Department of Economics

Statement of Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria

Revised 1/22/2021

Faculty Participating in Revision
Lea Fortmann
Wade Hands
Garrett Milam
Andrew Monaco
Lisa Nunn
Isha Rajbhandari
Kate Stirling
Peter Sullivan
Matt Warning

Introduction

This document is intended to serve as a guide for economics faculty in the evaluation process and is designed to serve both the evaluee 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. Evaluees should review the Faculty Code and discuss any questions about it or this document with the department chair and other colleagues. Additionally, the evaluee should carefully review the "Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria" memoranda distributed by the Professional Standards Committee. These documents are sent to evaluees 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 evaluee must demonstrate excellence in the areas of teaching and professional growth and also establish a record of service. To be promoted, the evaluee must demonstrate the highest standards in these areas 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, "the responsibility for demonstrating they meet the standards for tenure or promotion rests with the evaluee."

This document is organized according to the areas identified in the Faculty Code for promotion (chapter III, section 3, part e) and the areas are addressed in order of importance: teaching, professional growth, advising, university service and community service. For each area, we define the departmental standard and discuss the evidence to establish that the standard has been met.

Part A - Departmental Standards for Teaching

Teaching excellence is the most important criterion against which performance by professors is evaluated. The following guidelines represent generally accepted components of teaching excellence and evidence that can be used to evaluate teaching performance.

1. Components of Teaching Excellence

Excellence in teaching requires success in the four areas: course content, course design, teaching pedagogy and course management/student relations.

a. Course Content

i. Currency: Courses should reflect or be informed by current theory, policy and real-world events.
ii. Level: Content should be appropriate given the course level.
iii. Rigor: The course should present an appropriate degree of rigor given the nature of the material and the level of the course.
iv. Specific Content: Content should be consistent with the role of the course within the profession, the department and the university.

b. Course Design

i. Texts and Readings: Written materials should be appropriate to the content of the course; they should be chosen so as to maximize student mastery and understanding of the course material.
ii. Assignments and Assessments: Student assignments should be designed to maximize student understanding of the course content.

c. Pedagogy

i. Effective Communication: Professors should communicate course ideas and concepts clearly and monitor student understanding effectively.
ii. 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.
iii. Motivation: Professors should use appropriate techniques to motivate students to complete course assignments and to master course content.
iv. Flexibility: Professors should realize when class performance has failed and take swift action to remedy any situation that is detrimental to the quality of the course.

d. Course Management and Student Relations

i. Course Expectations: Expectations regarding student behavior and student performance, both in general and for particular assignments, should be clearly and regularly communicated.
ii. Student Contact: Professors should provide ample opportunities for student contact outside the classroom, especially through regularly-scheduled office hours.
ii. Enthusiasm for Learning: Professors in their dealings with students should display and communicate an enthusiasm for learning.
iii. Respect: Professors should be honest with their students and demonstrate respect for them.

2. Evidence of Teaching Excellence

While a wide variety of measurements may be used to assess teaching excellence, every 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, including syllabi, examinations, assignments and assigned written materials.

c. An ongoing process of classroom visitation as accords with the Faculty Code.

d. 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.[1]

It is the responsibility of the evaluee to include i evidence in their file. Classroom visitation is the collective responsibility of the evaluee's departmental colleagues.

The evaluee may choose to submit other types of evidence of teaching excellence such as letters from university colleagues with whom the evaluee has collaborated on teaching activities, materials from non-evaluated departmental courses or courses taught outside the economics department or letters from current or former students.

[1] Evaluators should read the statement regarding the limitations and use of student evaluations in the User's Guide.

Part B - Departmental Standards for Professional Growth

1. Categories of Professional Development Activities

Successful evaluation at tenure and promotion requires that the evaluee demonstrate professional growth as evidenced by an ongoing research program. There are many ways the evaluee can show evidence of professional growth. The non-exhaustive list below describes activities that could be cited to support a claim of professional growth. These are grouped into three tiers, and we expect members of the department to be engaged in multiple activities across tiers. However, primary importance is placed on those activities in Tier I, secondary importance on those in Tier II, and tertiary importance on those in Tier III. We will evaluate an evaluee's professional development in each tier on the quality and quantity of contributions as well as the impact of these contributions.

For tenure and promotions to Associate and Full Professor, we require evidence of professional growth that includes original research and publication of that research in peer-reviewed journals, peer-reviewed conference proceedings or peer-reviewed or invited book chapters. The evaluee should describe how these activities fit into their research trajectory.

Tier I:

a. Conducting original research in one's discipline(s) and publishing that research in peer-reviewed journals, in peer-reviewed conference proceedings or in peer-reviewed or invited book chapters.
b. Authoring or editing books in relevant areas of economic scholarship.
c. Authoring or editing textbooks in relevant areas of economics.
d. Authoring significant software for academic research or pedagogy.

Tier II:

a. Actively participating at conferences (such as giving presentations, organizing sessions or serving on panel discussions).
b. Publishing non-peer-reviewed research such as working papers, policy papers, survey papers and papers for public and private institutions.
c. Publishing book reviews.
d. Sharing in the governance of professional organizations in the evaluee's area of expertise.
e. Refereeing or reviewing manuscripts for scholarly journals or academic publications.
f. Writing and submitting grant proposals to support research and/or educational activities.
g. Giving invited academic talks.

Tier III:

a. Attending conferences or workshops.
b. Directing student research.
c. Presenting in departmental “brown bag” seminars or other internal forums.

2. Evidence of Excellence in Professional Growth

The evaluee is responsible for providing the following evidence to the department as part of the evaluation file:

a. A personal statement that should include a description of the evaluee’s research program(s) and assessment of activities related to professional growth and how these activities advance the evaluee’s research program(s). (This constitutes part of the self-evaluation described under “Procedures” at the end of this document.)
b. Copies of all published and unpublished research, reports and/or documents related to professional growth.

The evaluee may choose at their discretion to include other types of evidence to establish excellence in the area of professional growth. Such evidence could include the letters from individuals outside of the department or the university who can provide evidence of professional growth, letters of evaluation from outside referees or any other materials as deemed appropriate by the evaluee.

Part C - 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.

1. Components of Satisfactory Advising

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

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

b. Openness. Advisors must show a readiness to serve in advising, to welcome student questions and concerns (personal, academic, and career-related) and to make appropriate referrals.

c. 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.

2. Evidence of Satisfactory Advising

It is the responsibility of evaluee to demonstrate an awareness of the components of satisfactory advising and to describe and evaluate their advising accordingly.

Part D - Departmental Standards for University Service

University service, encompassing both service to the department and to the university at large, carries less weight in evaluation decisions than teaching or professional growth, but it is a vital component of a faculty member's responsibilities. The department recognizes the following categories of service, although the evaluee is encouraged to make a case for any other service they believe should be considered.

1. Components of University Service

The components of university service have been divided into three sets. The first set identifies university service activities outside the department. The second set identifies collective departmental service activities. The third set identifies individual departmental service activities. Evaluees are responsible for all of the activities in set II, and should choose activities from set I and set III that complement their talents and interest. New faculty are not expected to participate in either I or III in their first year.

<u>I. University Service Activities Outside the Department</u>

a. Serving on a standing committee.
b. Serving on the faculty senate.
c. Serving on a trustee committee.
d. Serving on an ad hoc committee.
e. Participating in co-curricular activities.
f. Participating in activities that contribute to a creative and intellectual atmosphere on campus.
g. Participating in other university service activities.

<u>II. Collective Departmental Service Activities</u>

a. Recruiting and hiring of economics faculty.
b. Evaluating departmental colleagues.
c. Participating in departmental meetings and functions.

<u>III. Individual Departmental Service Activities</u>

a. Acting as department chair.
b. Acting as departmental representative.
c. Drafting statements on departmental standards and procedures.
d. Drafting statements for periodic curriculum reviews.
e. Drafting departmental statements for accreditation report.
f. Participating in other department service activities.

2. Evidence of Satisfactory University Service

The evaluee is responsible for identifying their contributions in these areas of university service activities. The evaluee may choose to include letters from university colleagues or written reports of their service activities.

Part E - Departmental Standards for Community Service

The Faculty Code recognizes service related to an evaluee's professional interests and expertise as the last area of consideration for promotion. The evaluee should include a description of any community service activities related to professional interests or expertise in the evaluation file. The evaluee may choose to include correspondence documenting their service activities.

Evaluation Procedures

Part A – Responsibilities of the Evaluee

As required by the Faculty Code, the evaluee should prepare an evaluation file including a self-assessment of performance with respect to each area of evaluation, identifying accomplishments in the area as well as specific ways in which concerns or weaknesses will be addressed[1] . The self-evaluation should 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. The file should also contain an up-to-date curriculum vitae as well as all evidence required to confirm that the candidate has demonstrated excellence in teaching and professional growth and has met or exceeded university standards in advising, university service and community service.

Part B – Departmental Recommendation Procedure

When a member of the Economics department is being evaluated, the departmental recommendation procedure will follow the steps below in the order in which they are listed.

1. Tenure-line colleagues participating in the evaluation (hereafter, "colleagues") will examine the evaluation file prepared by the candidate and determine if the candidate has met the departmental criteria for tenure and/or promotion. Colleagues will write a letter of

assessment that includes a specific recommendation regarding the reappointment, tenure and/or promotion decisions. Colleagues' letters will also include a statement detailing the courses they visited and the days they visited them. Faculty on leave may be excused by the department chair from participation in the evaluation process.

2. Colleagues will forward their evaluation letters to the head officer for the evaluation who will prepare a written summary of them in the case of a closed file. Alternatively, colleagues may elect to send their letters directly to the dean's office. Colleagues will review the draft to ensure representational adequacy and provide the head officer with written feedback as necessary. The head officer will then revise the summary letter to reflect colleagues' suggestions.

3. Colleagues will meet to deliberate on a departmental recommendation. This deliberative procedure will be based upon and governed by the department's stated criteria.

4. Colleagues will be asked to sign the summary of their letters and the summary of departmental deliberations letter. A colleague's signature indicates s/he has participated in the evaluation process and that the summary of colleague letters and summary of deliberations accurately reflects the department's deliberative process.

5. The evaluee will be given the summary letters for their review and signature. The evaluee's signature is to indicate, as required by the Faculty Code, that s/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.

6. All materials collected in the course of the departmental evaluations will be forwarded to the Faculty Advancement Committee.

Note: 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.