Criteria, Standards, and Procedures for Evaluation
Department of Psychology
University of Puget Sound

I. Introduction

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

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

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

1. To contribute to the liberal arts education of students in a manner consistent with the stated goals of the University;
2. Within the context of psychology, to contribute to students’ understanding of the philosophy and purpose of science, the methods of empirical research, and the application of research;
3. To contribute to students’ understanding of the profession of psychology as a diverse discipline.

C. Goals for Psychology Students. The department places heavy emphasis on educating students to be well-rounded individuals, knowledgeable about the discipline of scientific psychology. A comprehensive understanding of the field requires research training, critical analysis of psychological theories and research,
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and the ethical application of scientific knowledge. Within the context of a broad liberal arts education, our mission is to help students of psychology develop:

1. **both breadth and depth in their understanding of the content of psychology**, including familiarity with the major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and historical trends within the academic field;

2. **an ability to think scientifically**, including the capacity to construct arguments, analyze and interpret data, read and critique different forms of scientific writing, and evaluate ethical issues and scientific standards;

3. **an ability to express ideas effectively, both orally and in writing**, within the discourse of the discipline;

4. **an appreciation for and understanding of multiple perspectives**, including socio-cultural and individual differences as well as interdisciplinary and sub-disciplinary connections among different ways of knowing and across basic and applied approaches to the social and natural sciences; and

5. **characteristics valuable for personal development and effective civic engagement**, including the abilities to think critically, to work independently as well as collaboratively, to solve problems effectively, to act ethically, and to apply academic knowledge to real-world problems.

**II. Teaching**

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

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

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

1. **Organization** is characterized by effective management of class time, clearly stated expectations of learning objectives and standards, and appropriate and timely feedback to students. Course objectives and scope should be carefully conceived and clearly communicated through well constructed syllabi.

2. **Course content** should reflect the evaluatee's mastery of the subject and currency in the field. Content should also be consistent with the role of the
course in the department and university, and include materials appropriate to
the academic level of the course.

3. **Presentational skills** include the stylistic techniques and materials needed to
communicate information clearly and effectively.

4. Faculty need to display the ability to engage students and to promote interest
and curiosity about the subject. Engaging students requires an enthusiasm for
the subject and for teaching, depth of knowledge about the subject, and
carefully planned assignments, exercises, and readings.

5. Faculty should promote students' intellectual growth by challenging students
with creative, carefully conceived assignments, and by providing
opportunities for independent thinking, reasoning, and writing. At the same
time, faculty should set reasonable performance objectives and provide
appropriate guidance and support.

6. **Assessment** involves applying tools of appropriate rigor and scope to evaluate
student performance, including students' understanding and their abilities to
reason, analyze, and write. Faculty should demonstrate careful evaluation of
student work and provide feedback about areas necessary to improve
performance.

7. **Innovation** includes continued course development by incorporating current
material, demonstrating a willingness to revise and refine assignments, and
experimenting creatively with courses and assignments.

8. **Responsive and adaptable** teachers are sensitive to individual differences
among students. They have the flexibility to work with students of different
backgrounds, at different academic levels, and in a variety of teaching
situations.

9. Faculty should be accessible to students during posted office hours, by
appointment, and through informal interactions.

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

The evaluee shall include, at minimum:

1. **Course materials** which must include syllabi for each course. In addition,
representative examples of assessments such as exams, course assignments
(e.g., paper prompts, instructions), and rubrics (when available) must be
included for each course.

2. **An overarching teaching philosophy and a self-reflective analysis** of how
that teaching philosophy is enacted in the classroom for each course. The
evaluee should detail specific methods and course development and how
this has contributed to their growth as an educator.

3. **Student evaluations** for all courses taught during the review cycle.
4. Other relevant material and information may be used as evidence of teaching performance and pedagogical skill.

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

III. Professional Growth

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

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

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

Evaluation of Professional Growth. The discipline of psychology values both basic and applied scholarship, thus professional growth may encompass both basic and applied research. At the time of evaluation, the evaluee must demonstrate evidence of the vitality and the programmatic nature of their professional growth, as well as its relevance and
scholarly value within the contexts of teaching, the discipline, and/or society. The
evaluee’s statement must include a description of their current and future activities
related to professional growth, goals, methods, time-lines, and expected outcomes related
to professional activities. The file should include written material that serves as evidence
of scholarship (e.g., published work, unpublished manuscripts, documents related to
conference presentations or other scholarly activity). The evaluee must clarify how the
materials presented in the file serve as evidence of a programmatic line of research and
sustained currency in the field. While the department recognizes that scholarship often
spans review cycles, the evaluee should emphasize evidence of their professional growth
during the current review cycle.

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

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

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

IV. Advising

According to Chapter III, Part D, Section 2(c) of the Faculty Code,
“Faculty members are expected to advise a reasonable number of students. Thus,
they shall be available at appropriate times and show the interest essential to good
advising.”

The Psychology Department endorses the statement on advising presented in the Faculty
Evaluation Procedures and Criteria (2018-2019) which states:
“Academic advising is a significant faculty responsibility. Faculty members should be conversant with the learning community of which they are a part so that they can assist students in understanding that community and the language of University regulations and curricula.”

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

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

V. Service

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

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

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

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

B. **University service** includes, but is not limited to, serving on university standing committees and ad hoc committees, advising or assisting student groups, recruiting and hiring (students and faculty), co-curricular involvement, and other work which aligns with the institution’s missions and goals.
C. Community service relevant to one’s professional identity includes activities that enhance the reputation of the institution and that create or strengthen community relationships that serve the institution’s mission and goals (e.g., talks in the community, volunteer work that links with the evaluatee’s professional identity, and pro bono consultations, among others.).

VI. Needs of the Department and the University

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

VII. Faculty Evaluation Procedures

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

A. University Level Evaluation.

1. The faculty member being evaluated will prepare a file according to the guidelines given in the University Evaluation Criteria which will include:

   a) a self-evaluative statement of performance during the review period; b) a summary of short- and long-term professional objectives regarding teaching and professional growth; c) course materials including syllabi, examples of exams, other assessments and assignments, and other pertinent materials; d) student evaluations; and e) materials relating to the faculty member's professional growth. As indicated in Chapter III, Section 4a(1)(a) of the Faculty Code, the evaluatee is responsible for providing relevant evaluation material.

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

2. The evaluatee is encouraged to plan ahead in cases of sabbaticals and leaves of absence to ensure that four semesters of student evaluations are available for cases of tenure and two semesters of student evaluations are available 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
is to be submitted at least six weeks prior to the date on which evaluation materials are due in the Office of the Provost.

3. Full-time tenure-line faculty (unless excused, e.g., sabbatical) will participate in the evaluation. Non-tenure-line faculty will not participate as evaluators.

4. Colleagues may informally discuss the contents of the file with the evaluee during the review process. The purpose of these information discussion are to provide further clarity, if needed, about content in the evaluation file.

5. Regular class visitation is critical for faculty evaluation and to provide ongoing constructive feedback about teaching. Departmental colleagues are expected to visit the evaluee's classes and to document class visitation in their individual letters. To encourage visitation prior to the evaluation deadline, the Chair will notify colleagues each semester about which faculty are scheduled for evaluation.

6. The timeline outlined below shapes the evaluation process in the department prior to forwarding the file the Office of the Provost and the Faculty Advancement Committee. This timeline is also shown in Figure 1:
   a. At least 6 weeks before the file is due to the Office of the Provost, the evaluée will make the file available to the department. The head officer informs the department whether the file is open or closed.
   b. Individual letters of evaluation are due to the head officer at least 15 working days before the file is due to the Office of the Provost.
      i. Individual letters must include evaluative sections on teaching (including a list of dates teaching observations occurred), professional growth, advising, and service, and include a recommendation concerning the evaluation review. In the case of a tenure review, individual letters must also contain a section on needs of the department and university.
      ii. In the case of a closed file, individual letters of evaluation may be sent directly to the Office of the Provost.
      iii. The head officer will summarize individual letters that they receive; the Faculty Advancement Committee will summarize any individual letters that are sent directly to the Office of the Provost.
   c. Outside letters are due to the head officer approximately two weeks before the file is due to the Office the Provost. The exact date is set by the Faculty Advancement Committee and is found in the annual Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria.
      i. In the case of an open file, the head officer will not summarize the outside letters.
      ii. In the case of a closed file, the head officer will summarize the outside letters and provide a summary of
outside letters to the evaluee at least two working days prior to the deliberative meeting.

iii. Outside letters may also be included in the file directly by the evaluee.

d. At least 3 working days prior to the deliberative meeting, the head officer will provide the evaluee with a copy of the summary of individual letters. The summary letter is to be signed by all letter writers to indicate that the major points of their letters are presented in the summary.

e. Within three working days after receiving the summary of individual letters, the evaluee has the option of requesting a formal group meeting with departmental members before the deliberative meeting.

f. The deliberative meeting may not occur before the due date for outside letters as indicated in the *Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria*.

i. The purpose of the deliberative meeting, which is held in the absence of the evaluee, is to review the contents of the evaluee's file and to reach a departmental recommendation about the evaluee's performance during the review period. Only department members who have submitted individual letters to the head officer or the Provost prior to the deliberative meeting may participate in the meeting.

ii. During the meeting, each area being evaluated (teaching, professional growth, advising, service, and, in the case of tenure, needs of the department) is to be discussed. After discussion, the head officer will conduct a formal written vote to determine the department's recommendation. In cases of tenure or promotion, the vote will concentrate on whether or not the department recommends the change of status. For all other evaluations, the vote will consider whether the evaluee meets or does not meet expectations for the evaluation. All discussion in the deliberative meeting is confidential.

iii. The content of outside letters, if they are received for a review, must be discussed during the deliberative meeting.

The head officer will provide the evaluee with a copy of a summary of the deliberations and the departmental recommendation within one week after the deliberative meeting.

All participating members will sign the deliberations summary to indicate that it is an accurate summary of the deliberative meeting.

i. The summary will contain an explicit count of votes in cases of tenure and promotion.
ii. An explicit count of votes will not be included in cases where there is no change of status.

h. Letter writers may submit addenda after the deliberative meeting.
   i. Letter writers who submitted individual letters to the head officer may submit addenda to the head officer or the Provost.
   ii. If addenda are submitted to the head officer:
      iii. The head officer must receive addenda no later than 2 working days after the deliberative meeting.
      iv. Within one week of receiving addenda:
         v. For open files, the head officer will provide, in writing, the names of individuals who submitted addenda.
         vi. For closed files, the head officer will provide, in writing, the names of individuals who submitted addenda as well as a summary of the content of addenda.
      vii. Letter writers who submitted individual letters directly to the Provost may only submit addenda to the Provost, and not the head officer.
      viii. Addenda are due to the Office of the Provost by the date that the file is due to the Provost.
      ix. In the case of a closed file, the Faculty Advancement Committee will provide the evaluatee with a summary of addenda received by the Office of the Provost.
   i. Refer to the Faculty Code regarding deadlines for formal and informal challenges to the departmental evaluation.

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

Approved by the Professional Standards Committee on April 26, 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File due to department</td>
<td>6 weeks prior to file due to Office of the Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual letters due to Head Officer</td>
<td>At least 15 working days before file is due to Office of the Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Letters due to Head Officer</td>
<td>Approximately 2 weeks before file is due to Office of the Provost (see <em>Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria</em> or exact date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the case of a closed file, the head officer will summarize the outside letter(s) and provide a summary to the evaluatee at least 2 working days prior to the deliberative meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Individual Letters due to Evaluatee</td>
<td>At least 3 working days prior to Deliberative Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluatee may call Department meeting</td>
<td>Within 3 working days of receiving Summary of Individual Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberative Meeting</td>
<td>Not before Outside Letters are due to Head Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Deliberative Meeting due to Evaluatee</td>
<td>Within 1 week after the Deliberative Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addenda due to Head Officer</td>
<td>Within 2 working days after the Deliberative Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File due to Office of the Provost</td>
<td>Date specified in <em>Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>