

Department of Sociology & Anthropology
Procedures, Criteria, and Standards for Evaluation

Revised Spring, 2021

Preface

This document is intended to serve as a guide to Sociology & Anthropology 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 Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria memoranda distributed by the Professional Standards Committee, in consultation with the Faculty Advancement Committee.

The evaluatee should understand that they will be evaluated according to those University standards. However, the evaluatee should also understand that their department may take into account departmental criteria especially relevant to the department's mission. Those criteria are explicitly laid out in this document.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY & ANTHROPOLOGY

Statement of Procedures, Criteria, and Standards for Evaluation

Revised Fall, 2019

INTRODUCTION

This statement establishes the criteria, standards and procedures the Department of Sociology & Anthropology will use in evaluating members of the department. Evaluations will be conducted by available tenure-line faculty who are tenured or still eligible to be awarded tenure. These faculty members, excepting the person being evaluated, will come together to deliberate and reach a departmental recommendation about the evaluatee's performance during the review period. These deliberations shall be confidential.

The department realizes that as pedagogy and forms of professional development evolve, many of our endeavors overlap across evaluation categories. For example, classroom projects may contribute to online projects that show professional development and serve local communities; professional development may inform university service; and our university and community service may in turn directly overlap with what we do in the classroom. Candidates can make the case that items may be counted towards multiple categories.

Faculty on leave or absent from campus due to illness may be excused from participating in a particular evaluation by the department chair.

TEACHING

Excellence of teaching is the primary goal in the Department of Sociology & Anthropology. Evaluation of faculty therefore takes as its central focus the quality of each member's contribution to this departmental mission of providing a stimulating and challenging learning environment where students can develop the background and skills necessary for critical thought, analysis, and in-depth understanding of sociocultural processes in societies throughout the world.

We are concerned with each faculty member's ability to convey not only the knowledge and approaches of their field in a highly competent and organized fashion, but also their ability to inspire students' interest and excitement for anthropological and sociological approaches to understanding the world. Respecting the fact that individuals and their styles of teaching vary considerably, we expect faculty to leverage their particular strengths, training, and skills to advance the education of students.

Evidence of teaching excellence will be drawn through a critical, holistic analysis of the following sources, with appropriate attention to the potential biases inherent to each source:

- The faculty member's statement of teaching objectives and philosophy, self-evaluation of teaching performance, and prospective direction for the future, provided at the time of formal evaluation.
- Classroom performance as evaluated by colleagues. Departmental colleagues are responsible for writing an evaluation of faculty member's teaching in terms of criteria discussed above, based, in part, on an ongoing process of class visitation. In non-streamlined reviews, each tenure-line member of the department is expected to conduct at least two class visits as a basis for evaluation.
- Course syllabi. These are assumed to reflect the faculty member's conception of the scope, objectives, content, and organization of each course as presented to students. Evaluation of syllabi should be based on clarity of formulation; challenge to students in terms of reading, research, written assignments, or other appropriate activities; and currency in the field. Syllabi for courses offered regularly should show evidence of periodic revision to incorporate developments in the discipline, and modifications based on student and colleague feedback.
- Examples of exams, paper assignments, and guidelines for projects. These should give evidence of a creative and effective pedagogical approach involving rigorous expectations. Taken as a whole, assignments for classes should promote the goal of training students to use the perspectives, concepts and skills of sociology and/or anthropology, and require independent thought, research, and/or oral and written communication from students at the appropriate level.
- Any other written materials related to classroom activities or the faculty member's education praxis, as well as information about the ways the faculty member is available to students outside the classroom.
- Classroom performance based on standard student evaluations of teaching. These will be read and interpreted in the context of all the other sources of evidence discussed in this listing, taking into account the current literature on bias in student evaluations.

Procedures

The evaluatee should assemble all materials relevant to their teaching performance within the time frame as described in the Faculty Code, as requested by the Office of the Provost and/or the department chair. These materials will constitute the evidence of teaching performance as submitted by the evaluatee, and should therefore be carefully prepared.

Available tenure-line members of the department's faculty shall carefully review the materials related to teaching submitted by the evaluatee and offer their assessment in writing, including in their letters the dates and times of their class visits.

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

The Department of Sociology & Anthropology places a high value on professional growth, which we see reflected in the faculty member's engagement in ongoing research activities and maintenance of currency in the discipline.

The core of the Department's curriculum for majors is oriented toward the development of research competence and the display of this competence through written and oral reports. Faculty members' pursuit of these goals, at the professional level, is therefore integral to the mission of the Department.

Faculty research activity should be focused within the disciplines of anthropology and/or sociology. In order to make good use of each individual's strengths and also establish a close fit between research expertise and teaching responsibilities, we recognize that individual faculty members will likely vary in the particular ways by which they strive to meet the Department's research expectations.

Professional growth can take many forms, as suggested by the following three tiers. The strongest evidence (Tier 1) constitutes demonstrable progress toward the production of substantial works of peer-reviewed scholarship such as:

- original research and publication of book-length writings or research monographs
- original research and publication of articles in professional journals.
- original research and publication of book chapters in edited volumes or similar, peer-reviewed fora.

For this first tier, the department understands that while some works of scholarship are peer-reviewed in the narrow sense of blind review, other equally substantial works may be invited competitively and/or reviewed by peers and editors in other ways. A second tier of scholarly vitality and professional growth (Tier 2) is showing currency in the discipline by:

- active participation in appropriate scholarly conferences and meetings, involving such activities as presenting papers or serving as discussant
- submission of research proposals and grant proposals
- work on manuscripts in progress as evidenced by substantial drafts

- editorship of professional publications
- active research projects relevant to the Department and other disciplines
- writing or otherwise producing works of public scholarship
- writing encyclopedia entries
- writing invited contributions to professional newsletters or blogs, or other substantial works of public scholarship

We also expect that in their role as teachers, faculty members must stay abreast of developments in their discipline as a whole and in their areas of specialty in particular. A third and subordinate tier of professional growth (Tier 3) is the realm of participation in the broader scholarly community, as shown through activities such as:

- active engagement with new as well as established literature in anthropology, sociology, or related (sub-)disciplines and area studies
- review of research proposals submitted to funding organizations
- research affiliations with outside institutions
- serving as an outside evaluator of peers, departments, and institutions
- refereeing books and articles
- participation at training sessions and workshops
- involvement in symposia, programs of study, or seminars
- service to professional organizations, involving such activities as:
 - organizing or chairing sessions at professional meetings
 - fulfilling administrative responsibilities
 - evaluating research proposals
 - active engagement in community activities that are relevant to professional growth

In evaluations for tenure, work in all three tiers will be considered as part of the record of professional growth. A case for tenure must include evidence from all three tiers, including at least one completed item from Tier 1 *as primary author* that has been published or accepted for publication, and must demonstrate that the candidate's scholarship makes an original and substantive contribution to the fields of anthropology or sociology.

In evaluations for promotion to full professor, work in all three tiers will be considered as part of the record of professional growth. A case for full professor must include evidence of professional development from all three tiers, including at least one completed item from Tier 1 that has been published or accepted for publication, to demonstrate a pattern of sustained growth.

The department values substance over quantity, and it is incumbent on the candidate to make a case for the substance of their scholarly production. In considering scholarly vitality and professional growth, the department recognizes that some projects can be brought to fruition quickly, while others require extensive preparatory work – such as learning new skills, or spending extensive time conducting fieldwork – before writing or other dissemination of scholarly work can begin. The department thus encourages colleagues whose work in the above categories is in-progress to be clear in their personal statements about what steps of the project have been accomplished during the period under review, and to include as much evidence of that in-progress work as possible in their files. Further, in the case of co-authored work (whether published or in-progress) colleagues should make clear in their statements the specific parts of the project(s), including the research and writing, for which they themselves were responsible.

The department also recognizes that the world of publication and professional development is rapidly changing. Written work, such as books, articles, reviews, and the like, may now appear in a variety of formats. The department does not value one form over the other, but colleagues under review should also provide sufficient evidence to help others contextualize and evaluate published work in various journals or formats, such as their peer-review procedures. In ascertaining the value of a department member's scholarship and professional growth, colleagues may rely upon the judgment of others (through various forms of peer review) and on their own evaluation of the materials under review.

Procedures

The evaluatee shall assemble all materials relevant to their professional activities within the time frame as described by the Faculty Code, as requested by the Office of the Provost and/or the Department chair. Those materials will constitute the evidence of professional activity and therefore should be carefully prepared.

Available tenure-line members of the department will carefully review the materials submitted by the evaluatee and convey their assessment of the evaluatee's professional activities, in writing, to the Department chair (or Departmental evaluation officer).

ADVISING

The Department of Sociology & Anthropology is fully committed to the definition of an advisor as an educator who would "...understand that the sharing of ideas with students demands a step beyond text and discipline to purposeful discussion of decisions leading to meaningful academic and life goals." (Professional Standards Committee). Departmental standards regarding faculty fulfillment of this goal can be more specifically considered by looking at the more particular implications of the two-fold distinction of academic and career-related advising.

A. Academic Advising

Faculty members must, at the outset, clearly understand and base their advising on an overall knowledge of formal University requirements (policies and curricula), complementing this with: 1) an in-depth knowledge of the Sociology & Anthropology Department's program of studies, and 2) robust knowledge of university support offices and advising resources for making references when appropriate. To put this knowledge into practice, faculty members are expected to be reasonably available to students, including those students who are not their advisees but who nevertheless seek them out for advice.

B. Career-Related Advising

Career-related advising involves faculty members' ability to help students make informed decisions about the relationship between coursework and options for continuing and directing such study toward future academic or professional goals. This includes assisting students in deciding on internship placements, graduate school programs, career paths, and other, related opportunities.

Procedures

The evaluatee shall identify and describe all activities and outcomes relevant to their academic and career advising within the time frame as described in the Faculty Code, as requested by the Office of the Provost and/or the Department chair.

Available tenure-line members of the department will carefully review the materials submitted by the evaluatee and convey their assessment of the evaluatee's advising performance, in writing, to the department chair.

UNIVERSITY SERVICE

The Department of Sociology & Anthropology expects that its faculty will provide substantial and ongoing service to the Department and to the University. That involvement can take a variety of forms.

Departmental Involvement

We are a department with a clearly defined mission. If we are to continue to be successful, every member of our department must enthusiastically participate in the day-to-day activities of the Department. The ability of faculty to achieve excellence in teaching, professional growth, and advising depends, in large measure, on departmental encouragement and support. Therefore, it is expected that a faculty member will actively participate in and contribute to department governance, curricular planning and development, and departmental events. Examples of active participation include serving as chair of the Department, acting as faculty advisor to SoAn-related student clubs, contributing to the departmental blog and broader web presence, organizing co-curricular activities, serving as mentors to new faculty, and representing the department to the wider University community.

University Involvement

In addition to their work to support the Department, faculty members in Sociology & Anthropology should be committed to the governance, development, and improvement of the University as a whole. Activities evidencing this commitment might include, among other examples: participation in and chairing of University committees and co-curricular programs; helping to promote the intellectual vitality of life on campus; development or demonstrated improvement of programs, policies, and opportunities for University students and faculty; and helping to convey the nature and purpose of the institution to the wider community.

The evaluation of a faculty member's University service will be based on materials provided by the evaluatee.

Service Beyond the University

Community service that is related to professional interests and expertise will be considered in the evaluation process. In particular, community service activities that enrich teaching and professional growth and/or enhance the reputation of the department and the University will be taken into account.

Procedures

The evaluatee shall assemble all materials relevant to their University and community service activities within the time frame described in the Faculty Code, as requested by the Office of the Provost and/or the department chair. Those materials will constitute the evidence of university and community service and should therefore be prepared with care.

Available tenure-line members of the department will carefully review the materials submitted by the evaluatee and convey, in writing, their assessment of the evaluatee's university and community service activities.

SUMMARY OF PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Responsibilities of the individual being evaluated:

The evaluatee shall submit a FILE to the Department within the time frame established by the chair or by the evaluation officer, if the chair is under review. This file shall contain all materials relevant to the evaluation, including:

- a. A statement regarding the evaluatee's short-term and long-term professional goals, and a self-assessment of their teaching and advising, professional development, and service to the Department and University.
- b. Current curriculum vitae.
- c. Pertinent documents and materials including, for example, course syllabi, exams, assignments, as well as submitted grants, projects, and scholarly writings.
- d. Student course evaluations.

Responsibilities of Chair (or Evaluation Officer) include:

- a. Notifying career-track Department members when the FILE is available for review.
- b. Calling a department meeting to determine the department's collective recommendation.
- c. Drafting a letter representing the Department's collective evaluation of the evaluatee.
- d. Circulating draft copies of the department letter to members of the Department for their approval prior to submission of the FILE to the Faculty Advancement Committee.
- e. Submitting the final copy of the Department letter to the Provost.
- f. Presenting to the evaluatee a list of names of those who participated in the department meeting, and of those who have submitted letters of evaluation to the chair, as well as a written summary of the substance of the department's deliberations.
- g. In the case of evaluations with confidential letters, the Chair will also present to the evaluatee a summary of the substance of the letters.

Responsibilities of Colleagues:

- a. Conducting a detailed and conscientious review of the evaluatee's file.

- b. Individual discussions with the evaluatee if requested by either party.
- c. Participating in an appropriate number of class visitations (which we regard to be at least two visits per colleague, for non-streamlined reviews). Colleagues who make class visitations are requested by the Professional Standards Committee to specify the "courses they visited and the days they visited them" in their letters.
- d. Writing a letter of evaluation addressed to the Chair of the department or if they so wish sending it directly to the Provost.
- e. Participating in a department meeting to determine the department's collective evaluation and recommendation.

These guidelines were developed by:

Richard Anderson-Connolly, Gareth Barkin, Monica DeHart, Andrew Gardner, Benjamin Lewin, Jason Struna, Jennifer Utrata.