April 21, 2017

TO: Faculty Senate

FR: Stacey Weiss, Chair of the Faculty Advancement Committee
On behalf of Jeff Matthews, Jill Nealey-Moore, Doug Sackman, George Tomlin, Stacey Weiss and Kris Bartanen

RE: 2016-2017 Annual Report

The Faculty Advancement Committee this year will have completed 46\(^1\) evaluations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Review</th>
<th>Number and Status of Evaluations</th>
<th>Used Moodle Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>3 (1 open, 2 closed)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure and promotion to associate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to assoc/clinical assoc</td>
<td>2 (open)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to professor</td>
<td>16 (14 open, 2 closed)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 year assistant</td>
<td>5 (3 open, 2 closed)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 year associate/clinical associate</td>
<td>9 – head officer only (not FAC)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year professor</td>
<td>14 (1 closed, 13 streamlined)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 year instructor</td>
<td>6 (1 closed, 5 streamlined)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 55 35 (76%)

The Committee has forwarded evaluations for tenure, tenure and promotion, and promotion to professor to the President. Some of these cases were considered by the Board of Trustees at the October 2016 and February 2017 meetings; some will be considered at the May 2017 meeting.

The Advancement Committee met for a total of 25 hours from October through December 2016 and will have met 24 hours for the Spring 2017 semester. FAC members estimate that they spend roughly 15 hours per week reading files and preparing evaluation letters in addition to time spent in meetings. We welcome a discussion as to whether the 1 unit release per year is sufficient for this level of service, while emphasizing that the work itself is important, educational, and truly inspirational.

Observations and Recommendations

1. 2016-17 was the second year in which we have seen a very large number of streamlined Professor reviews. Given that the Faculty Code, Chapter III, Section 5, does not provide for class visits, the Advancement Committee notes the potential of colleagues (with three or more years of full-time, post-Ph.D. teaching experience) being promoted in year 9 at Puget Sound, or those promoted in year 12 on our campus, experiencing a long career without

---

\(^1\) Under the revision to the Faculty Code, 9 reviews were “head officer only” for third-year associate professors.
ever having colleagues visit classes. We find this prospect unfortunate both for the senior colleagues, who might benefit from formative feedback, and for other colleagues – particularly junior colleagues – not having the benefit of observing and learning from good teachers. We offer two recommendations: (1) that department chairs consider encouraging – even delegating – junior colleagues to visit classes taught by senior colleagues, with perhaps follow-up discussions with the chair regarding their observations; and (2) that the faculty consider amending Chapter III, Section 5 to include a provision for class visits as part of streamlined reviews.

2. The Committee also observed some three-year assistant professor evaluation files in which class visits were limited to a small delegation of a larger department. While this meets the “2 visits by 2 colleagues” minimum standard, we encourage the Professional Standards Committee to consider re-evaluation of this minimum in order to increase avenues of collegial interaction on approaches to teaching and to help insure that pre-tenure faculty members have a fuller sense of colleague feedback prior to the tenure review.

3. 2016-17 was the first year in which there was a larger group (more than two) of head officer only (“HOO”) reviews for three-year associate professors. The Dean discussed with the Committee her observation that three of the nine head officers provided specific feedback to the evaluatee regarding their preparation for a promotion to Professor evaluation; other head officer letters offered descriptions or lists of the evaluatee’s activity, but did not offer evaluative guidance with respect to departmental (as expressed in departmental guidelines) or university (as expressed by the Professional Standards Committee and the Faculty Code) expectations. Given there is no C.V. or evaluation statement required for the HOO file, and having observed the care with which the FAC reviewed evidence of sustained professional growth in promotion files, the Dean recommends greater attention by head officers to the purpose of the third-year associate review in preparation for the future promotion review, and plans to include this topic in the August 2017 Department Chairs, Directors, and Deans Workshop.

In discussion of these reviews, the Advancement Committee noted that an unintended consequence of this process is that it is difficult to consider the three-year associates as candidates for teaching or research awards. The Committee invites the faculty to consider an amendment to the Faculty Code to incorporate the possibility of a three-year associate professor choosing a head officer only, a streamline, or a regular review.

4. The Committee recommends that evaluatees provide a chart of any release time received during the three-year or five-year period under review, accompanied by an explanation of the purpose of the release time. In some files, where the number of Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms is small, a snapshot of reassigned time and what was accomplished with the time would be informative in overall consideration of the evaluation file.
5. We encourage evaluatees to update and accurately reflect their career paths on their curriculum vita. For example, Assistant Professor year-year; Associate Professor year-year; etc. The Committee was interested to see how many C.V.s suggest colleagues were hired to Puget Sound at Associate or Professor; it would be helpful for the Committee to have an accurate view of career path.

6. As the Professional Standards Committee opens a fuller discussion of bias in Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms, we encourage the PSC to meet with the FAC (and perhaps recent FAC members) to discuss how files are read, how observations of bias are and might be addressed, and how the qualitative benefit of student voices can be maintained in the evaluation process.

**Evaluation Standards**

A year ago, the Faculty Advancement Committee again strongly encouraged the Professional Standards Committee to implement a periodic review process for department, school, and program evaluation guidelines; we appreciate the action taken by PSC to implement an eight-year review cycle for evaluation guidelines. Given that the implementation allows an evaluatee to select either the evaluation guidelines currently in effect or the immediately prior guidelines, multiple sets of each department’s guidelines will need to be maintained on the Faculty gateway webpage and both evaluatees and evaluators will need to be scrupulous in applying the correct departmental evaluation standards.

Similarly, the Committee is pleased to observe that the Faculty Senate opened a discussion in the faculty to reassess university-wide expectations in light of changes in university profile since 1999, new forms of scholarship and creative work, and new venues for publication in the digital age. The Committee continues to be hopeful that this discussion will provide the basis for the PSC to then rewrite the “university standards” section (not revised since 1999) of its Faculty Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria document.

**Promotion**

A year ago, we offered a significant call for the faculty to articulate faculty expectations: Is every file truly ready for promotion to Professor, the highest rank of the faculty, at the first point of eligibility to stand for promotion? We have received some feedback in Spring 2017 that some faculty members perceive that they must stand for promotion to Professor at the first opportunity that they are eligible; we wish to make clear that no one is required to stand for promotion to Professor. (The Dean notes that faculty members may elect to remain at the Associate 7 step on the Faculty Salary Scale and receive “across the board” increases to the salary scale.) The Dean’s Office communicates each early summer with faculty eligible for promotion in the next review year regarding their choice to have a promotion review or a regular three-year review.

Similarly, pre-tenure faculty members with prior full-time, post-Ph.D. teaching experience whose appointment letters allow them to elect consideration for promotion in their third-year review are not required to stand for promotion to Associate at that time. They may chose to be...
evaluated for promotion in accord with the *Faculty Code*, including electing consideration for tenure and promotion in the year-six review.

As a reminder, faculty members may elect consideration for promotion in “off-years” rather than waiting a full three years, based on conversation with their department and the Dean.

The following three sections are repeats from prior reports of recent years:

Advice to Colleagues:

- Evaluations by the Advancement Committee are both formative and summative. The Committee expects that, in accord with *Faculty Code*, Chapter III, Section 4.d.(1), “No later than four months after receiving the report from the Faculty Advancement Committee, or notification of action by the Board of Trustees in cases of tenure and promotion, the head officer meets with the evaluatee to discuss the results of the evaluation.” Such discussion not only allows for the clarification of individual teaching, scholarly, and service expectations moving forward, but also promotes acknowledgement of FAC feedback that may be of larger departmental concern.

- Expecting that the above-noted meeting and discussion will have occurred between the head officer and the evaluatee, FAC members have the prior Committee’s evaluation letter available to them and treat it as important context for their review of the current file.

- The Committee observes in some files where teaching responsibilities include lecture and laboratory sections that colleagues express hopes for Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms tailored for administration in laboratory sections. The Committee again suggests that Professional Standards Committee invite faculty input on this topic.

Advice to Head Officers:

- The Committee reminds head officers that the deliberative letter – informed by individual colleague letters and deliberative discussion – should address “the needs of the department, school, or program and the university” as a criterion for tenure reviews (see *Faculty Code*, Chapter III, Section 3.d). The Code calls for “demonstrated need” for the position.

- In change of status reviews, head officer summary of deliberation letters (along with the FAC and President’s letter) are forwarded to trustee members of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee and need to reflect the formative and summative substance of the departmental discussion.

- We recommend that head officers be identified a year in advance of the evaluation, particularly when department chairs, directors, or deans are up for review; the head officer needs to ensure that there is an adequate set of class visits. The Dean’s Office provides the information about who is up for review one year in advance (and two years in advance for tenure evaluations).

- The Committee appreciates that many head officers have this year provided a chart of class visits at the beginning of deliberative summary letters (who visited what classes and when) in order to document clearly all class visits conducted by colleagues; we encourage this practice by all head officers as we still struggle in some files to discern accurately the ongoing pattern of class visits.
• We continue to see too many clusters of visits to the same few class sessions in the early Fall semester for tenure files; every head officer receives a chart of candidates for tenure two years ahead (and, for all other reviews, one year ahead) in order to assist their ensuring of an ongoing pattern of class visits.

Advice to Evaluees:
• The Committee encourages evaluees, in accord with the Faculty Code and Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures (p. 18), to include a statement of professional objectives, both short-term and long-term.
• The Committee again encourages evaluees to include in their files copies of scholarly materials (publications, conference papers, proposals, letters from editors, etc.) that they are citing as evidence of professional growth.
• The Committee observes across a number of files calls from evaluators for evaluees to make clear their roles in co-authored or collaborative work. Department, school, or program head officers can also assist the FAC in understanding how “author order” for collaborative work is treated in the specific field. Departments could also add such information to departmental guidelines during their next updating and review for approval by the PSC.
• As the Committee relies on the previous FAC letter for context as they review the current file, we encourage evaluees to review this letter and to address in their personal statement their progress in addressing any areas of concern.
• The Committee encourages evaluees to describe progress made on scholarly or creative projects since the time of the previous review, in addition to discussing the content of that work. Such an approach allows the Committee to more readily ascertain “sustained growth.”
• The Committee encourages colleagues to attend to revised Interpretations of the Faculty Code regarding solicitation and submission of external letters; this information is included in the annual Faculty Evaluation Standards and Guidelines document.

Conclusion
The Faculty Advancement Committee will discuss other ideas after it finishes with the 2016-2017 evaluations and reserves the opportunity to provide an addendum to this report to the Faculty Senate at or after semester’s end.

Finally, the continuing members of the committee wish to thank Jeff Matthews (Business and Leadership), Doug Sackman (History) and Stacey Weiss (Biology) for their dedicated and articulate service on the Advancement Committee. We look forward to welcoming Dawn Padula (Music), Steven Neshyba (Chemistry) and Seth Weinberger (Politics and Government) to the committee next year. As well, we welcome Sunil Kukreja to the Committee, and heap abundant thanks to Kris Bartanen for her years of esteemed and patient guidance, and for her continued consultation to the Advancement Committee.