

1 **Criteria, Standards, and Procedures for Evaluation**
2 **Department of Psychology**
3 **University of Puget Sound**
4
5

6 **I. Introduction**
7

8 A. Purpose. This document was developed by the members of the University of
9 Puget Sound Psychology Department to serve as a guide for evaluation of
10 department members, regardless of rank or type of review. This document is to be
11 used for evaluation in conjunction with the Professional Standards Committee's
12 *Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria (Evaluation User Guide)* and the
13 appropriate sections of the *Faculty Code*. Evaluatees are expected to make use of
14 the criteria and standards outlined in all three documents as they prepare their file.
15 Evaluators are expected to apply the criteria and standards in their review of
16 colleagues' files. Consistency in preparing and evaluating files is one concrete
17 way to ensure equitable evaluation decisions.
18

19 In the following sections of this document, Teaching, Professional Growth,
20 Advising, and Service are treated as separate and unique categories per the faculty
21 code. Thus, in accordance with the guidelines for evaluation of faculty, the
22 department document describes varied forms of evidence an evaluatee must provide
23 in each category. The department also wishes to recognize that clear delineations
24 between aspects of our professional work do not always align with the multi-
25 faceted aspects of our work and scholarly products. For example, our teaching and
26 research often overlap, and our professional expertise may lead to similar
27 presentations in the classroom, the university, or the broader community. Thus, an
28 evaluatee may want to include examples of work that illustrate contributions to
29 more than one area being evaluated. In these instances, we ask the evaluatee to
30 clearly describe how that evidence speaks to each category under consideration.
31

32 B. Goals of the Psychology Department. The following objectives reflect the mission
33 of the department:
34

- 35 1. To contribute to the liberal arts education of students in a manner consistent
36 with the stated goals of the University;
- 37 2. Within the context of psychology, to contribute to students' understanding of
38 the philosophy and purpose of science, the methods of empirical research, and
39 the application of research;
- 40 3. To contribute to students' understanding of the profession of psychology as a
41 diverse discipline.

42 C. Goals for Psychology Students. The department places heavy emphasis on
43 educating students to be well-rounded individuals, knowledgeable about the
44 discipline of scientific psychology. A comprehensive understanding of the field
45 requires research training, critical analysis of psychological theories and research,

46 and the ethical application of scientific knowledge. Within the context of a broad
47 liberal arts education, our mission is to help students of psychology develop:

- 48 **1. both breadth and depth in their understanding of the content of**
49 **psychology**, including familiarity with the major concepts, theoretical
50 perspectives, empirical findings, and historical trends within the academic
51 field;
- 52 **2. an ability to think scientifically**, including the capacity to construct
53 arguments, analyze and interpret data, read and critique different forms of
54 scientific writing, and evaluate ethical issues and scientific standards;
- 55 **3. an ability to express ideas effectively, both orally and in writing**, within
56 the discourse of the discipline;
- 57 **4. an appreciation for and understanding of multiple perspectives**, including
58 socio-cultural and individual differences as well as interdisciplinary and sub-
59 disciplinary connections among different ways of knowing and across basic
60 and applied approaches to the social and natural sciences; and
- 61 **5. characteristics valuable for personal development and effective civic**
62 **engagement**, including the abilities to think critically, to work independently
63 as well as collaboratively, to solve problems effectively, to act ethically, and
64 to apply academic knowledge to real-world problems.

65 II. Teaching

66 Teaching is a critical dimension in all evaluations, and proven excellence in teaching is
67 required for tenure. With their passion for teaching, effective undergraduate instructors
68 inspire students and serve as role models for the profession. Effective teachers promote
69 critical thinking and communication skills. They foster an appreciation for the dual role
70 of psychology as a scientific and applied discipline (as outlined in Section I.C).

71 This section outlines separately the qualities that contribute to teaching excellence
72 (Section II.A) and the sources of evidence by which teaching excellence may be
73 evaluated (Section II.B).

74 A. Dimensions of Teaching Excellence. High quality undergraduate instruction
75 involves the development of mastery along the nine dimensions described below.
76 At the time of tenure and beyond, faculty should provide evidence of overall
77 excellence in teaching. Because excellent teachers have different instructional
78 styles and strengths, individuals will vary in their approaches and methods, and
79 the degree to which they emphasize each of the nine dimensions that comprise
80 teaching excellence.

- 81 1. Organization is characterized by effective management of class time, clearly
82 stated expectations of learning objectives and standards, and appropriate and
83 timely feedback to students. Course objectives and scope should be carefully
84 conceived and clearly communicated through well constructed syllabi.
- 85 2. Course content should reflect the evaluatee's mastery of the subject and
86 currency in the field. Content should also be consistent with the role of the

- 87 course in the department and university, and include materials appropriate to
88 the academic level of the course.
- 89 3. Presentational skills include the stylistic techniques and materials needed to
90 communicate information clearly and effectively.
- 91 4. Faculty need to display the ability to engage students and to promote interest
92 and curiosity about the subject. Engaging students requires an enthusiasm for
93 the subject and for teaching, depth of knowledge about the subject, and
94 carefully planned assignments, exercises, and readings.
- 95 5. Faculty should promote students' intellectual growth by challenging students
96 with creative, carefully conceived assignments, and by providing
97 opportunities for independent thinking, reasoning, and writing. At the same
98 time, faculty should set reasonable performance objectives and provide
99 appropriate guidance and support.
- 100 6. Assessment involves applying tools of appropriate rigor and scope to evaluate
101 student performance, including students' understanding and their abilities to
102 reason, analyze, and write. Faculty should demonstrate careful evaluation of
103 student work and provide feedback about areas necessary to improve
104 performance.
- 105 7. Innovation includes continued course development by incorporating current
106 material, demonstrating a willingness to revise and refine assignments, and
107 experimenting creatively with courses and assignments.
- 108 8. Responsive and adaptable teachers are sensitive to individual differences
109 among students. They have the flexibility to work with students of different
110 backgrounds, at different academic levels, and in a variety of teaching
111 situations.
- 112 9. Faculty should be accessible to students during posted office hours, by
113 appointment, and through informal interactions.

114 B. Evidence of Teaching Excellence. The evaluatee must provide evidence that
115 demonstrates teaching excellence along the nine dimensions outlined above. The
116 materials and methods used in the evaluation of teaching excellence are described
117 below.

118 The evaluatee shall include, at minimum:

- 119 1. Course materials which must include syllabi for each course. In addition,
120 representative examples of assessments such as exams, course assignments
121 (e.g., paper prompts, instructions), and rubrics (when available) must be
122 included for each course.
- 123 2. An overarching teaching philosophy and a self-reflective analysis of how
124 that teaching philosophy is enacted in the classroom for each course. The
125 evaluatee should detail specific methods and course development and how
126 this has contributed to their growth as an educator.
- 127 3. Student evaluations for all courses taught during the review cycle.

128 4. Other relevant material and information may be used as evidence of
129 teaching performance and pedagogical skill.

130 Department colleagues must meet the minimum requirement for regular class
131 visitation as set by the Professional Standards Committee. This is particularly
132 important because the department recognizes that student evaluations can be
133 influenced by factors other than teaching skill, and therefore interpretation of
134 student evaluations should be used in conjunction with other forms of evidence,
135 such as class visitation and the evaluatee's file. Evidence of availability to students
136 can be demonstrated by scheduled office hours and department colleagues'
137 personal knowledge of the evaluatee's out-of-classroom interactions with students.

138 **III. Professional Growth**

139
140 The Psychology Department expects faculty to engage in professional activities that
141 contribute to the intellectual vitality of the department, university, and discipline. We
142 recognize that teaching of the highest caliber is directly related to the intellectual strength
143 and vibrancy of each faculty member. Sustained professional growth throughout the
144 course of a faculty member's career ensures that students receive a solid education in the
145 field of psychology as it evolves over time. It also increases the range and sophistication
146 of our course offerings to students as they prepare for graduate school and employment.
147 Thus, currency in the field, extension of expertise in areas of specialization, and
148 development of professional acumen are highly valued activities.

149
150 While we talk about psychology as a single discipline, it is evident that we have a diverse
151 faculty whose training is grounded in a variety of sub-disciplines. This breadth of training
152 supports a broad curriculum designed to meet the varied interests of students who major
153 in psychology as well as those who take psychology courses to fulfill other requirements.
154 The department values the diversity of faculty interests, goals, and theoretical emphases,
155 recognizing that individual strengths enhance the collective effort. Such differences may
156 lead to varied approaches to psychological inquiry in terms of theory, methodology,
157 subject, and scope. It is therefore our goal to encourage the scholarly and professional
158 development of faculty as best fits the values and methods of each person's particular
159 sub-discipline and scholarly focus. Interdisciplinary research, civic scholarship, and
160 collaborative research are also valued when appropriate to the professional development
161 of each faculty member.

162
163 The Psychology Department encourages, in particular, the involvement of students in
164 faculty research because it contributes to teaching and mentoring. However, student
165 involvement may be less appropriate in some cases, given the nature of an individual
166 faculty member's research. Thus, the development of appropriate avenues for student
167 collaboration in a given research program is left to the discretion of each faculty member.

168
169 Evaluation of Professional Growth. The discipline of psychology values both basic and
170 applied scholarship, thus *professional growth* may encompass both basic and applied
171 research. At the time of evaluation, the evaluatee must demonstrate evidence of the vitality
172 and the programmatic nature of their professional growth, as a well as its relevance and

173 scholarly value within the contexts of teaching, the discipline, and/or society. The
174 evaluatee's statement must include a description of their current and future activities
175 related to professional growth, goals, methods, time-lines, and expected outcomes related
176 to professional activities. The file should include written material that serves as evidence
177 of scholarship (e.g., published work, unpublished manuscripts, documents related to
178 conference presentations or other scholarly activity). The evaluatee must clarify how the
179 materials presented in the file serve as evidence of a programmatic line of research and
180 sustained currency in the field. While the department recognizes that scholarship often
181 spans review cycles, the evaluatee should emphasize evidence of their professional growth
182 during the current review cycle.

183

184 All evaluatees must provide evidence described in (A). The activities listed in (B), while
185 highly valued by the department, are optional.

186

187 (A) The evaluatee must demonstrate a clear record of active publication. Publication in
188 peer-reviewed journals is the clearest way to illustrate the impact of one's work in
189 a given subfield, and publications may focus on basic or applied questions in the
190 evaluatee's area(s) of expertise. Other forms of publication or activity may also
191 serve as evidence of professional growth, including, but not limited to: books
192 (single or edited volumes), chapters in edited volumes, monographs, reviews and
193 commentary, research reports submitted to government agencies or other
194 institutions, manuscripts of papers presented at professional meetings, conference
195 posters, research proposals submitted for funding, manuscripts in progress,
196 professional writing published in other venues such as organizational
197 publications, encyclopedia entries, textbooks, and published pedagogical
198 materials.

199

200 (B) Other activities may serve as further evidence of professional growth, including
201 but not limited to the following: professional consultation, educational pursuits
202 (e.g., participation in conferences, workshops, programs of intensive study,
203 graduate level courses, trainings), editorial work in conjunction with journal
204 editorships or ad-hoc editorial positions, grant reviewing, active involvement in
205 the governance of the professional organizations in the individual's area of
206 expertise, presentations of scholarly work, and research to colleagues at other
207 institutions or on campus.

208

209 **IV. Advising**

210 According to Chapter III, Part D, Section 2(c) of the *Faculty Code*,

211

212 "Faculty members are expected to advise a reasonable number of students. Thus,
213 they shall be available at appropriate times and show the interest essential to good
214 advising."

215

216 The Psychology Department endorses the statement on advising presented in the *Faculty*
217 *Evaluation Procedures and Criteria (2018-2019)* which states:

218

219 “Academic advising is a significant faculty responsibility. Faculty members should be
 220 conversant with the learning community of which they are a part so that they can
 221 assist students in understanding that community and the language of University
 222 regulations and curricula.”

223
 224 “To advise students well, faculty members in all departments will need a clear
 225 understanding of university curricula, rules, regulations, and policies; an in-depth
 226 knowledge of their own departmental curriculum; knowledge of the requirements of
 227 external agencies as appropriate; sufficient knowledge of university support offices to
 228 make appropriate referrals; and familiarity with advising resources provided to them.
 229 Faculty members must show a readiness to advise, to make themselves available to
 230 students at reasonable times, to welcome student’s questions and concerns, and to
 231 make appropriate referrals. They should be willing to share their expertise with
 232 students who are not their advisees as well as those who are.”

233
 234 In their statement, the evaluatee shall provide a self-reflective description of their
 235 general approach to advising students well. In addition, the evaluatee may share
 236 information regarding advising load, number of advising sections taught during the
 237 review cycle, and invisible advising work in order to provide further context surrounding
 238 advising.

239

240 **V. Service**

241 As stated in Chapter III, Part D, Section 2(e) of the *Faculty Code*:

242

243 "Reasonable participation in university service is expected of tenure-line
 244 faculty members. Service that advances the mission of the university includes
 245 participation in departmental and university governance, in co-curricular
 246 programs, in promoting intellectual vitality and a high quality of life on the
 247 campus, and in activities which help convey the nature and purpose of the
 248 university to its constituencies."

249

250 The Psychology Department values colleagues who are actively engaged in providing
 251 service to the department, university, and community. Fulfilling this service requirement
 252 is important and can be done in a variety of ways.

253

254 A. Departmental service includes, but is not limited to, contributing to the curriculum
 255 review process, evaluating departmental colleagues, research or writing on behalf
 256 of the department, serving as department chair, attending departmental functions,
 257 organizing colloquia, bringing speakers to campus, and representing the
 258 department at university functions such as fall campus day.

259

260 B. University service includes, but is not limited to, serving on university standing
 261 committees and ad hoc committees, advising or assisting student groups,
 262 recruiting and hiring (students and faculty), co-curricular involvement, and other
 263 work which aligns with the institution’s missions and goals.

264

265 C. Community service relevant to one's professional identity includes activities that
266 enhance the reputation of the institution and that create or strengthen community
267 relationships that serve the institution's mission and goals (e.g., talks in the
268 community, volunteer work that links with the evaluatee's professional identity, and
269 pro bono consultations, among others.).
270

271 **VI. Needs of the Department and the University**

272

273 In cases of tenure, the needs of the department and university will be assessed in relation
274 to the goals listed in Section I of this document.
275

276 **VII. Faculty Evaluation Procedures**

277

278 Deviations from the prescribed timeline for procedures are to be approved by the evaluatee
279 and by departmental members participating in the evaluation. References to days indicate
280 working days.
281

282

A. University Level Evaluation.

283

284 1. The faculty member being evaluated will prepare a file according to the
285 guidelines given in the *University Evaluation Criteria* which will include:
286 a) a self-evaluative statement of performance during the review period; b) a
287 summary of short- and long-term professional objectives regarding
288 teaching and professional growth; c) course materials including syllabi,
289 examples of exams, other assessments and assignments, and other pertinent
290 materials; d) student evaluations; and e) materials relating to the faculty
291 member's professional growth. As indicated in Chapter III, Section 4a(1)(a)
292 of the *Faculty Code*, the evaluatee is responsible for providing relevant
293 evaluation material.

294

295 Per the faculty code, this document describes Teaching, Professional
296 Growth, Advising, and Service as separate and unique categories. The
297 department also wishes to recognize that clear delineations between aspects
298 of our professional work do not always align with the multi-faceted aspects
299 of our work and scholarly products. For example, our teaching and research
300 often overlap, and our professional expertise may lead to similar
301 presentations in the classroom, the university, or the broader community.
302 Thus, an evaluatee may want to include examples of work that illustrate
303 contributions to more than one area being evaluated. In these instances, we
304 ask the evaluatee to clearly describe how that evidence speaks to each
305 category under consideration.

306

307 2. The evaluatee is encouraged to plan ahead in cases of sabbaticals and leaves
308 of absence to ensure that four semesters of student evaluations are available
309 for cases of tenure and two semesters of student evaluations are available
310 for promotion, three-year, and five-year reviews. In collaboration with the
Provost and head officer, the evaluatee will decide whether the file is open or
closed. The head officer will relay this decision to the department. The file

- 311 is to be submitted at least six weeks prior to the date on which evaluation
312 materials are due in the Office of the Provost.
- 313 3. Full-time tenure-line faculty (unless excused, e.g., sabbatical) will
314 participate in the evaluation. Non-tenure-line faculty will not participate as
315 evaluators.
- 316 4. Colleagues may informally discuss the contents of the file with the evaluatee
317 during the review process. The purpose of these information discussion are
318 to provide further clarity, if needed, about content in the evaluation file.
- 319 5. Regular class visitation is critical for faculty evaluation and to provide
320 ongoing constructive feedback about teaching. Departmental colleagues are
321 expected to visit the evaluatee's classes and to document class visitation in
322 their individual letters. To encourage visitation prior to the evaluation
323 deadline, the Chair will notify colleagues each semester about which
324 faculty are scheduled for evaluation.
- 325 6. The timeline outlined below shapes the evaluation process in the
326 department prior to forwarding the file the Office of the Provost and the
327 Faculty Advancement Committee. This timeline is also shown in Figure 1:
- 328 a. At least 6 weeks before the file is due to the Office of the Provost,
329 the evaluatee will make the file available to the department. The
330 head officer informs the department whether the file is open or
331 closed.
- 332 b. Individual letters of evaluation are due to the head officer at least 15
333 working days before the file is due to the Office of the Provost.
- 334 i. Individual letters must include evaluative sections on
335 teaching (including a list of dates teaching observations
336 occurred), professional growth, advising, and service,
337 and include a recommendation concerning the
338 evaluation review. In the case of a tenure review,
339 individual letters must also contain a section on needs
340 of the department and university.
- 341 ii. In the case of a closed file, individual letters of
342 evaluation may be sent directly to the Office of the
343 Provost.
- 344 iii. The head officer will summarize individual letters that
345 they receive; the *Faculty Advancement Committee* will
346 summarize any individual letters that are sent directly to
347 the Office of the Provost.
- 348 c. Outside letters are due to the head officer approximately two
349 weeks before the file is due to the Office the Provost. The exact
350 date is set by the *Faculty Advancement Committee* and is found in
351 the annual *Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria*.
- 352 i. In the case of an open file, the head officer will not
353 summarize the outside letters.
- 354 ii. In the case of a closed file, the head officer will
355 summarize the outside letters and provide a summary of

- 356 outside letters to the evaluatee at least two working days
357 prior to the deliberative meeting.
358 iii. Outside letters may also be included in the file directly
359 by the evaluatee.
- 360 d. At least 3 working days prior to the deliberative meeting, the head
361 officer will provide the evaluatee with a copy of the summary of
362 individual letters. The summary letter is to be signed by all letter
363 writers to indicate that the major points of their letters are presented
364 in the summary.
- 365 e. Within three working days after receiving the summary of
366 individual letters, the evaluatee has the option of requesting a formal
367 group meeting with departmental members before the deliberative
368 meeting.
- 369 f. The deliberative meeting may not occur before the due date for
370 outside letters as indicated in the *Faculty Evaluation Procedures*
371 *and Criteria*.
- 372 i. The purpose of the deliberative meeting, which is held
373 in the absence of the evaluatee, is to review the contents
374 of the evaluatee's file and to reach a departmental
375 recommendation about the evaluatee's performance
376 during the review period. Only department members
377 who have submitted individual letters to the head
378 officer or the Provost prior to the deliberative meeting
379 may participate in the meeting.
- 380 ii. During the meeting, each area being evaluated
381 (teaching, professional growth, advising, service, and,
382 in the case of tenure, needs of the department) is to be
383 discussed. After discussion, the head officer will
384 conduct a formal written vote to determine the
385 department's recommendation. In cases of tenure or
386 promotion, the vote will concentrate on whether or not
387 the department recommends the change of status. For
388 all other evaluations, the vote will consider whether the
389 evaluatee meets or does not meet expectations for the
390 evaluation. All discussion in the deliberative meeting is
391 confidential.
- 392 iii. The content of outside letters, if they are received for a
393 review, must be discussed during the deliberative
394 meeting.
- 395 g. The head officer will provide the evaluatee with a copy of a
396 summary of the deliberations and the departmental
397 recommendation within one week after the deliberative meeting.
398 All participating members will sign the deliberations summary to
399 indicate that it is an accurate summary of the deliberative meeting.
- 400 i. The summary will contain an explicit count of votes in
401 cases of tenure and promotion.

- 402 ii. An explicit count of votes will not be included in cases
403 where there is no change of status.
404 h. Letter writers may submit addenda after the deliberative meeting.
405 i. Letter writers who submitted individual letters to the
406 head officer may submit addenda to the head officer or
407 the Provost.
408 ii. If addenda are submitted to the head officer:
409 iii. The head officer must receive addenda no later than 2
410 working days after the deliberative meeting.
411 iv. Within one week of receiving addenda:
412 v. For open files, the head officer will provide, in writing,
413 the names of individuals who submitted addenda.
414 vi. For closed files, the head officer will provide, in
415 writing, the names of individuals who submitted
416 addenda as well as a summary of the content of
417 addenda.
418 vii. Letter writers who submitted individual letters directly
419 to the Provost may only submit addenda to the Provost,
420 and not the head officer.
421 viii. Addenda are due to the Office of the Provost by the
422 date that the file is due to the Provost.
423 ix. In the case of a closed file, the Faculty Advancement
424 Committee will provide the evaluatee with a summary of
425 addenda received by the Office of the Provost.
426 i. Refer to the Faculty Code regarding deadlines for formal and
427 informal challenges to the departmental evaluation.
428

429 Prepared by: David Andresen, Tim Beyer, Erin Colbert-White, David Moore, Sarah
430 Moore, Jill Nealey-Moore, Mark Reinitz, Melvin Rouse, Adrian Villicana, Carolyn
431 Weisz, Lisa Fortlouis Wood

432
433 Approved by the Professional Standards Committee on April 26, 2019
434

435 Figure 1: Timeline of Departmental Evaluation Processes
 436
 437

438	File due to department	6 weeks prior to file due to Office of the Provost
439		
440	Individual letters due	At least 15 working days before file is due to Office of the
441	to Head Officer	Provost
442		
443	Outside Letters due to	Approximately 2 weeks before file is due to Office of the
444	Head Officer	Provost (see <i>Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria</i> f
445		or exact date)
446		
447		In the case of a closed file, the head officer will summarize
448		the outside letter(s) and provide a summary to the evaluatee
449		at least 2 working days prior to the deliberative meeting.
450		
451	Summary of Individual	At least 3 working days prior to Deliberative Meeting
452	Letters due to Evaluatee	
453		
454	Evaluee may call	Within 3 working days of receiving Summary of Individual
455	Letters	
456	Department meeting	
457		
458	Deliberative Meeting	Not before Outside Letters are due to Head Officer
459		
460	Summary of Deliberative	Within 1 week after the Deliberative Meeting
461	Meeting due to Evaluatee	
462		
463	Addenda due to Head	Within 2 working days after the Deliberative Meeting
464	Officer	
465		
466	File due to Office of the	Date specified in <i>Faculty Evaluation Procedures and</i>
467	Provost	<i>Criteria</i>
468		