



FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES & CRITERIA

(EVALUATION "USER GUIDE")

2021-22

**PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE
UNIVERSITY OF PUGET SOUND**

TACOMA, WASHINGTON 98416

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Memo from the Provostiii

Spring 2020: Professional Standards Committee Guidelines for Evaluation Due to COVID-19iv

August 2020: Professional Standards Committee Guidelines for Evaluation Due to COVID -19.....vii

May 2021: Professional Standards Committee Guidelines for Evaluation Due to COVID-19.....ix

Faculty Scheduled for Evaluation, 2021-22..... 1

Deadlines for Outside Letters and Forwarding Recommendations to the Provost’s Office..... 2

General Information for all Faculty 4

University Evaluation Standards 6

Evaluation Letters 9

Class Visits12

The Departmental Evaluation Process 14

Information for Faculty Being Evaluated 18

Checklist for Head Officers 24

Evaluations in First and Second Years 26

Evaluation of Three-Year Visiting Faculty27

Evaluations of Instructors27

Alternative Evaluation Process for Associate and Full Professors28

Some Guiding Principles 30

Appendix A – Team Teaching Course Addendum... 32

Appendix B – Team Teaching Evaluation Form....33

Appendix C – Faculty Google Evaluation Site FAQ35

DATE: June 25, 2021
TO: All Faculty Members
FROM: Laura Behling, Provost/Dean of the University
SUBJECT: Faculty Evaluation Criteria & Procedures

This document includes information from the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) and the Provost's Office regarding faculty evaluation. Please read the entire document carefully. The document lists those faculty members scheduled for evaluation in 2021-22 and also provides information on the schedule for presentation of files to departments, for the review of those files, and for their submission to the Provost's Office. All faculty members may review the list of those scheduled for evaluation and consider whether they wish to submit letters on colleagues outside their own department, school, or program.

Please note the statement of University Evaluation Standards called for in the *Faculty Code*. Each department, school or program also has a statement of standards and procedures for evaluation that has been approved by the PSC. The PSC encourages faculty members to read the *Faculty Code* and specific departmental, school or program document before beginning the evaluation process. Effective 2017-18, with implementation of a regular review cycle for departmental evaluation statements, faculty members undergoing evaluation may choose to use either the newly approved departmental evaluation standards or the most recent prior version of their department's evaluation standards, so long as the most recent prior version was in effect on the date that the faculty member's tenure-line or ongoing clinical-line appointment began. **It is important that departments keep their evaluation documents up-to-date via the established review cycle.**

Effective 2017-18, the PSC also developed and approved a new Team-Teaching Evaluation Form, as well as a new addendum to use with the current Instructor and Course Evaluation form, that evaluatees may elect for team-taught courses. See details on pages 18-19. Please read the PSC's caution regarding bias and Student Evaluation of Teaching forms.

Head officers should remember that the *Faculty Code* requires a meeting between an evaluatee and the head officer for the review within four months of receiving the evaluation letter from the Faculty Advancement Committee (or, in the case of tenure and/or promotion) of receiving notification regarding the Board's decision. These letters and meetings provide important feedback to evaluatees and to departments about areas for improvement and/or consultation that inform subsequent reviews.

Please continue to note guidelines regarding letter length, specifying classes visited, and length of evaluatee statements. Please also note the *Appendices* containing Google instructions.

Thank you for the conscientious attention and serious professional effort that you bring to the evaluation process each year.

**Spring 2020: Professional Standards Committee
Guidelines for Evaluation Due to COVID-19**

Dear Colleagues,

COVID-19 has required adaptations to our usual practices and workloads, including an unexpected transition to teaching remotely, and disruptions in your programs of research, scholarship, or creative work. We recognize that this new reality may have caused anxiety about evaluations and your career progress, and we want to ensure that you will not be penalized for your flexibility, adaptability, and hard work. We hope these changes alleviate some of your anxiety and allow you to focus on the adjustments you are making in your teaching and other professional activities.

Timeline for Faculty Reviews

Faculty Scheduled for 3-Year Assistant Reviews in Spring 2021

Because three-year assistant reviews are critical for continued faculty development along the tenure track, faculty third-year reviews will be rescheduled for Spring 2021 (see due dates below). Faculty may satisfy the requirement for the most recent two semesters of student evaluations by including their choice of two semesters of evaluations from Fall 2019, Spring 2020 or Fall 2020 student evaluations.

Faculty and Clinical Faculty Scheduled for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate or Full Professor, in 2020-21

Although we recognize that many faculty up for tenure and/or promotion may be prepared to move forward on their current evaluation schedule, we are providing faculty with the following three options:

1. Faculty may opt to be evaluated in Fall 2020, as currently scheduled .
2. Faculty may opt to delay their review to Spring 2021 .
3. Faculty may opt to delay their review to Fall 2021, following the dates and deadlines as scheduled for that year.

Faculty should email the Provost by June 1 indicating which of the three options they have chosen. Due dates for 2020-21 evaluations are below.

Faculty Scheduled for 3-Year Associate and 5-Year Full Professor Reviews in 2020-21

Three year associates and full professors up for evaluation will have their reviews rescheduled to Fall 2020, unless they opt out of the Fall 2020 review by emailing the Provost by June 1. If they opt out, they will be evaluated in Spring 2021. Due dates for 2020-21 evaluations are below.

3-Year Instructor Reviews Scheduled for Spring 2021

The following two options are available to 3-year instructors scheduled for review in the academic year 2020-2021.

1. Faculty may opt to be evaluated in Spring 2021, as currently scheduled.
2. Faculty may opt to delay their review for one full year, following the dates and deadlines as scheduled for that year.

Faculty should email the Provost by June 1 indicating when they have elected to submit their file for review. Due dates for 2020-21 evaluation are below.

Reviews of Current First- and Second-Year Faculty Members

Review of first- and second-year faculty will be completed by department chairs/head officers according to the timeline in the "Faculty Evaluation Procedures & Evaluation": "First- and second-year faculty members will be evaluated only within the department by means of a written progress report by the head officer that should be forwarded to the individual and the [Provost] by June 30, 2020" (Faculty Evaluation Procedures & Criteria , 2).

Faculty scheduled for tenure beyond the 2020-2021 academic year

The PSC recognizes that faculty colleagues scheduled for tenure evaluation beyond 2020-21 have been impacted by the current situation. The PSC will address this concern in the near future.

Student Evaluations of Teaching

Faculty have two options regarding student evaluations of teaching for Spring 2020:

1. Faculty may elect to administer student course evaluations of teaching for Spring 2020. Electronic evaluations forms, completed anonymously online, will be made available to students using Google Forms, and administered by departmental administrative assistants.
 - i. Faculty should notify their departmental assistant if they would like student evaluations of teaching administered this semester.
 - ii. If Spring 2020 student evaluations are collected, faculty may elect to include, or exclude, Spring 2020 student evaluations with regard to subsequent evaluation files, and this decision may be made after the faculty member has reviewed the evaluations.
2. Faculty **may elect not to administer** student course evaluations of teaching for Spring 2020.
3. If student evaluations are not collected for Spring 2020, or if they are collected and the faculty member opts to not use them in their file, faculty should use the directions below in order to include the required number of semesters of student evaluations for their review:

- i. Faculty who opt to stand for evaluation in Fall 2020 may replace spring 2020 evaluations with student evaluations from a prior semester from within the evaluation period not already included in their file.
- ii. Faculty who opt to delay until Spring 2021 will include Fall 2020 student evaluations in lieu of Spring 2020 evaluations.
- iii.

Peer Observations

The following peer observation options are available to faculty up for review in the academic year 2020-21. Faculty may opt to:

1. Continue peer observations during spring 2020.
 - Peer observations may occur during online teaching sessions
2. Not have peer observations during spring 2020.
 - If additional peer observations are needed please discuss this requirement with your department chair and/or head officer to determine if additional peer observations are necessary, and how to schedule those observations. Peer observations may occur in Fall 2020 as long as those observations occur prior to submission of colleagues' evaluation letters to the head officer.

**August 2020: Professional Standards Committee
Guidelines for Evaluation Due to COVID-19**

Dear Colleagues:

The PSC recognizes that these are unprecedented, anxious times, especially for faculty with upcoming evaluations. Given the magnitude of COVID-19 disruptions on our individual lives, our families, and our academic communities, we believe it is incumbent on all of us to find ways to incorporate an awareness of the impact of the “COVID disruption” on our individual and departmental evaluations of our colleagues.

COVID-19’s disruptions are profound and manifesting in myriad ways. Research agendas have been interrupted, and faculty are being asked to restructure their courses, assignments, and pedagogies. Many faculty are coping with mental health challenges and stress, and faculty caregiving responsibilities have increased exponentially. Inequalities of race, gender, and socio-economic status have been amplified. Some of these burdens are obvious and some of these burdens are hidden. These challenges show no sign of ending soon, and their effects on colleagues’ work will be long lived. As a result, the PSC offers the guidance below.

PSC recommendations for faculty undergoing evaluation in 2020-21:

The PSC strongly encourages faculty scheduled for evaluation in 2020-21 to include in their narrative a statement that describes as clearly as they can the ways that the pandemic has affected their professional trajectories and, in so doing, impacted their teaching, advising, service, and professional development. We understand that doing so may be difficult, but we believe it is crucial that faculty being evaluated have the opportunity to add a “COVID Narrative” to their evaluation statements, if they so desire. We hope faculty scheduled for evaluation will embrace this invitation to reflect on the pandemic’s impact in the context of their respective evaluations.

PSC recommendations for letter writers in 2020-2021:

Similarly, all faculty participating in colleague reviews in 2020-21 should *consider carefully* an evaluatee’s “COVID Narrative” and be responsive to the issues raised therein. Individual colleague letters, the summary letter for departmental deliberations, and FAC evaluation letters should specifically address how colleagues, the department, and the FAC considered COVID-related disruptions to the evaluatee’s teaching, service, advising, and professional development.

PSC recommendations regarding SETs and evaluation of teaching:

Faculty requiring evaluations in 2020-2021 should plan to administer SETs to their classes. Be aware that, depending on circumstances, the distribution of SETs may occur remotely.

Given the unreliability of SETs as a measure of teaching excellence and the potentially low completion rate of remotely administered SETs, departments could take proactive steps to help faculty being evaluated gather other meaningful evidence to meet the University’s expectation for teaching excellence. These steps must be agreed by both the head officer and the evaluatee, and might include:

increasing the number of colleague observations of teaching (in person or remote), soliciting student reflections on their classroom (and remote classroom) experience in other ways beyond the standard SET instrument, and other modes of evidence. Departments and the FAC should give less weight to traditional SETs and more weight to the abovementioned sorts of additional evidence when assessing teaching excellence.

PSC recommendations to departments regarding departmental evaluation standards:

The impacts of COVID disruptions are likely to increase rather than decrease in subsequent years, especially when it comes to professional growth. During the 2020-2021 academic year, all departments and programs, especially those with colleagues up for tenure and/or promotion in upcoming years, should discuss how they might temporarily adjust or amend their evaluation guidelines, given COVID-related disruptions. Such “COVID Amendments” must still comply with all guidelines listed in the Faculty Code, and must be submitted to the PSC for review prior to being implemented.

By February 1, 2021 all departments and programs with evaluation standards must send the PSC one of the following:

1. Any “COVID Amendments” intended for the 2021-2022 AY.
2. A letter explaining why no COVID-related changes to departmental evaluation standards are being made.

Note that any “COVID Amendments” intended for spring 2021 must be received by the PSC by October 1, 2020.

Note regarding AY 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 review schedules:

Candidates up for tenure and/or promotion review in 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 may choose:

1. To stand for review in fall of the academic year
2. To stand for review in spring of the academic year

Candidates up for review in AY 2021-2022 or 2022-2023 who would prefer to request a one-year delay in their tenure/promotion clock should, after consultation with their department or program chair, submit that request, in writing, to the Provost’s office at least one semester before the academic year in which the file would ordinarily be due. Such requests should include a rationale for requesting the delay.

Faculty and departments/programs with questions should submit them using this form:
<https://forms.gle/Kaz96PKV8cdFHC8XA>

**May 2021: Professional Standards Committee Memo
Guidelines for Evaluation Due to COVID-19**

May 10, 2021

Dear Colleagues:

The PSC recognizes that these remain unprecedented, anxious times, especially for faculty with upcoming evaluations. Given the magnitude of COVID-19 disruptions on our individual lives, our families, and our academic communities, we believe it is incumbent on all of us to continue finding ways to incorporate an awareness of the impact of the “COVID disruption” on our individual and departmental evaluations of our colleagues.

As we noted last summer, COVID-19’s disruptions are profound and manifesting in myriad ways. Research agendas have been interrupted, and faculty are being asked to restructure their courses, assignments, and pedagogies. Many faculty are coping with mental health challenges and stress, and faculty caregiving responsibilities have increased exponentially. Inequalities of race, gender, and socio-economic status have been amplified. Some of these burdens are obvious and some of these burdens are hidden. While these challenges are, we think, subsiding, they remain substantial. As a result, the PSC offers the guidance below.

PSC recommendations for faculty undergoing evaluation in 2021-22:

The PSC strongly encourages faculty scheduled for evaluation in 2021-22 to include in their narrative a statement that describes as clearly as they can the ways that the pandemic has affected their professional trajectories and, in so doing, impacted their teaching, advising, service, and professional development. This narrative can be woven into the overall narrative or set apart as a separate section or sections. We understand that doing so may be difficult, but we believe it is crucial that faculty being evaluated have the opportunity to add a “COVID Narrative” to their evaluation statements, if they so desire. We hope faculty scheduled for evaluation will embrace this invitation to reflect on the pandemic’s impact in the context of their respective evaluations.

PSC recommendations for letter writers in 2021-2022:

Similarly, all faculty participating in colleague reviews in 2020-21 must *consider carefully* an evaluatee’s “COVID Narrative” and be responsive to the issues raised therein. Individual colleague letters, the summary letter for departmental deliberations, and FAC evaluation letters must specifically address how colleagues, the department, and the FAC considered COVID- related disruptions to the evaluatee’s teaching, service, advising, and professional development.

PSC recommendations regarding SETs and evaluation of teaching:

Given the unreliability of SETs as a measure of teaching excellence and the potentially low completion rate of remotely administered SETs during spring 2020 and the 2020-21 school year, departments could take proactive steps to help faculty being evaluated gather other meaningful evidence to meet the University’s expectation for teaching excellence. These steps must be agreed to by both the head officer and the evaluatee, and might include: increasing the number of colleague observations of teaching (in

person or remote), soliciting student reflections on their classroom (and remote classroom) experience in other ways beyond the standard SET instrument, and other modes of evidence. Departments and the FAC should consider traditional SETs in the context of the abovementioned sorts of additional evidence when assessing teaching excellence.

PSC recommendations to departments regarding departmental evaluation standards:

The impacts of COVID disruptions are likely to persist, especially when it comes to professional growth. Last year we asked departments to discuss how they might temporarily adjust or amend their evaluation guidelines, given COVID-related disruptions. As we indicated last year, such “COVID Amendments” must still comply with all guidelines listed in the Faculty Code, and must be submitted to the PSC for review prior to being implemented. All departments and programs with colleagues up for tenure and/or promotion in 2021-22 will need to satisfy one of the following two conditions:

1. The PSC has approved the department, school, or program’s “COVID Amendments” intended for the 2021-2022 AY.
2. The PSC has approved the department, school, or program’s explanation of why no COVID-related changes to departmental evaluation standards are being made.

Departments and programs with colleagues up for tenure and/or promotion in 2021-22 should be especially attentive to this provision in order to ensure fair and equitable treatment for colleagues. Departments and programs with colleagues up for tenure and/promotion in 2021-22 *that are not yet in compliance must submit their amendment or explanation to the PSC by August 15.*

Note regarding AY 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 review schedules:

Candidates up for tenure and/or promotion review in 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 may choose:

1. To stand for review in fall of the academic year
2. To stand for review in spring of the academic year

Candidates up for review in AY 2021-2022 or 2022-2023 who would prefer to request a one- year delay in their tenure/promotion clock should, after consultation with their department or program chair, submit that request, in writing, to the Provost’s office at least one semester before the academic year in which the file would ordinarily be due. Such requests should include a rationale for requesting the delay.

Follow up to Professional Standards Committee Guidelines for Evaluation Due to Covid-19

Tuesday, May 11, 2021 at 4:05 PM (email distributed via facultycoms)

Dear Colleagues:

The PSC posted a memo to facultycoms yesterday (Mon 5/10/21) with recommendations for 2021-22 faculty evaluations. We thought it might be helpful to offer the following clarifications.

(1) The PSC's 5/10/21 memo is almost identical to the PSC's summer 2020 memo that appears in the 2020-21 User Guide (pp. vii-viii). The May 2021 memo contains no substantive changes to the document that appeared in this year's User Guide.

(2) Neither the summer 2020 memo nor the most recent May 2021 memo permanently modify the faculty evaluation process.

(3) Neither the summer 2020 memo nor the most recent May 2021 memo eliminate the current SET instrument or the Code requirement that SETs be included in all evaluation files (four semesters of SETs for tenure files and two semesters for all other evaluations).

(4) Both documents respond to the exigencies of the Covid disruption and the unreliability of SETs as a measure of teaching excellence by recommending (consistent with the Code) that evaluatees (in consultation with head officers) "gather other meaningful evidence to meet the University's expectation for teaching excellence."

Best,

Your PSC colleagues

FACULTY SCHEDULED FOR EVALUATION 2021-22

CURRENT AS OF JUNE 2021 SUBJECT TO REVISION

TENURE

Tracy Doyle
Music

Michael Pohl
Exercise Science

TENURE & PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Mengjun Li
Asian Studies

Melvin Rouse
Psychology

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Wind Woods
Theatre Arts

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Gerard Morris
Music

3-YEAR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Kirsten Coffman
Exercise Science

Tina Huynh
Music

Ania Kapalczynski
Business & Leadership

Ameera Nimjee
Music

Oscar Sosa
Biology

Emily Tollefson
Chemistry

3-YEAR ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (HEAD OFFICER ONLY)

Nicolas Brody
Communication Studies

Erin Colbert-White
Psychology

Amy Fisher
Science, Society, and Technology

Poppy Fry
History

Jung Kim
Exercise Science

Andrew Monaco
Economics

Adam Smith
Mathematics/CS

Jess Smith
Theatre Arts

5-YEAR PROFESSOR

Gareth Barkin
Sociology & Anthropology

Robert Boyles
Physical Therapy

Dan Burgard
Chemistry

Lynnette Claire
Business & Leadership

Denise Despres
English

Greg Elliot
Physics

John Hanson
Chemistry

Tatiana Kaminsky
Occupational Therapy

Diane Kelley
French Studies

Alisa Kessel
Politics & Government

Benjamin Lewin
Sociology & Anthropology

Aislinn Melchior
Classics & Ancient
Mediterranean Studies

Brad Reich
Business & Leadership

Elise Richman
Art & Art History

Adam Smith
Mathematics/CS

Katherine Smith
History

Amy Spivey
Physics

Jonathan Stockdale
Religious Studies

Yvonne Swinth
Occupational Therapy

Carolyn Weisz
Psychology

Rand Worland
Physics

Steven Zopfi
Music

INSTRUCTOR

Alistair MacRae
Artist-in-Residence

Molly Pugh
Education

DEADLINES

The following deadlines apply for individuals submitting outside letters to the head officer and for departments forwarding recommendations and supporting files to the Provost's Office:

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>File due to Department (evaluee access to Google evaluation site ends)</i>	<i>Outside letters due to Department (deliberative meeting must not occur prior to this date)</i>	<i>File due to Provost's Office (department access to Google evaluation site ends)</i>
Tenure	September 6 OR January 10	September 20 January 24	October 4 February 7
Promotion to Associate	September 6 OR January 10	September 20 January 24	October 4 February 7
Promotion to Full	September 6 OR January 10	September 20 January 24	October 4 February 7
3-year Assistant	January 18	February 1	February 15
5-year Professor	September 6 OR January 10	September 20 January 24	October 4 February 7
3-year Associate	September 6 OR January 10	September 20 January 24	October 4 February 7
3-year Instructor	January 18	February 1	February 15
Spring approved evaluation files	January 18	February 1	February 15

First- and Second-year Faculty Members will be evaluated only within the department by means of a written progress report by the head officer that should be forwarded to the individual and the Provost by **June 30, 2021**. Second-year letters are available to the Faculty Advancement Committee during the third-year review process.

Importance of deadlines

It is very important that deadlines for the departmental submission of files be met. The Faculty Advancement Committee must complete its review of the tenure and promotion candidates prior to scheduled meetings of the Board of Trustees. The individual being evaluated is entitled to a timely decision and timely information on the substance of the evaluation. An incomplete file or a file submitted after the deadline may delay a tenure or promotion decision.

Exceptions and extensions. The Professional Standards Committee and the Faculty Advancement Committee recognize that the shifting patterns of evaluations from year to year in larger departments may produce in some years a cluster of evaluations due on or near the same date. Under such circumstances, the department may work with the Provost to establish a schedule for submitting files to the Advancement Committee. The object of such a schedule should be to permit a reasonable distribution of departmental evaluation meetings across a period consistent with the need for a timely process. **In all such cases, the expectation must remain that evaluatees will submit their files to the department in accord with the schedule above and that all outside letters sent to the head officer must be received no later than ten working days after that same published date (see above).**

GENERAL INFORMATION FOR ALL FACULTY

Evaluating colleagues is one of the most important and most difficult tasks that we as faculty members are called upon to perform. Our evaluation decisions determine the quality of the department, school, or program and the university for many years to come.

This booklet is designed to help you through the evaluation process.

However, it does not cover every feature of our evaluation system. Please read it in conjunction with Chapters III and IV of the *Faculty Code*, including interpretations contained in the *Code* appendix, and with the statement of evaluation criteria and standards for your department, school, or program.

The nature of evaluation at Puget Sound. The evaluation process is both formative and summative; in other words, an evaluation is a time both for constructive feedback and for an evaluative judgment of a colleague's performance. Departmental colleague letters and deliberative summary letters that only forward glowing conclusions without offering honest and appropriate feedback in light of articulated departmental expectations, particularly for faculty members who are still advancing on pathways to tenure and promotion, may be missed opportunities to support those colleagues toward satisfying and productive careers at Puget Sound. This is particularly important when there are areas of improvement that are glossed over or left unaddressed. Furthermore, departmental evaluations that affirm an evaluatee as "stellar" without rigorous consideration of evidence and reasonable expectations may send confusing signals to junior colleagues.

When faculty are evaluated. Faculty members are evaluated before a decision to promote, to grant or deny tenure, or to not reappoint an untenured tenure-line faculty member. Faculty members without tenure are evaluated by their head officer at the conclusion of their first and second years of appointment. Instructors, assistant professors, and associate professors are normally evaluated every three years, and professors are normally evaluated every five years. (See *Faculty Code*, Chapter III, Section 2.) Associate professors who are not candidates for tenure or promotion, in accord with the Spring 2015 amendments of the *Faculty Code*, are evaluated through a head-officer-only review that parallels the process used for first- and second-year faculty members (see p. 22), unless they elect a regular review; untenured associate professors would not normally use this process for a pre-tenure, third-year review. Professors at any year of service in that rank may elect, with the concurrence of their head officer and the Provost, to have a "streamlined" review. All five-year reviews will be streamlined unless a) the evaluatee requests a full review or b) the head officer or Provost determines that a full review is necessary. Whomever calls for the full review must inform the other involved parties one year prior to the semester in which the evaluation is scheduled. Instructors who have served 17 years or more in that rank may elect, with the concurrence of their head officer and the provost, to alternate full and "streamlined" reviews. (See *Faculty Code*, Chapter III, Section 5 and p. 27 of this document.)

Delaying an evaluation. Effective 2015-2016, delays to evaluation automatically occur if faculty are granted leave under the Faculty Medical leave and Disability Policies; effective 2016-2017, if the

approved leave is six weeks or more, the length of the evaluation delay is one year. Please read that policy for provisions regarding how to “opt out” from an automatic delay.

The Provost has discretionary authority to grant a faculty member’s request to delay an evaluation (interpretation of the *Faculty Code*, Chapter III, Section 2, which was approved by the Board of Trustees on February 17, 2005). A request for a delay in evaluation is to be submitted in writing to the department chair. The chair makes a recommendation to the Provost, who reviews the request and approves the delay when circumstances warrant. Whenever possible, faculty members should anticipate the need for a delayed evaluation, take steps to ensure that student evaluations are administered as required, and seek the recommendation of the department chair and the approval of the Provost well in advance of the time for the normally scheduled evaluation.

All delayed reviews should be treated procedurally in the same manner as regularly scheduled reviews and files shall be evaluated without prejudice as if the work were done in the normal period of service.

Departmental evaluation standards and criteria. The faculty of each department, school, or program have been asked to affirm collectively an intention to apply high standards to the evaluation of teaching, professional growth, advising, and university service. These standards are stated in the department, school, or program evaluation guidelines in clearly identifiable criteria for that department, school, or program (*Faculty Code*, Chapter III, Section 3b), consistent with university criteria and standards. Evaluations should therefore be specific to these department, school, or program guidelines. Newly approved departmental criteria for evaluation, tenure, and promotion normally take effect at the beginning of the next academic year following PSC approval. Departmental evaluation standards are available online.

University evaluation standards. The Professional Standards Committee has also prepared a document, “University Evaluation Standards,” elaborating upon the categories of evaluation under the *Code* as required in Chapter III, Section 3a. That document is reprinted below. Please note as well the statement in the *Faculty Code* that the provisions of Chapter I, Parts B (Categories of the Faculty) and C (Role of the Faculty) shall serve as fundamental definitions of faculty responsibility (Chapter III, Section 3c). Adjuncts and visiting faculty do not participate in faculty evaluations (Interpretation of Chapter III, Section 4, approved by the Board of Trustees on May 11, 2012.)

Ethical or other grievances that arise or may be raised during evaluation of faculty. As indicated in the *Faculty Code*, Chapter III, Section 4, the evaluation process is designed to provide a substantial body of credible evidence in writing as the basis for a fair and impartial review. Moreover, “the evaluation process should be fair and ensure that adequate consideration is given the faculty member involved. Fairness and adequate consideration shall be achieved consistent with the criteria and procedures outlined in Chapter III, Sections 2-4.” Note that Chapter III, Section 4.f. requires that if, during an evaluation, a question or concern regarding ethical behavior is raised, the faculty member shall initiate a grievance process.

UNIVERSITY EVALUATION STANDARDS

(Revised 5/99)

I. TEACHING

The University of Puget Sound is committed to offering a high-quality liberal arts education that cultivates critical thinking skills and inspires intellectual excitement, encouraging students toward a lifetime of learning. This commitment is the hallmark of the university and influences the entire range of formal and informal activities within the institution. Thus, the identity and purpose of the University of Puget Sound are closely tied to the quality of its faculty, their passion for teaching, and their interactions with students.

The university has identified goals for students that concentrate not simply on the accumulation of information, but also on the ability to speak and to write, to analyze and interpret, to acknowledge values and to learn independently. These goals can only be met with teaching that opens the minds of students so that they see the world in a deeper and more complex way.

When teachers are enthusiastic about teaching, learning, and their discipline, students become engaged in learning. Excellent teachers challenge students intellectually and equip them to meet those challenges. To this end teachers develop effective course structure, select appropriate material, plan meaningful assignments, provide full and fair evaluation of students' work, and develop effective techniques for classroom presentation and management. The manner in which this is done will vary with the nature of the course (for example, lecture, discussion, or lab), as well as the level of the course (for example, introductory or advanced). Teachers must be current and active in their fields to infuse intellectual energy into their teaching and to enhance the quality and integrity of the curriculum.

Students come to us from a variety of backgrounds and bring with them an array of experiences and abilities. Students' needs also vary as they progress through their university education. Effective teachers need to recognize this diverse range of students. This recognition of differences should lead to flexibility in teaching strategy and tactics. Good teachers, then, will gauge students' current abilities and will provide strategies for their continued development.

Because teaching occurs in informal as well as formal settings, teachers' responsibilities extend beyond the classroom. Out-of-class discussions of a paper or project or informal conversations with a student, for instance, are an important part of teaching.

Proven excellence in teaching is a criterion for tenure. The ongoing pursuit of teaching excellence is also a process that continues over the entire career of a faculty member. Teachers may use a variety of methods and approaches; the measure of success for these methods and approaches is whether they result in student learning and contribute to an outstanding liberal arts education. Thus, the challenge of teaching rests with flexibility in approach and with sensitivity and concern for effectiveness.

II. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Since a university is a center for learning and expansion of knowledge, the professional growth of faculty members is a matter of vital interest to the University of Puget Sound. It is, thus, fitting that individual faculty members should be evaluated on the intellectual contribution they bring to the classroom and to their profession.

The university seeks to evoke in students a recognition of learning as an ongoing process that will extend far beyond their college years. Faculty members serve as models of a continuing engagement with the life of the mind. The pursuit of individual research, writing, creation, exhibition,

or performance contributes to a faculty member's work in ways both direct and indirect. In some cases research and publication may deepen a faculty member's understanding of materials that he or she teaches regularly in undergraduate courses, or it may even be essential to the appropriate training of students in the design and completion of research projects. In other cases the topics for individual faculty research may be more specialized than is appropriate for undergraduates but may nevertheless add to the teacher's grasp of conceptual issues in their field and hone the ability to present ideas. Moreover, a teacher who is actively engaged in research, writing, creating, exhibiting, or performing is better able to convey to students the importance of these activities to intellectual development.

Faculty research, publication, exhibition, and performance also have value apart from their contribution to teaching. An important function of a university is to encourage the pursuit of knowledge and the advancement of understanding in many fields. Individual faculty members demonstrate their own intellectual vitality, contribute to the larger purposes of scholarship, and positively represent the university as a place of learning when they share their ideas in a public form. Moreover, participation in the intellectual life of a discipline contributes in many cases to the morale of faculty members, creating a positive feeling of involvement in a wider community of learning.

An important element of professional growth involves engagement with and involvement in the larger professional community where ideas are debated and modified. There are many ways that a faculty member can be involved in the larger professional community including (but not limited to) peer-reviewed publication, making presentations at meetings, reviewing books or scholarly manuscripts, organizing meetings or forums, or taking leadership positions in professional societies.

III. ACADEMIC & CAREER ADVISING

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 students' 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 with those who are.

IV. UNIVERSITY SERVICE

University service refers to faculty activities that are not part of the teaching, professional growth, and advising functions, but that advance the mission of the university. Activities under this rubric include (but are not limited to): contributing to university governance, serving the department or academic program, participating in cocurricular programs, promoting intellectual and cultural vitality on campus, and helping convey the nature and purpose of this institution. Individual faculty members need not participate in all areas, but they should be actively engaged in university service. Though important, the extent and quality of university service carry less weight than the criteria of teaching and professional growth.

In the long-term functioning of the university, however, the competent performance of a reasonable share of university governance and departmental service by each faculty member is indispensable. Participation in university governance, including formal standing committees, ad hoc committees and faculty senate, is a valuable contribution to the effective operation of the institution

and ensures that faculty will, in general, have opportunities to help shape university policies. Substantial departmental service is also a necessary component of service to the university as a whole, and includes regular participation in departmental meetings and other ongoing or occasional tasks, such as searches, curriculum planning, and budget preparation.

A faculty member's participation in informal and cocurricular activities contributes to a stimulating atmosphere that enriches the intellectual and cultural life of the campus. Such participation is an extension of the faculty's central teaching role. Activities that help convey the nature and purpose of the institution may be a part of a faculty member's service to the university. Faculty involvement in Admission programs designed to acquaint prospective students and their parents with the character of the institution provides one example of such activity.

V. COMMUNITY SERVICE

Consideration should be given to service outside the university that is related to professional interest and expertise and which enhances a person's value to the university, or enriches teaching.

EVALUATION LETTERS

Recommendation on length of evaluation letters. In recent years, evaluation letters submitted on behalf of colleagues under review have become unnecessarily long. Such letters represent, collectively, a significant burden on both the letter writer and letter readers. The Faculty Code calls for colleagues "to make substantive assessments of evaluatee performance." Substantive review need not imply a long letter. Duly recognizing that circumstances and situations may vary, the PSC – with the support of the FAC – strongly encourages colleagues to observe the following guidelines.

- **Letters for candidates up for tenure or promotion or for third-year assistant review: up to 5 single-spaced pages.**
- **Letters for candidates in all other evaluations: up to 3 single-spaced pages**

Importance and content of colleagues' evaluation letters. Past and present Faculty Advancement Committee members agree that colleague evaluation letters provide essential data in the decision-making process. As faculty members, we are expected to write evaluation letters for departmental colleagues and are encouraged to write letters for colleagues in other departments or schools. The recommendations should be based upon a careful, searching assessment of the evaluatee's past performance and future potential with regard to the best interests of generations of future students, the standards, goals, needs and strengths of the department, and the quality of the university. Letters should be specific and should discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate in the context of the goals and future needs of the department or school and the university for the position. They should be based on professional contacts and material presented by the evaluatee. Departmental colleague letters should address all criteria contained in the *Faculty Code*. Evaluation letters for colleagues outside one's department or school need not be as extensive. They should, nonetheless, be based on pertinent, professional contacts.

Colleague letters offer perhaps the very best opportunity for a faculty member to enrich the understanding of other colleagues and/or FAC members about the particular strengths or challenges of an evaluatee's file. **For example, colleague letters that provide a descriptive summary of student evaluations are less helpful than colleague letters that provide analysis and synthesis regarding teaching effectiveness and forward an assessment of evaluatee performance. Similarly, for example, colleague letters that list what can be read on an evaluatee's curriculum vita are less helpful than colleague letters that help readers to understand the quality and significance of scholarly work or the caliber of publication or performance venues.** The *Faculty Code*, Chapter III, Section 4.a.(1)(c) calls upon all of us to make substantive assessments of evaluatee performance.

Letters in tenure and promotion cases. In writing colleague evaluation letters, please refer to the *Faculty Code* for the specific criteria for tenure (Chapter III, Section 3d) and for promotion (Chapter III, Section 3e). Although the criteria are similar, they are not identical. Tenure involves a long-term commitment on the part of the university to the faculty member. It is imperative, therefore, that letters concerning candidates for tenure address the evaluatee's past achievements as well as the prospects for continuing growth as a teacher, scholar, and professional colleague.

Letters must be signed documents. The Professional Standards Committee has clarified that a letter for an evaluation file must be a signed document. Both handwritten and electronic signatures are valid.

If you submit an evaluation letter on paper, **please print single-sided as that allows for a more sustainable process as the file moves forward through committee, president, and trustee review.**

Open and closed files. The Professional Standards Committee has determined that the writer of a letter has a right to know whether the evaluatee has chosen to waive access to letters of evaluation. If you are writing for a departmental colleague, the head officer will inform you of the file choice made by the evaluatee. If you are writing for a colleague outside of your department or school, the file choice made by the evaluatee may be secured from the Provost, the head officer, or the evaluatee. The Professional Standards Committee believes that the evaluatee's choice of file status is privileged information and should be treated with discretion. "Open file" does not mean that individual letters written by departmental colleagues are open to review by the entire department; rather "open" means the evaluatee may read individual letters.

Choice of evaluation standards version to be used in the evaluation. Faculty members undergoing evaluation will choose to use either the newly approved departmental evaluation standards or the most recent prior version of their department's evaluation standards, so long as the most recent prior version was in effect on the date that the faculty member's tenure-line or ongoing clinical-line appointment began.

Letters from outside the department. The Professional Standards Committee has developed and the Board of Trustees has approved an interpretation of the *Faculty Code* regarding the submission of evaluation letters from persons outside the department during the process of faculty evaluation. The interpretation, which is reprinted below, is meant to clarify the process by which letters from individuals outside the department may be included in the evaluation process. Faculty undergoing evaluation may include any materials they wish in their file, and this is the most reliable way to include letters from outside sources. Evaluatees are reminded to request these letters far enough in advance to meet the deadline for submission of their files to departments. It is also possible for the head officer to receive directly letters from persons outside the department. **Letters from faculty emeriti are considered outside letters and need to be submitted to head officers.** According to the aforementioned *Code* interpretation, the head officer must receive these letters at least 10 working days before the deadline for submission of materials to the Provost's Office. To ensure that these letters can be considered as part of the departmental deliberation, departments should not schedule their deliberations earlier than 10 working days before the deadline for submission of materials to the Provost's office.

Interpretation of Chapter III, Sections 4a(1) and 4a(1)(c) of the *Faculty Code*: Letters of Evaluation from Persons Outside the Department (Approved by the Board of Trustees, May 2000; updated May 2015 [underlined]):

The Professional Standards Committee offers the following interpretation of the procedures regarding submission of letters of evaluation* (or any other written material) from persons outside the department during the process of faculty evaluations.

Faculty Evaluation Criteria & Procedures

The *Faculty Code* (Chapter III, section, 4a(1)) states that "the head officer shall gather information in writing about the faculty member being evaluated from the faculty member; from colleagues in the department, school, or program; and from other sources if they seem relevant."

In consultation with the evaluatee, the head officer may also solicit appropriate letters from outside the department or university. When soliciting the letters, the head officer will notify the letter writers of the status of the file as open or closed. The *Code* further states (Chapter III, section 4a(1)(c)) that "individual Faculty members may send their observations and recommendations directly to the provost." The PSC interprets these comments to provide for three ways in which letters (or other written material) from persons outside the department may be included in faculty evaluations.

1. The faculty member being evaluated may include any documents she or he wishes into the evaluation file. Thus, evaluatees wishing to guarantee the inclusion of outside letters into the evaluation file can receive those letters and put them in the file before it is submitted for consideration by departmental colleagues.
2. Any persons who wish may submit letters directly to the head officer. The head officer may then include the materials from this person "if they seem relevant." All materials must be received at least ten working days before the deadline for submission of the completed file to the Provost's Office to allow department members the time to review these materials prior to the department deliberation. Letters arriving after that deadline will not be included in the evaluatee's file. (The deadline for submission of files is established each fall in a document that is distributed to all faculty members.) Head officers are reminded that, if the evaluatee has chosen confidential letters, the head officer must provide the evaluatee with a list of those individuals who submitted letters and a summary of the substance of the letters.
3. Any University of Puget Sound faculty member may submit letters directly to the Provost's Office as long as those letters are received by the date of the deadline for departmental submission of a completed file to the Provost's Office. Letters arriving after that deadline will not be included in the evaluatee's file. Any letters other than those from Puget Sound faculty members that are sent to the Provost's Office will be forwarded to the head officer and will be handled according to the provisions in part 2 above.

* [Note: As defined for purposes of this interpretation, a letter of evaluation is a signed document (PSC, April 2003; updated May 2015). This interpretation includes electronic signatures.]

CLASS VISITS

Interpretation: *Faculty Code* Chapter III, Section 4a.1.b: Class Visitation (PSC Minutes March 22, 1993):

Although "an ongoing process of class visitation" allows flexible implementation, an evaluation without a reasonable number of class visitations by members of the evaluatee's department, school, or program is in violation of the *Code*.

Clarification of adequate classroom visits. PSC affirms that adequate visitation requires at least two visits by each of two faculty members and recommends at least four separate class sessions be visited across more than one semester. The PSC also notes that the head officer is charged with evaluating the number and type of class visitations and determining the degree to which this pattern provides the basis for 'adequate consideration.' In turn, the Faculty Advancement Committee judges whether or not this pattern is indeed adequate (Chapter III, Section 4 c [4]). Thus, although two class visits made by two faculty members from a given department or program may constitute a *minimum* number of required visits, this pattern might not necessarily amount to *adequate* consideration. The final determination of adequacy rests with the head officer and the Faculty Advancement Committee." The PSC affirms that it is the evaluatee's responsibility to ensure that adequate opportunities for evaluators to visit are available, but not to ensure that the visits actually occur.

Avoiding inadequate class visitation. Obviously, we want to avoid a situation in which the Faculty Advancement Committee concludes that the *Code* has been violated because there has not been a reasonable number of class visits. Given the nature of the evaluation process, the problem of insufficient class visits is easier to prevent than to cure.

Begin class visits early. Head officers should encourage departmental colleagues to anticipate upcoming evaluations and begin class visits early. Doing some class visits a semester or two in advance, rather than waiting until the week before evaluation letters are due, not only would meet responsibilities for adequate visitation but also would go far to ensure that class visits serve their intended purpose—providing ongoing evaluation and feedback.

Evaluation committees. When an evaluation committee is formed, in accord with the Faculty Code, for a joint appointment, interdisciplinary appointment, or an evaluation in a very small department, we urge colleagues to be particularly vigilant about ensuring an on-going pattern of class visits in order to ensure a full basis from which to make an assessment.

List class visits in evaluation letters. Departmental colleagues are expected to include in their individual letters a statement listing the classes they visited and the days they visited them. Including this data enables the head officer and the Advancement Committee to assess how comprehensive

the visitation process has been. Head officers are encouraged to provide a summary chart of visited classes in the departmental evaluation letter.

Faculty member	Course(s) visited	Date(s)

Affirm adequate visitation in departmental summary letter. The head officer’s summary letter to the Advancement Committee should contain the department’s explicit affirmation that, in its judgment, its members as a group made enough visits to be able to give “adequate consideration” to the evaluatee as a teacher. In other words, the summary letter should explain how the department met the standard of a “reasonable number” of class visits, as required by the *Code*.

THE DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The instructions in this section should be followed for all non-streamlined 3- or 5-year evaluations, and all tenure and promotion evaluations. If you have any questions, please consult the Professional Standards Committee, the Faculty Advancement Committee, or the Provost.

General instructions for the head officer. As stated in the *Faculty Code*, the responsibility for building a file and documenting a case for tenure or promotion rests upon the individual being evaluated and the department or school. The head officer will need to do some background work in the summer and be prepared to move quickly in the fall. The process is a long one and, as a result, the due dates are early. This means that faculty members being evaluated for tenure or promotion will need to get their material to the department **by the dates in the schedule provided in this document** so that the department can hold its deliberations and meet the deadlines. The head officer should read carefully Chapter III of the *Faculty Code*. Of particular importance are Sections 3, 4 and 5, and interpretations regarding “working days” and regarding Chapters III and IV of the *Code* contained in the appendix to the *Code*. **The head officer should also be aware of any special provisions for the evaluation process that were specified in the candidate’s appointment letter;** please contact the provost if there are questions.

Evaluation of a head officer. When the head officer is the subject of the evaluation, the other tenure-line faculty of that unit will select some person to perform the functions that the head officer performs (Chapter III, Section 4a(3)(b) of the *Faculty Code*). Such person may be a member of that unit or may, in the case of a small department, be a faculty member of a related department.

Evaluation of a joint appointment or interdisciplinary appointment. When a faculty member being evaluated is jointly appointed in more than one department, or has significant teaching responsibility in an interdisciplinary program, there may be more than one evaluation committee (Chapter III, Section 4a(3)(c) of the *Faculty Code*).

When a faculty member is appointed fully in an interdisciplinary position, composition of an evaluation committee and selection of the person who will function as head officer will be determined by the provost in consultation with the evaluatee (*Faculty Code*, Chapter III, Section 4a(3)(d)).

Variations in evaluation procedures should follow those specified in the appointment letter. These could include the following:

- (1) Specification of the Departmental Evaluation Guidelines to be followed (the “home” department), in addition to any addenda, including a time frame for development of any addenda and submission to the PSC for approval.
- (2) Specific information about the evaluation committee, stating how many faculty from each program or department will be represented on each committee, as well as the time frame for designating specific faculty members to fill those committee slots for

each evaluation. (3) The division of teaching responsibilities between the home department and any other programs and departments. (4) Any specific requirements for university and/or department and/or program service.

Other variations in procedures. Under the *Faculty Code*, questions that may arise about procedure may be addressed through mutual agreement: "Other variations in procedure are permitted provided they are mutually agreed to by the evaluatee, head officer, the Provost, and the Advancement Committee. At any time during the evaluation, these same parties may resolve questions about the departmental review process by mutual agreement in writing" (Chapter III, Section 4a(3)(e)). Faculty participating in the evaluation of departmental colleagues should discuss with the head officer the specific procedures to be followed in each case.

Fairness and adequate consideration. As indicated in the *Faculty Code*, Chapter III, Section 4, "The evaluation process is designed to provide a substantial body of credible evidence in writing as the basis for a fair and impartial review." Moreover, "the evaluation process should be fair and ensure that adequate consideration is given the faculty member involved. Fairness and adequate consideration shall be achieved consistent with the criteria and procedures outlined in Chapter III, Sections 2-4."

Assessing the evaluatee's contribution to the department and the university. The department should not assume the uncritical role of advocate for its members, but should assess impartially the individual's performance, capabilities, and potential, with a serious concern for the strength of the department and university. It should respond to the question of whether or not this person will contribute in a significant way to the growth of the department in future years, so that it becomes, or remains, an outstanding part of a university offering the best instruction and finest student/faculty relations.

Informing letter-writers about open and closed files. As the result of an amendment of the *Faculty Code* passed on April 12, 2005, which was approved by the Board of Trustees on May 13, 2005, all faculty members have the option of an open or closed evaluation file, including candidates for tenure. Every person writing an evaluation letter has a right to know whether a file is open or closed. The Provost, the department chair, school or program director, or the candidate should be the only persons to inform others of the file status, and that information should be released only when needed for the specific purpose of writing an evaluation letter. Thus, head officers should inform those department, school, or program colleagues who are writing evaluation letters about the status of the file for each faculty member being evaluated; the head officer should also inform letter writers outside the university of the file's open or closed status at the point of solicitation of any outside evaluation letters. It is up to each individual faculty member whether they choose to share their letter with an evaluatee in an open or a closed file. Note that, as letters sent directly to the Provost's Office are summarized by the Advancement Committee and contributors named, if only one such letter is sent then the writer's comments might not be effectively confidential.

Evidence used by departmental colleagues. The *Faculty Code* indicates in Chapter III, Section 4a (1) (b) that colleagues should be familiar with:

(1) the evaluatee's professional objectives and philosophy, both as outlined in the evaluatee's statement and as demonstrated in practice; (2) the evaluatee's teaching performance/effectiveness, including the organization and construction of courses and the exhibition of pedagogical skill, as assessed through examination of course materials, an ongoing process of class visitation, and the careful review of student evaluations; (3) the evaluatee's record of professional growth, as assessed through examination of evidence in the evaluation file and ongoing attendance to the evaluatee's scholarly and creative activity; (4) the evaluatee's contributions through university service, as documented in the evaluatee's file; (5) the evaluatee's service as an advisor; (6) the evaluatee's involvement in community service related to professional interests and expertise.

In 2017-18, the PSC performed a review of recent scholarship on the problem of racial and gender bias in forms used for Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET). On April 25, 2018, the Faculty approved a PSC motion: "that the Faculty Senate create an ad committee for the purposes of 1) mitigating the problem of bias in student evaluations, and 2) recommending a long-term solution or change to our current system." **Because of concern supported by national research studies, that evaluation forms invite bias and because evaluation forms by themselves may not accurately measure effective teaching, head officers of faculty reviews, department colleagues, and the Faculty Advancement Committee should use them with awareness of potential limitations and in the context of multiple forms of evidence of teaching effectiveness.**

The *Faculty Code* requires that department colleagues engage in a "careful review of student evaluations" (Chapter 3, Section 4, a.1.b). Given the aforementioned national research regarding bias in evaluation forms, the PSC recommends (a) that such "careful review of student evaluations" should take into account their unreliability as an indicator of teaching effectiveness and their potential for bias and (b) that students evaluations should be assessed in close relationship to the faculty member's interpretation of student feedback in their statement as well as departmental colleagues' interpretations of student feedback contained in their individual and departmental recommendations.

Departmental deliberative process. The deliberative process called for in the *Faculty Code* Chapter III, Section 4a(2) can take a number of different forms. The record of departmental deliberation forwarded to the Faculty Advancement Committee must demonstrate that a clear evaluation, based upon and governed by the department, school, or program's stated criteria, has been conducted. There is no reference in the *Faculty Code* to deliberations being confidential but individual departments may, by way of departmental evaluation guidelines, declare the deliberative process confidential.

Departmental recommendation. Please forward to the Provost's Office a department, school, or program recommendation for each member of your faculty under consideration. A recommendation for each faculty member should be clear and unambiguous. It should be specific and should discuss, in the context of the standards, goals, and future needs of the department or school and the university, the strengths and weaknesses of each individual evaluatee in relation to university and departmental

evaluation criteria. In evaluations for tenure, the *Code* requires affirmative evidence of excellence in teaching and in professional growth, a record of service, and demonstrated need for the position. In evaluations for promotion to full professor, the *Code* requires evidence of distinguished service in addition to sustained growth in the areas of teaching, professional growth, advising, university service, and community service related to professional interests and expertise.

Materials to be prepared by the department include:

1. accurately dated and signed colleague letters addressing such items as:
 - a. evaluatee's file and supporting evidence
 - b. classroom observations over a period of time
 - c. interview with evaluatee if conducted
2. a written statement of criteria, standards, and needs used in the departmental evaluation process as called for in Chapter III, Section 3b of the *Code*;
3. a summary of the departmental deliberative process and a list of those participating in the process.
4. a department recommendation based on developed criteria and department and university needs and standards, and a list of those individuals whose recommendations served as bases for the departmental recommendation;
5. a minority recommendation by the head officer if he or she voted in the minority when the department, school, or program reached its recommendation;
6. a summary of the substance of the letters (including any outside letters), if the file is a closed file.

Contents of the file as sent to the Provost's Office. Accompanying each recommendation should be the candidate's file. A description of the items to be included in the evaluatee's file by the candidate can be found in the section entitled "Information for Faculty Who Are Being Evaluated" (See the Table of Contents).

Access to the evaluation file. All materials in the evaluatee's file shall be open to the Faculty Advancement Committee, the Provost, the President, and the Board of Trustees. In all reviews, including tenure reviews, the file shall also be open by choice to the faculty member involved. This access is governed by stipulations in the *Faculty Code* Chapter III, Section 8.

DEADLINES

The deadlines for forwarding departmental recommendations to the Provost's Office are included in this document. Please see [page XX](#).

INFORMATION FOR FACULTY WHO ARE BEING EVALUATED

This section provides information for those who are scheduled for **tenure, promotion, and/or non-streamlined 3-year or 5-year** evaluations. (The special provisions for first- and second-year evaluations, third-year associate professors, instructors' evaluations, and streamlined evaluations for professors are described elsewhere in this document.)

The PSC supports and encourages but does not require the use of electronic submission of faculty evaluation files. In order to set up an evaluation site for faculty members wishing to use electronic submission, you must make the decision concerning whether you will create a hard copy file or submit electronically and inform the Provost's Office by July 1st.

I. PREPARATION OF YOUR EVALUATION FILE

Begin by reading the documents that govern evaluations. Start with Chapter III of the *Faculty Code*, which describes the evaluation process and relevant interpretations in the *Code* appendix. If you are up for tenure and/or promotion, also read Chapter IV. Next, read the statement of "University Evaluation Standards," which is printed in this booklet (and while you are at it, read the other sections of this booklet). Finally, read your department's statement of criteria and standards for evaluation. Effective 2017-18, with implementation of a regular review cycle for departmental evaluation statements, faculty members undergoing evaluation may choose to use either the newly approved departmental evaluation standards or the most recent prior version of their department's evaluation standards, so long as the most recent prior version was in effect on the date that the faculty member's tenure-line or ongoing clinical-line appointment began. If you have any questions regarding the evaluation process, please consult with the head officer of your department, school or program, the Professional Standards Committee, the Faculty Advancement Committee, or the Provost.²

Chapter III, Section 4a of the *Faculty Code* places responsibility for building a file and documenting a case for tenure or promotion upon the individual being evaluated and upon the department, school, or program. You and your head officer should pay particular attention to this section of the *Code*.

If it is early in your career at the University of Puget Sound, bear in mind the advice given in the following excerpt from the *Code* interpretation of Chapter III, Sections 2-4: "The first annual evaluations and the first three year evaluation are important events. These evaluations constitute the only official feedback from the department, school or program and from the university that the evaluatee will get prior to being considered for tenure. For the three year evaluation, great care should be taken on the part of the evaluatee in preparing the documents for submission to the department, school, or program and it is incumbent upon the evaluatee to initiate a dialogue with the head officer and/or colleagues upon receipt of the Faculty Advancement Committee's letter in order to maximize the constructiveness of the evaluation process."

As your part of the evaluation process, you should submit your file to your head officer (department chair, program director, or school director or provost) by the date specified earlier in this document.

2 For 2020-21 digital evaluation files, the currently approved departmental guidelines will be loaded for evaluatees when your Google evaluation sites are created; if you wish to use a prior set of guidelines, **you can upload them to your evaluation file from <https://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/dept-evaluation-standards/>.**

Your file should include the following items:

1. a statement of your professional objectives, both short-term and long-term, including a self-analysis of your teaching, scholarship, and service;

To minimize the burden on the evaluatee and others involved in the review process, the PSC recommends for all reviews except tenure that a statement not exceed 15 single-spaced pages. The PSC affirms that the length of a statement written for a tenure review ought to be left to the judgment of the evaluatee.

2. your curriculum vita (candidates for full professor should include in the curriculum vita a complete summary of career service at Puget Sound);
3. copies of course syllabi, examinations, or other pertinent material on all courses evaluated by students;
4. information about professional growth, including copies of relevant prepared materials (note that “in progress” work that is not included in the file, or not evaluated by colleagues, may signal promise but is challenging for the FAC to evaluate as demonstrable evidence of professional growth);
5. information concerning successful advising;
6. information concerning university service;
7. information concerning community service;
8. other material you believe to be useful (for example, outside letters from individuals who are not faculty members at the University of Puget Sound); and
9. student evaluations of all courses taught during the **most recent two semesters of teaching in promotion, 3-year, or 5-year evaluation cases**, and during the **most recent four semesters of teaching in tenure cases** (*Faculty Code* Chapter 3, Section 4, 1.a). Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms should normally be completed no earlier than the tenth week of class.
 - a. The PSC wants to remind colleagues that third-year SETs satisfy the “most recent four semesters” requirement in cases where a colleague did not obtain SETs during years 4 and 5 because of a junior sabbatical (or because of medical leave or other leaves)
 - b. The PSC wants to remind department chairs and junior colleagues that collecting at least one semester of SETs during year three is advisable.
 - c. SETs collected during a junior colleague’s second year will not normally satisfy the “most recent four semesters” requirement for tenure files.

Faculty teaching team-taught courses (at either the undergraduate or graduate levels) may use any one of the options below for student evaluations:

- a. the current, standard Instructor and Course Evaluation Form;
- b. the current, standard Instructor and Course Evaluation Form along with a one page addendum with additional questions regarding the team-taught aspects of the course (see p. 30, Appendix A, for the team teaching addendum form);
- c. the new Team-Teaching Evaluation Form, based on the standard evaluation form, which focuses on the team-taught nature of the course rather than evaluation of an individual faculty member (see p. 31, Appendix B, for the new evaluation form).

Graduate faculty should check with their program chairs to determine which option and form to use.

Regardless of the form used, the time allowed for student evaluations will still be the standard evaluation time (20 minutes). Instructors who teach short segments of a team-teaching course (e.g., a two-week block) rather than being part of a course for the entire term are encouraged to use options A or B above. In a team-taught course in which a faculty member only teaches a small segment of the course, evaluation forms can be administered at the conclusion of the faculty member's participation in the course.

Any of the team-teaching evaluation options above can be used during a faculty member's formal evaluation.

Faculty readers of the new Team-Teaching Evaluation Form (option C) should bear in mind that this form seeks to elicit student feedback on collaborative pedagogy that is distinct from a course designed and taught by one individual instructor.

The Advancement Committee requests that **12-point font** and single-sided pages (if hard copy) be used for personal statements, vitae, and letters. Single-sided materials allow for a more sustainable process as the file moves forward through committee, president, and trustee review. **If you are submitting your file electronically you should upload and organize materials for courses taught during the evaluation period to your Google Drive Evaluation site.**

II. DEPARTMENT EVALUATION PROCESS

Your departmental colleagues will prepare their evaluation letters based on the material in your file and on other evidence such as class visitations. They will make a recommendation. When the department, school, or program has completed its evaluation, your entire file will be sent to the Provost's Office for the Faculty Advancement Committee's consideration.

III. REVIEWING AND CHALLENGING THE DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION

Reviewing your file. After your file has been forwarded to the Provost's Office by your head officer and the Provost's Office has notified you that the file is complete and ready for review, you have five working days to inventory the contents of the file and to review the non-confidential materials in it (*Faculty Code*, Chapter III, Section 4.b.).

Challenging the departmental evaluation: If after reviewing your file in the Provost's Office, you believe that you have been inadequately or unfairly evaluated by your department, school, or program, you have the right to challenge the evaluation informally and/or formally. An informal challenge must be initiated within five working days of your reviewing the file.

A formal challenge, which involves an appeal to a hearing board, must be initiated within ten working days of your reviewing the file. Formal appeals must allege that the Faculty Code has been violated, while informal appeals need not do so. For more information about informal and formal challenges, consult Chapter III, Section 4.b of the *Faculty Code*.

FAC's evaluation schedule: The Faculty Advancement Committee will attempt to complete its evaluations of tenure candidates in time for the President to take his tenure recommendations to the Board of Trustees at their annual February meeting. Promotion recommendations have, in recent years, been considered at the Board's May meeting. The FAC's general practice is to send evaluation letters by group (e.g., all third-year assistant professor letters typically are sent out when all of those evaluations are completed).

Formal appeals: If formal hearing board finds no violation of the *Faculty Code*, the evaluation file moves to the next stage, and the evaluatee may appeal if the next stage is the Faculty Advancement Committee but not if the next stage is review by the President; however, if a formal hearing board finds a violation and recommends that the file be sent back whence it came, then the evaluatee, the evaluators, and the process of evaluation must follow the *Code*, which entails that the evaluatee may informally or formally challenge as the evaluation proceeds anew according to the *Code* (*Faculty Code*, Chapter 3, Section 6).

Further review of the file: Once the period of informal or formal challenge to a departmental decision has passed, an evaluatee can request access to the file. The file is also available for review after the FAC has completed its work. (*Faculty Code*, Chapter III, Section 8.)

CHECKLIST FOR HEAD OFFICERS

The Faculty Advancement Committee suggests that steps listed below are particularly important for head officers in promoting conformity with *Faculty Code* provisions governing the evaluation process. This list is selective and is not a substitute for or a summary of the *Code*. The Faculty Advancement Committee requests that **12-point font** and single-sided pages be used for personal statements, vita, and all letters. **Single-sided materials allow for a more sustainable process as the file moves forward through committee, president, and trustee review.**

1. Ideally, a year before the expected evaluation date, the department should consider an appropriate distribution of visits by its members that represents the full range of the evaluatee's courses, including any courses taught outside the department. Even if the visiting colleague does not have expertise in the area being taught, faculty can assess good teaching.

- The head officer re-reads the *Faculty Code* Chapters I, III, and IV, and interpretations in the *Code* appendix, and reviews relevant portions of those chapters with the department.

- The head officer notifies departmental colleagues, and any outside letter writers upon receipt of an unsolicited letter, as to whether the evaluation file is open or closed. If the outside letter writer does not wish their original letter to be read by an evaluatee in an open file, the letter may be altered or withdrawn. When soliciting outside letters, the head officer notifies outside letter writers in advance of the status of the file as open or closed.
- The head officer also encourages colleagues to make class visits, preferably well in advance of the evaluation deliberation.
- The head officer should remind colleagues that, effective 2017-18 with implementation of a regular review cycle for departmental evaluation statements, faculty members undergoing evaluation will choose to use either the newly approved departmental evaluation standards or the most recent prior version of their department's evaluation standards, so long as the most recent prior version was in effect on the date that the faculty member's tenure-line or ongoing clinical-line appointment began.
- The head officer should make clear to colleagues that any delayed review should be treated procedurally in the same manner as a regularly scheduled review and the file shall be evaluated without prejudice as if the work were done in the normal period of service.

2. The head officer gathers information in writing about the faculty member being evaluated, **checking for completeness in the materials supplied by the faculty member and in the required student evaluations.** In consultation with the evaluatee, the head officer may also solicit appropriate letters from outside the department or university. The information on class visitation and outside letters contained in the *Code* interpretations and PSC statements in this document should guide the evaluation process. **In particular, the head officer should instruct departmental colleagues to include in their individual letters a statement detailing the classes they visited and the days they visited them.**

3. The head officer ensures that the department reaches a recommendation through a deliberative process consistent with the statement of departmental criteria and procedures approved by the PSC.

4. The head officer should remember that the *Faculty Code* asks that “the needs of the department, school or program and the university” be addressed in tenure evaluations and that “advising students” be addressed in promotion evaluations.

5. If the head officer disagrees with the departmental recommendation (as indicated by voting in the minority when the department reaches its recommendation), the head officer shall submit a minority recommendation to the Provost.

6. The head officer forwards to the Provost in writing (along with all hard copy file materials submitted by the faculty member):

- a. the statement of criteria and procedures used in the deliberative process;
- b. a list of individuals who participated in the departmental deliberative process and a specific summary chart of classes visited;
- c. a summary of the department's deliberations and the departmental

recommendation; this summary should include an explicit affirmation by the department that, in its judgment, its members as a group made enough class visits to be able to give “adequate consideration” to the evaluatee as a teacher;

d. the names of individuals who submitted letters to the head officer and hard copies of the submitted letters, printed single-sided;

e. a summary of the substance of the letters (including any outside letters), if the file is closed; this summary should be distinct from the summary of departmental deliberations; and

f. the head officer’s minority recommendation, if there is one.

7. The head officer provides the faculty member who is being evaluated:

a. a list of individuals participating in the department’s deliberations;

b. a summary of the department’s deliberations, the departmental recommendation, and notification of a minority report by the head officer, if applicable;

c. the names of individuals who submitted letters to the head officer;

d. a summary of the substance of the letters (including any outside letters), if the file is closed; this summary should be distinct from the summary of departmental deliberations.

8. Should the evaluatee pursue an informal and/or formal challenge to the department, school or program’s evaluation, the head officer will participate in the process as described in Chapter III, Section 4b. Please read this section carefully. In the case of an informal challenge, the head officer shall forward to the Faculty Advancement Committee, for inclusion in the evaluatee’s file, a copy of the evaluatee’s statement of concerns and a copy of the head officer’s own written statement on the results of the informal resolution process. No informal resolution between the head officer and the evaluatee may remove materials from the file or set aside the provisions of the *Faculty Code*.

9. 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** (*Faculty Code*, Chapter III, Section 4d.1).

Evaluation Checklist for Head Officers

<i>Prior to the Evaluation Year</i>	
At least one year prior (two years for tenure) to the evaluation year, with particular attention to pre-tenure sabbatical semesters	Check-in with the evaluatee to Ensure the requisite semesters of Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms will be administered.
One year prior to evaluation date	Consider an appropriate distribution of visits by department members that represents the full range of the evaluatee’s courses, including any courses taught outside the department. Even if the visiting colleague does not have expertise in the area being taught, faculty can assess good teaching.
One year prior to evaluation date	Re-read Chapters I, III, and IV of the <i>Faculty Code</i> , and interpretations in the <i>Code</i> appendix, and review relevant portions of those chapters with the department.
One year, and one semester prior to evaluation date	Encourage, and remind, colleagues to make class visits, preferably well in advance of the evaluation deliberation.
	In consultation with the evaluatee, the head officer may also solicit appropriate letters from outside the department or university. When soliciting outside letters, the head officer notifies outside letter writers in advance of the status of the file as open or closed.
<i>Early in the Evaluation Year</i>	
Prior to file due date to department	Notify departmental colleagues, and any outside letter writers upon receipt of an unsolicited letter, as to whether the evaluation file is open or closed. If the outside letter writer does not wish their original letter to be read by an evaluatee in an open file, the letter may be altered or withdrawn.
When the file becomes available to the department	Check for completeness in the materials supplied by the faculty member and in the required student evaluations.
As department begins review of the file	Notify colleagues of what departmental guidelines the evaluatee has selected for the review. (Remind colleagues that faculty members undergoing evaluation will choose to use either the newly approved departmental evaluation standards or the most recent prior version of their department’s evaluation standards, so long as the most recent prior version was in effect on the date that the faculty member’s tenure-line or ongoing clinical-line appointment began.)
As department begins review of the file	Make clear to colleagues that any delayed review (e.g., a family or medical leave) should be treated procedurally in the same manner as a regularly scheduled review and the file shall be evaluated without prejudice as if the work were done in the normal period of service.
Prior to the deliberative meeting	Instruct departmental colleagues to (a) include in their individual letters a statement detailing the classes they visited and the days they visited them and (b) a recommendation (reappointment, tenure, promotion, advancement).
Schedule departmental deliberative meeting	Do not schedule before due date for any outside letters; if outside letters are received by the due date, make them available to colleagues participating in the review.

Faculty Evaluation Criteria & Procedures

Departmental deliberative meeting	Ensure that the department reaches a recommendation through a deliberative process consistent with the statement of departmental criteria and procedures approved by the PSC.
<i>After the Deliberative Meeting</i>	
Forward with the summary of deliberations letter:	a. the statement of criteria and procedures used in the deliberative process;
	b. a list of individuals who participated in the departmental deliberative process and a specific summary chart of classes visited;
	c. a summary of the department's deliberations and the departmental recommendation; this summary should include an explicit affirmation by the department that, in its judgment, its members as a group made enough class visits to be able to give "adequate consideration" to the evaluatee as a teacher;
	d. the names of individuals who submitted letters to the head officer and hard copies of the submitted letters, printed single-sided;
	e. a summary of the substance of the letters (including any outside letters), if the file is closed; this summary should be distinct from the summary of departmental deliberations; and
	f. the head officer's minority recommendation, if there is one.
Provide the faculty member being evaluated:	a. a list of individuals participating in the department's deliberations;
	b. a summary of the department's deliberations, the departmental recommendation, and notification of a minority report by the head officer, if applicable;
	c. the names of individuals who submitted letters to the head officer;
	d. a summary of the substance of the letters (including any outside letters), if the file is closed; this summary should be distinct from the summary of departmental deliberations.
Should the evaluatee pursue an informal and/or formal challenge to the department, school or program's evaluation . . .	Participate in the process as described in Chapter III, Section 4b. Please read this section carefully. In the case of an informal challenge, the head officer shall forward to the Faculty Advancement Committee, for inclusion in the evaluatee's file, a copy of the evaluatee's statement of concerns and a copy of the head officer's own written statement on the results of the informal resolution process. No informal resolution between the head officer and the evaluatee may remove materials from the file or set aside the provisions of the <i>Faculty Code</i> .
<i>After the university-level evaluation is completed</i>	
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	Meet with the evaluatee to discuss the results of the evaluation. (<i>Faculty Code</i> , Chapter III, Section 4d(1))

EVALUATIONS IN THE FIRST AND SECOND YEARS

First- and second-year faculty members will be evaluated only within the department by means of a written progress report by the head officer that should be forwarded to the individual, the Faculty Advancement Committee and the Provost by **June 30, 2021**.

The following passages are excerpted from the interpretation of the *Faculty Code*, Chapter III, Sections 2-4, which is published in the appendix to the *Code*.

“Each Department, School, or Program should have on file with the Provost a written statement of the criteria, standards, and needs of the Department which are used in the deliberation. This statement includes criteria for faculty teaching, professional growth, and service. This document is written with respect to the university's standards and needs. Evaluatees are encouraged to obtain this document early in their first year from their Department, School, or Program and to discuss its meaning with the head officer.”

“The annual evaluations during the first two years of a non-tenured appointment are made by the head officer of the Department, School, or Program. A copy of the report will be sent to the individual evaluated, the Provost, and the Faculty Advancement Committee. This document is for informational purposes and no further action is required; however, the Professional Standards Committee urges evaluatees to initiate interaction with the head officer and/or colleagues for constructive utilization of this evaluation process.”

“The first annual evaluations and the first three-year evaluation are important events. These evaluations constitute the only official feedback from the Department, School or Program and from the university that the evaluatee will get prior to being considered for tenure.”

**THE PROCESS ABOVE MAY ALSO BE USED FOR THREE-YEAR
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR REVIEWS (SEE PAGE 3). “HEAD OFFICER ONLY” ASSOCIATE
PROFESSOR REVIEWS DO NOT REQUIRE PREPARATION OF AN EVALUATION FILE.**

EVALUATION OF THREE-YEAR VISITING FACULTY

For those visiting faculty members whose appointments are renewable and continue beyond the second year, evaluations normally occur at the end of the first and second year and are performed by the head officer of the department, school, or program. In each year, a copy of the report is sent to the individual evaluated and to the Provost. At the end of the first year, this document is for informational purposes and no further action is required; however, the Professional Standards Committee urges evaluatees to initiate interaction with the head officer and/or colleagues for constructive utilization of this evaluation process. At the end of the second year, this evaluation may serve as a basis for renewal of contract, when applicable.

Approved by the PSC, October 22, 2018: If the appointment is renewed beyond the second year, an evaluation will be conducted by the head officer at the end of year 3 and every three years thereafter, with a copy of the report sent to the individual and to the Provost. Pending recommendations from the Faculty Senate Committee on Contingent Faculty, this provision for persons who will have served six years or more will take effect in 2020-21. At the time of the sixth-year review, a full departmental review will be completed. Instructor and Course evaluation forms from the two semesters preceding the review years will be included in the evaluation file.

In all reviews of visiting faculty members, the evaluation criteria and procedures of the department or program will serve as the basis for review.

The *Faculty Code* Chapter II, Section 5 authorizes the university to determine not to reappoint faculty without tenure for any reason not forbidden by the *Code*.

EVALUATIONS OF ONGOING UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTORS

Interpretation of *Faculty Code* Chapter III, Section 3 and 4 and Chapter I, Part B, Section 2a. Evaluation of Instructors (Report to Faculty Senate 5 May 1986):

The evaluation procedure to be followed (for Instructors) is roughly the procedure outlined in the *Faculty Code*, Chapter III. An informal evaluation is to be done within the department in each of the first two years, with a summary report sent to the Provost for information. In the third year, and every third year thereafter, a formal evaluation, as outlined in the *Code*, will be held. The evaluation of Instructors will be based upon the quality of their performance in the following areas, listed in order of importance:

1. Teaching

2. Professional Development: Instructors are expected to remain current in the relevant parts of the discipline and to keep abreast of those developments in the discipline which bear upon their teaching duties. They are not required to engage in scholarly research and writing; however, the department may encourage them to do those things which will add to their repertoire of professional awareness and abilities.

3. Advising Students

4. Participation in Departmental Service

Finally, the standards to be employed in assessing professional performance will be those used for all other evaluations in the department, except as they pertain to scholarly work and university service.

Note: In 2001-2002, the faculty implemented a revised salary scale for Instructors that replaced the existing merit pay system and allows Instructors who are performing well to advance in salary over their careers. For advancement to pay levels 13 and beyond, Instructors must maintain satisfactory performance as recommended to the Provost by their department and the Faculty Advancement Committee through the normal three-year evaluation process.

**ALTERNATIVE EVALUATION PROCESS
(ALSO KNOWN AS “STREAMLINED” EVALUATIONS)**

As outlined in the *Faculty Code* Chapter III, Section 5, professors at any year of service in that rank may elect, with the concurrence of their head officer and the Provost, to have their review conducted by the head officer and the Provost as described below. Instructors who have served 17 years or more in that rank may establish an alternating schedule of full and alternative reviews in consultation with the head officer and the Provost under the procedures described in this section. All streamlined review files are considered “open” files.

1. The faculty member consults with the head officer about the review one year prior to the start of the semester in which the evaluation is scheduled and informs the head officer whether they prefer a streamlined or full review.
2. The head officer, as described in *Faculty Code* Chapter III, Section 5, determines whether a full review or a “streamlined” review is warranted and reports that decision to the Provost.
3. The evaluatee prepares a file and submits it to the department in accord with the schedule contained in this document. All colleagues have the option of reading the file in a streamlined review.
4. The head officer writes a letter of evaluation and forwards the file and the letter to the Provost in accord with the schedule contained in this document; the head officer also provides a copy of the letter to the evaluatee.
5. After their file has been forwarded to the Provost’s office by the head officer and the Provost’s office has notified the evaluatee that their file is complete, the evaluatee will have five days to review their file.

The streamlined review process is intended to lessen the impact of the review on departmental colleagues while preserving many of the review safeguards currently in place. Thus, the evaluatee's file is made available for colleagues and they "have the option of" reading it, but colleagues are not required or even expected to do so (*Faculty Code*, Chapter III, Section 5.c). External letters, colleague letters from inside or outside the department, and class visits are optional. Given that any additional letters (external or internal) will not be representative of the whole department or the processes of the full review, those letters can be sent on to the Provost and included in the head officer's letter only at the discretion of the head officer.

Eligibility for Distinguished Professorship. Both those who elect the alternative evaluation process and those who are evaluated through the full evaluation process will be eligible for consideration for recognition as Distinguished Professors.

SOME GUIDING PRINCIPLES

University Mission Statement and Educational Goals

The mission of the university is to develop in its students capacities for critical analysis, aesthetic appreciation, sound judgment, and apt expression that will sustain a lifetime of intellectual curiosity, active inquiry, and reasoned independence. A Puget Sound education, both academic and co-curricular, encourages a rich knowledge of self and others, an appreciation of commonality and difference, the full, open, and civil discussion of ideas, thoughtful moral discourse, and the integration of learning, preparing the university's graduates to meet the highest tests of democratic citizenship. Such an education seeks to liberate each person's fullest intellectual and human potential to assist in the unfolding of creative and useful lives.

A student completing the undergraduate curriculum will be able to

- a. think critically and creatively;
- b. communicate clearly and effectively, both orally and in writing;
- c. develop and apply knowledge both independently and collaboratively

and will have developed

- a. familiarity with diverse fields of knowledge and the ability to draw connections among them;
- b. solid grounding in the field of the student's choosing;
- c. understanding of self, others, and influence in the world; and
- d. an informed and thoughtful sense of justice and a commitment to ethical action

University Diversity Statement**WE ACKNOWLEDGE**

- the richness of commonalities and differences we share as a university community.
- the intrinsic worth of all who work and study here.
- that education is enhanced by investigation of and reflection upon multiple perspectives.

WE ASPIRE

- to create respect for and appreciation of all persons as a key characteristic of our campus community.
- to increase the diversity of all parts of our university community through commitment to diversity in our recruitment and retention efforts.
- to foster a spirit of openness to active engagement among all members of our campus community.

WE ACT

- to achieve an environment that welcomes and supports diversity.
- to ensure full educational opportunity for all who teach and learn here.

- to prepare effectively citizen-leaders for a pluralistic world.

At the request of the 2005-2006 University Diversity Committee, the Professional Standards Committee includes the following acknowledgment of faculty work related to diversity:

Embracing diversity enriches everyone's educational experience while the lack of understanding and respect for diversity can negatively impact students' learning and constrain our ability to prepare responsible and caring world citizens. Therefore, faculty members' contributions to building a diverse campus community are valued and recognized. These contributions can be related to teaching (e.g., teaching about diversity in the classroom, being sensitive to a diverse student body); professional growth (e.g., engaging in research and/or professional presentations related to diversity); and service (e.g., working on diversity initiatives on and off campus, assisting in the recruitment and retention of diverse students).

We acknowledge the fact that addressing diversity requires a commitment of time and effort. We know that while teaching with respect for diversity is valued across campus, it may look different in different disciplines. We further understand that teaching about diversity may be challenging. Students may, for example, resist attempts to include diverse and unfamiliar perspectives in a course. Despite these challenges, we affirm the centrality of diversity to the mission and goals of the University of Puget Sound.

Appendix B - PUGET SOUND Team-taught Course Evaluation Form

To the student: A team-taught course relies on the collaborative work of two or more instructors. Because team-taught courses are meant to be collaborative efforts, this form asks you to evaluate the course you have just taken using criteria related to the joint work of your instructors.

The evaluation you are about to write is an important document. The information provided will be used by the university in the evaluation of your instructors' teaching. It will also be used for improving course structure and teaching. Your evaluation does count. You are encouraged to respond thoughtfully, to take this evaluation seriously, and to provide written remarks. Your instructors will not see these evaluation forms until after they have turned in final grades. If you do not want the instructors to see your hand-written form, check this box [] and your responses will be typed before it is given to the instructors.

Course # _____ Semester _____ Year _____

Instructors' Names _____

Major _____ Minor (if applicable) _____

Status: _____ First Year _____ Sophomore _____ Junior _____ Senior _____ Graduate Student

1. Course Design, Collaboration, and Communication

a. There was evidence of a thoughtful team-teaching approach/design to the course.	1 2 3 4 5
b. Overall the course was well organized.	1 2 3 4 5
c. Collaboration between the instructors and/or joint teaching enhanced the course.	1 2 3 4 5
d. The instructors were well prepared for class sessions.	1 2 3 4 5
e. The instructors established clear expectations of students' responsibilities.	1 2 3 4 5

Please explain the choices you checked above with comments that help give context to your ratings.

2. Promotion of Students' Learning

a. The combined efforts of the instructors helped students master relevant concepts and skills.	1 2 3 4 5
b. The instructors were intellectually challenging.	1 2 3 4 5
c. The instructors encouraged students to take learning seriously and to think critically.	1 2 3 4 5
d. The instructors encouraged students' intellectual self-reliance and self-motivation.	1 2 3 4 5
e. Instructors presented material in a manner that facilitated student learning.	1 2 3 4 5

Appendix C - Faculty Google Drive Evaluation Site FAQ

Faculty Google Drive Evaluation Site FAQ

1. While I'm preparing my file, can I view the site as an EVALUATOR would see it?

The view you see of your files and folders will be the same view an evaluator sees. All files and folders put into your Google Drive Faculty Evaluation folder will be visible to evaluators.

2. How do I give access to my PAST/PRESENT Moodle/Canvas courses to my evaluators?

Evaluees are not expected to give full access to past courses in Moodle or Canvas, but any materials you want to include from past courses can be uploaded and organized into folders.

3. Until what time do I have to submit my file on the date it's due?

You have until 11:55 PM (PST) on the day the file is due to submit content. You will COMPLETELY LOSE access to your Google Drive Evaluation Site at this time.

IMPORTANT: Since you will lose access to your Google Drive Evaluation Site, you are responsible for retaining your own copies of the documents you place in the Evaluation Site for future reference.

4. Who do I contact with questions about my evaluation file?

For questions related to using the technology (how to add/edit files in Google Drive): contact Educational Technology (253.879.3259 or edtech@pugetsound.edu)

For questions related to the evaluation process and dates, please contact the Provost's Office.

5. Can my Administrative Assistant upload content for me?

If you requested that your administrative assistant be added to your Evaluation Site, they are able to add content for you. Contact the Provost's Office to give your administrative assistant permissions.

6. Do I have to upload my course evaluation forms to my electronic Google Drive evaluation site?

Previous year's course evaluations are scanned by administrative assistants and provided electronically. You may upload them or you may ask your administrative assistant to do so. For tenure candidates or others who need earlier course evaluations to be part of the file, you may ask your administrative assistant to scan those paper copies on file in the department.

*Please double-check that the complete evaluations have properly uploaded into the site—in some instances, only the first page has loaded or the evaluations contain completely blank pages.

7. Can I use my personal account instead of my Puget Sound account to access my evaluation site?

No. You must use your Puget Sound Google account.

8. How do I login and access my Google Drive Evaluation folder?


<https://www.pugetsound.edu/about/offices-services/technology-services/educational-technology/g-suite-2/how-do-i-login/>

9. How should I structure my G Suite Evaluation Site?

The G Suite Evaluation Site has been pre-structured according to the categories in the “Faculty Evaluation Criteria & Procedures” User Guide, page 19.

10. Do I need to share my Google Drive Evaluation folder with my evaluators?

No. Evaluatees should not share their folder with anyone to maintain confidentiality. The Provost’s Office manages access and will permit your evaluators to gain access to your folder after your due date.



Logging in and Getting Started

1. Please see “How do I login to Puget Sound G Suite?” for directions on how to login to your account with your Puget Sound credentials.


2. Once I’ve followed step 1 to access my account, how do I access my Google Drive evaluation folder?

Open a browser and navigate to drive.google.com. Login with your Puget Sound email address and password. On the left-side of the screen, click on “Shared With Me:”


You will see a folder entitled “My Name’s Evaluation Site.”

3. What kind of files can I upload to my Google Drive Evaluation folder?

Any file type can be stored in Drive. The most common include: Microsoft files (.doc, .docx, .ppt, xls, etc.), audio files .mp3, wav, mpeg, etc.), and image files (.jpeg, png, gif, svg, etc).



4. How do I upload files and folders to my Google Drive Evaluation Site?

Click  New > File upload or Folder upload, and then choose the file or folder you want to upload on your computer. Click **open**.



If you’re using the latest version of Chrome or Firefox®, you can simply drag files directly from your computer to the [Drive](https://drive.google.com) page on your browser.

When you see Upload complete, your files have uploaded successfully and can be accessed in any browser or device that has Drive installed.

5. How do I create new folders to organize my files?


Click New > Folder. This creates an empty folder within your Google Drive Evaluation Folder. Double-click on the new folder to access it, and repeat step 3 to upload files into it.

6. How do I move files to a new folder in my Evaluation Google Drive folder?


1. Select the file.
2. Click More  Move to .
3. Select the folder and click Move or Move here.

You can also drag files and folders to a folder in My Drive on the left.

7. How do I delete files I no longer want?

Select the files or folders you want to remove and click Remove .

8. How do I create a new document within Google Drive?

1. On your computer, open a Google [Docs](#), [Sheets](#), [Slides](#), or [Forms](#) home screen.
2. Click Create .

9. How do I rename a file?

1. Click the name at the top of the file.
2. Type a new name.
3. Press Enter.

10. Where can I get support?

The Google Learning Center has extensive support and step by step guides on how to use Google Drive, and other Google Apps. You can also schedule time with Educational Technology for help on getting started by emailing edtech@pugetsound.edu