

approved  
01/05

Draft of January 14, 2005

International Political Economy Program  
Statement of Evaluation Criteria, Standards and Procedures

**PURPOSE**

This document is intended to serve as a guide to International Political Economy (IPE) faculty in the evaluation process and is designed to serve both the evaluatee and those undertaking the evaluation. It also serves to fulfill the requirement of the Faculty Code of the University of Puget Sound that "Departments shall state in writing the criteria, standards and needs of the department used in the deliberative process in relation to the University's standards and needs." This document should be viewed as a complement to the criteria and procedures for tenure and promotion that are detailed in the Faculty Code (or, the Code). Evaluatees, in particular, should review the Code and discuss any questions about it or this document with the department chair and other colleagues. Additionally, the evaluatee should carefully review the "University Evaluation Criteria" and "Evaluation Procedures" memoranda distributed by the Professional Standards Committee, in consultation with the Faculty Advancement Committee. These documents are sent to evaluatees in the summer prior to the year of evaluation.

The Faculty Code identifies several areas of assessment for tenure and promotion. For tenure, they are teaching, professional growth, university service and the needs of the department. The factors for promotion are similar, but not identical: teaching, professional growth, advising students, university service, and community service related to professional interests and expertise. To be granted tenure, the evaluatee must demonstrate excellence in the areas of teaching and professional growth and also establish a record of service. To be promoted, the evaluatee must demonstrate the "highest standards," while advancement to full professor requires "distinguished service in addition to sustained growth" in the above areas. In all cases, as the Faculty Code states, "responsibility for demonstrating he or she meets the standards for tenure or promotion rests with the evaluatee."

## DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS FOR TEACHING EXCELLENCE

There is no simple working definition of teaching excellence that is appropriate for all situations, nor an unambiguous way to determine when excellence has been achieved. The following guidelines, however, represent generally accepted components of teaching excellence and evidence that are used to evaluate teaching performance.

### COMPONENTS OF TEACHING EXCELLENCE

1. Structure and Rigor. Courses should be structured to challenge students and to facilitate their mastery of course objectives.
2. Readings and Assignments: Readings and assignments should be appropriate to the level and content of the course and facilitate student mastery of course objectives.
3. Course Objectives: The specific content and objectives of each course should be consistent with the role of the course within the department and the university.
4. Effective Communication: Professors should communicate course ideas and concepts clearly and effectively monitor student understanding.
5. Student Feedback: Professors should solicit and respond to student questions effectively and provide prompt and appropriate feedback to students regarding their performance on class assignments.
6. Motivation: Professors should motivate students to complete course assignments and to master course content.
7. Student Contact: Professors should provide ample opportunities for student contact outside the classroom, especially through regularly-scheduled office hours.
8. Enthusiasm for Learning: In their dealings with students, professors should display and communicate an enthusiasm for learning.
9. Appropriate Behavior: Professors should be honest with their students and demonstrate respect for them in all academic settings.

### EVIDENCE OF TEACHING EXCELLENCE.

While a wide variety of measurements may be used to assess teaching excellence, every faculty evaluation must include the following four types of evidence:

- A. A personal statement of teaching philosophy and performance assessment. (This constitutes part of the self-evaluation described under "Procedures" at the end of this document.)
- B. Course materials for all evaluated courses (both IPE courses and courses taught for other departments), including syllabi, sample examinations, assignments, and assigned written materials.
- C. Student evaluations, for the previous four semesters of teaching in tenure cases, and two semesters of teaching in cases of promotion, 3-year and 5-year evaluations.
- D. An on-going process of classroom visitation.

It is the responsibility of the evaluatee to include the first three types of evidence in his or her file. Classroom visitation, however, is the collective responsibility of the evaluatee's departmental colleagues.

Other types of evidence that the evaluatee may wish to submit or that colleagues may wish to consider as evidence for teaching excellence include: letters from university colleagues with whom the evaluatee has collaborated on teaching activities; student performance on course assignments; discussions with colleagues; team-teaching experience; video-recording of classroom activities; attendance at teaching seminars; the creation of effective teaching resources, including web-based resources; and an innovative teaching pedagogy.

### **DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS FOR EXCELLENCE: PROFESSIONAL GROWTH**

Successful evaluation at tenure and promotion is predicated upon the evaluatee achieving and maintaining excellence in the area of professional growth. Within the liberal-arts environment, it is desirable that the IPE faculty be composed of diverse individuals with varying interests and different areas of expertise within the discipline. Because of this heterogeneity it is to be expected that the set of activities which constitute a high level of professional growth will vary from individual to individual within the department. Nonetheless, the department is able to delineate, in broad terms, the parameters defining professional growth for its members.

#### **COMPONENTS OF EXCELLENCE IN PROFESSIONAL GROWTH**

The department clearly recognizes that there are a number of different types of activities that constitute professional growth. Particular evaluatees, therefore, may have very different research agendas and developmental strategies depending upon their own individual areas of inquiry. In recognition of these differences among individuals, the department has established a two Category system for classifying the kinds of activities which are acceptable in demonstrating excellence in professional growth. These Categories are identified as General Activities (Category I) and Specific Activities (Category II).

In order for an individual to meet the departmental standards for excellence in professional growth, the department must be convinced that the individual has:

- A. Met all criteria identified in Category I: General Activities, and
- B. Engaged in activities from Category II which indicate, in both the level of effort and quality of achievement, a sustained and continuing intellectual commitment to professional growth.
- C. Has established a sustained record of professional growth that includes previous scholarly and professional work (including any work completed before appointment at Puget Sound), a current agenda of professional activities, and plans for continued future growth.

#### CATEGORY I: GENERAL ACTIVITIES

1. Maintain currency in the IPE theory consistent with the requirements for effectively teaching IPE 201, 301 and 401.
2. Remain current and informed regarding events, trends and problems in IPE.

#### CATEGORY II: SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES

1. Publish in scholarly journals in the appropriate field;
2. Author, edit, or contribute to research monographs, books, or more general works in a relevant area;
3. Present papers or participate as a discussant in national/regional/specialty area conferences;
4. Conduct consulting-based research which contributes to the individual's professional development by clearly making a substantive or novel contribution to the evaluatee's research program;
5. Author texts or develop software suitable for classroom use;
6. Participate in community service activities where the individual is involved in professional development;
7. Share in the governance of the professional organizations in the individual's area of expertise;
8. Participate in seminars or colloquia;
9. Referee or review manuscripts for scholarly journals or academic publications;
10. Engage in other scholarly activities as may be deemed appropriate by the department.

**EVIDENCE OF EXCELLENCE:  
PROFESSIONAL GROWTH**

Materials that constitute evidence include:

- A. A personal statement which shall include a description and assessment of past activities related to professional growth as well as the evaluatee's future research agenda. (This constitutes part of the self-evaluation described under "Procedures" at the end of this document.)
- B. Copies of published and unpublished research, reports, and/or documents related to professional growth. (In the case of conflict arising from the release of proprietary information, the individual and the chair of the departmental evaluation committee will agree on a mutually acceptable form for disseminating this evidence.)
- C. Course syllabi, reading lists, class handouts, and any other material which might be needed by the department in order to judge the content of a course being offered as a contribution to professional growth in either Category I or II. (Because many of these materials would be provided as part of the evidence pertaining to excellence in teaching, only those which were not reproduced earlier are necessary here.)

The evaluatee may choose at his or her discretion to include other types of evidence to establish excellence in the area of professional growth.

**DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS  
FOR ACADEMIC AND CAREER ADVISING**

The department recognizes the vital role that advising plays in the educational mission of the university. Therefore, department members must conscientiously undertake advising duties consistent with the needs of the department and the university.

**COMPONENTS OF ADVISING**

Advisors should foster independence of thought and action and a sense of responsibility for academic and career planning in their advisees. Although individual advising styles may differ considerably, the common elements in every effective style include appropriate knowledge, openness and availability.

#### Knowledge

Advisors must have a good working knowledge of university curricula, rules, regulations and policies; an in-depth knowledge of their own departmental curriculum; a sufficient awareness for student support offices to make appropriate referrals; and a familiarity with advising resources. Advisors should maintain and be familiar with their advisees' academic records and any other pertinent information provided by the university.

#### Openness

Advisors must show a readiness to serve in advising, to welcome student questions and concerns and to make appropriate referrals.

#### Availability

Advisors must make themselves available to students at reasonable times both formally through regular advising appointments and informally, including discussions with students who are not their advisees.

### EVIDENCE RELEVANT TO ADVISING

It is the responsibility of individuals being evaluated to demonstrate an awareness of the components of excellent advising and to describe and analyze their advising accordingly.

### **DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS FOR UNIVERSITY SERVICE**

University service is one of the areas of assessment for tenure and promotion identified in the Faculty Code. University service results in public goods, which collectively benefit the university community. Because of its public and collective nature, the overall benefits of university service and the contributions of an individual faculty member to the final product are difficult to assess and measure. Nonetheless, the Department has delineated various types of service and specified its expectations regarding each component.

#### COMPONENTS OF UNIVERSITY SERVICE

The components of university service have been divided into three sets. The first set (I) identifies general departmental service activities. The second set (II) identifies specific departmental service activities. The third set (III) identifies specific university service activities outside the department. Individuals in the department are responsible for all of the activities in set (I). Individuals in the department should choose activities from both set (II) and set (III) which complement their talents and interest. Non-tenured career faculty are not expected to participate in either (II) or (III) for the first year.

#### I. General Departmental Service Activities

1. Recruitment and hiring of faculty;
2. Evaluation of departmental colleagues;
3. Participation in departmental meetings and functions.

#### II. Specific Departmental Service Activities

1. Acting as department chair;
2. Acting as departmental representative;

3. Drafting departmental statements and procedures;
4. Drafting statements for periodic curriculum reviews;
5. Drafting departmental statements for accreditation report;
6. Participation in other department service activities.

### III. University Service Activities Outside The Department

1. Member of the faculty senate;
2. Member of a standing committee;
3. Member of a trustee committee;
4. Member of an ad hoc committee;
5. Participation in co-curricular activities;
6. Participation in activities that contribute to a creative and intellectual atmosphere on campus;
7. Participation in other university service activities.

#### EVIDENCE OF SATISFACTORY UNIVERSITY SERVICE

The individual being evaluated is responsible for providing an evaluation of her or his university service activities. The evaluatee may choose to include letters from university colleagues or written reports of their service activities.

#### **DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE**

Community service related to professional interests and expertise is one of the criteria identified in the Faculty Code for promotion. Community service can enhance the reputation of the university, contribute directly to the professional growth of a faculty member and add significantly to the mission of the university.

Community service activities will vary among individuals, depending upon their interests and the manner in which they choose to apply their expertise to community needs. Individuals should choose those community activities appropriate to their interests and preferences.

Similar to university service, community service is a shared, public enterprise and thus an individual's contribution is difficult to measure. The evaluatee should include a description of any community service activities related to professional interests or expertise in the evaluation file.

#### **DEPARTMENT STATEMENT OF PROCEDURES DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION OF COLLEAGUES**

##### Responsibilities of the Evaluatee

As required by the Faculty Code, the evaluatee shall prepare an evaluation file, including in it a current curriculum vita. The file shall also include a self-assessment of performance with respect to each of the criteria, identifying specific ways in which concerns or weaknesses will be addressed or improvements will be sought. The self-evaluation shall also include a statement of goals and objectives, both for the period leading up to the current evaluation and for the time to be covered in the next one. The file shall also contain all evidence required to establish excellence in teaching and professional growth,



and evidence necessary to establish that satisfactory standards have been met in advising, university, and community service. Specific types of evidence required for each criterion are discussed earlier in this document. The evaluatee may also choose to include any other types of evidence he or she believes is appropriate for the evaluation process.

#### Departmental Recommendation Procedure

When a faculty member with an appointment in IPE is being evaluated, the departmental recommendation procedure shall be as follows.

1. These procedures apply to tenure-line faculty with appointment in or contractual commitment to International Political Economy (hereafter “the IPE faculty”).
2. All evaluations in IPE shall be governed by these procedures except, as specified in the Code, in cases where the Alternative Evaluation Process is employed (see below) or where a faculty contract specifies a different evaluation process.
3. The IPE faculty shall examine the evaluation file prepared by the candidate and take whatever other actions as shall be required by the Code in such cases.
4. Faculty on leave may be excused by the department chair. When the department chair is the subject of evaluation, other members of the IPE faculty shall select some other person to perform the functions of the head officer for the purpose of the evaluation as specified in Chapter III Section 4 Paragraph 3(b) of the Code.
5. The evaluators shall determine if, based on this evidence, the candidate meets the appropriate departmental criteria.
6. Individual members will write letters of assessment based on the evaluation file and any other appropriate evidence the individual considers in his or her recommendation. The letters shall include a specific recommendation regarding the tenure and/or promotion decision. Additionally, the Professional Standards Committee requests that faculty include in their individual letters “a statement detailing the courses they visited and the days they visited them.” Class visitations will normally include visits to at least two consecutive class sessions.
7. Evaluators will meet to consider a draft department recommendation letter prepared by the department chair and recommend any necessary changes to the letter.
8. Members of the IPE faculty who have participated in the evaluation process will be asked to sign the departmental recommendation letter. An evaluator’s signature indicates s/he has participated in the evaluation process and that the letter accurately reflects the department’s deliberative process.

9. The final departmental recommendation shall then be given to the evaluatee for his or her review and signature. The evaluatee's signature is to indicate, as required by the Faculty Code, that she or he was provided with a list of faculty members participating in the departmental recommendation (indicated by their attached signatures) and had an opportunity to review, though not necessarily endorse, the departmental recommendation which includes a summary of the substance of the letters and departmental deliberations. The evaluatee shall receive a copy of this document.
10. All materials collected in the course of the departmental evaluations will be forwarded to the Advancement Committee.

#### Alternative Evaluation Process for Associate and Full Professors

Faculty members in the rank of associate professors who are not candidates for tenure or promotion and professors in the years 5, 15, or 25 years of service in that rank may elect to have their review conducted by the head officer and the dean as specified in Chapter III, section 5 of the Faculty Code.

The Code process for these alternative evaluations shall be followed precisely. The evaluatee's file will be made available to tenure-line IPE faculty, who have the option to read it according to the Faculty Code. The head officer will review the file and write the letter of evaluation. If the head officer is to be evaluated, the tenure-line faculty with appointments in IPE (in consultation with the dean) will select a member to conduct the evaluation.

Note that no part of this document should be construed to supersede or prevail over any portion of the Faculty Code. In all cases, the departmental criteria, evaluation and procedures shall be subject to criteria, evaluation, and procedures as established in the Faculty Code.