
4.	Candidate will continue to work collegially and professionally with others
5.	Candidate will fulfill the long-term needs of the Department
6.	Overall judgment that the candidate will fully measure up to the expectations of a
	tenured faculty member as indicated in items #1 through #5 above
Additi	onal comments:
1	

Revised October, 2022