

# STATEMENT OF CRITERIA, STANDARDS, AND PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

## Department of English Fall 2012

### I. PURPOSE

This document is designed to guide faculty in the English Department in the evaluation process and to serve both the evaluatee and those undertaking the evaluation of colleagues. It also fulfills the requirement of the *Faculty Code* (as approved in May 2009; hereafter *Code*) of the University of Puget Sound that "Departments shall state in writing the criteria, standards and needs of the department used in the deliberative process in relation to the University's standards and needs" (Chapter III, Sec 3, b; p. 10). This document should be viewed as a complement to the criteria and procedures for tenure and promotion that are detailed in the *Code* (Chapter III). Additionally, the evaluatee should carefully review the "Faculty Evaluation Criteria & Procedures" (unofficially known as the "buff document") memoranda distributed each year by the Professional Standards Committee in consultation with the Faculty Advancement Committee.

The evaluation process serves as the formal vehicle to assess each faculty member's performance. The *Code* identifies several areas of assessment.

For tenure, faculty are evaluated in the following categories:

1. teaching
2. professional growth
3. university service
4. the needs of the department.

To be granted tenure, the evaluatee must demonstrate excellence in the areas of teaching and professional growth and also establish a record of service (see *Code*, Chapter III, Sec 3, d; p. 11).

For promotion, faculty are evaluated in the following categories:

1. teaching
2. professional growth
3. advising students
4. university service
5. community service related to professional interests and expertise.

To be promoted, the evaluatee must demonstrate the "highest standards" in all of the above categories, while advancement to full professor requires "distinguished service in addition to sustained growth in the above-mentioned areas" (see *Code*, Chapter III, Sec 3, e; p. 11).

Instructors are employed primarily as teachers and, according to the *Code*, are evaluated in the following categories:

1. teaching
2. professional development (currency in the field as it relates to teaching duties is required; scholarly research and writing is encouraged but not required)
3. advising students
4. participation in departmental service

In all cases, the *Code* states that “the responsibility for demonstrating he or she meets the standards for tenure or promotion rests with the evaluatee” (Chapter III, Sec 3, d; p. 11)

## **II. EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

Our evaluation system is intended to acknowledge and applaud colleagues’ innovations in teaching and scholarly development, to develop their strengths, and to provide them constructive criticism so that the interests of students, the department, the university, as well as of the individual faculty member are best served. Evaluation of faculty members provides the department with an opportunity to assess individual performance.

### **A. Who is Evaluated and by Whom?**

All faculty are evaluated at times specified in the *Code* (Chapter III, Sec 2; p 10) or in their appointment letters.

First- and second-year tenure-line faculty evaluation letters are written by the department chair.

All tenure-line faculty, full-time in English, as well as other full-time instructors, unless on sabbatical or leave, are normally required to participate in third-year, tenure, promotion, and periodic full (i.e. non-streamline) reviews of colleagues according to the criteria elaborated in Section D below.

Tenure-line faculty whose lines are partially in English will work in consultation with the following persons in the academic year prior to the evaluation to determine their participation in the evaluation: the evaluatee, the department chair, and the Dean of Faculty (see *Code*, Chapter III, Sec 4, (3), (e), p 13). In order to allow for class visits, should they participate, the determination of possible partial-line evaluators’ participation should occur no later than October 1 of the academic year prior to the evaluation occurring.

All full-time tenure-line members of the department as well as other full-time Instructors, unless on sabbatical or leave, are required to participate in the review of Instructors during Instructors’ full (i.e. non-“streamlined”) reviews .

Visiting or adjunct faculty, during their first two years, will be evaluated by the Chair. The evaluation will consist of student evaluations, class visits, and a conversation between Chair and evaluatee. If the evaluatee anticipates continued employment beyond the third year, the Chair may request other tenure-line faculty colleagues to assist in evaluating the visiting faculty.

“Streamlined” reviews, available only at specific times noted in *Code* (see Chapter III, Sec 5; pp 17-18), are conducted by the department chair (or designee). Other department colleagues have the option of reading the file and writing a letter as allowed by the *Code*, Chapter III, Sec 5, c, p. 18.

### **B. Responsibilities of the Department Chair/Head Officer**

In accordance with the *Code*, the head officer (typically the department chair or designee, if the chair is under evaluation) will:

1. Identify and announce to the department the names of faculty members who are to be evaluated in a given year and their file status (open or closed).
2. Identify the colleagues in the department who will participate in each evaluation and share that information with the evaluatee.
3. Ensure, in consultation with the evaluatee, that the evaluatee has appropriate and sufficient “coverage” of colleagues visiting classes.
  - a. The *Code* calls for an “ongoing process of class visitation” [Chapter III, Sec 4, a. (1) (b); p. 12]]
  - b. The 2008 “Faculty Evaluation Criteria & Procedures” memoranda clarifies: “adequate visitation would require more than one visit by more than one faculty member (i.e., *at least* two visits by two faculty members). 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.’”
4. Establish, and make known to all involved, a schedule for the evaluation process (see item E below).
5. Collect and place in the evaluatee’s file by the stated deadline (listed in the “buff document”) any “outside” letters the evaluatee has requested as part of the file that department colleagues read.
6. Collect letters from departmental colleagues at least three days in advance of the meeting. The head officer is responsible for reviewing these letters to ensure that there are no allegations of violations of professional ethics (see *Code*, Chapter III, Sec 4, f; p 17).
7. Schedule a discussion and deliberation of the evaluatee by faculty members who wrote letters of evaluation. Only departmental colleagues who submitted letters may participate in the deliberations.
8. Draft a summary of the departmental deliberations of the evaluatee and provide colleagues with a copy of the summary for revision and approval. When all revisions have been made and accepted, colleagues participating in the discussion will sign their approval of the report of the departmental discussion.
9. Write a summary of the letters provided by colleagues and any outside letters that come directly to the chair/department in the case of a closed file .
10. Send the summary of the departmental deliberation, the summary of departmental letters (if applicable), individual letters, and the evaluatee's complete file to the Faculty Advancement Committee.
11. Provide the evaluatee with copies of the departmental deliberation summary letter and, where applicable, the summary of letters. We recommend that the head officer expeditiously discuss with the evaluatee the observations and recommendations of the department.
12. Meet with the evaluatee to discuss the response of the Faculty Advancement Committee after it has been rendered.

### **C. Responsibilities of the Evaluatee**

The evaluatee should consult with the chair/head officer regarding appropriate and sufficient “coverage” of colleagues visiting classes (see item B.2). It is the responsibility of the evaluatee to take the lead in scheduling colleagues’ visits to her/his classes. In tenure cases in particular, the evaluatee is encouraged to schedule visits by colleagues in a range of classes during the four semesters preceding the tenure evaluation.

The evaluatee is responsible for preparing a file in accordance with the schedule established and containing, at a minimum, the following materials:

1. A reflective statement that should discuss at the very least: her/his pedagogy or teaching philosophy, courses taught (particularly in the period under review), course objectives and assessment, a description of professional growth activities as well as future research agenda, and discussion of the evaluatee’s service to the department, university and/or community.
2. A current curriculum vitae.
3. A portfolio of teaching materials for courses taught during the evaluation period. The portfolio should include at a minimum: syllabi, paper prompts, exams or quizzes, and teaching handouts.
4. A copy of published materials related to professional growth, copies of papers presented at conferences, and evidence of works that are in substantial progress.
5. Course evaluations for the relevant semesters (for tenure: the most recent four semesters of teaching; for all other evaluations unless otherwise indicated: the most recent two semesters of teaching).

The list above is a minimum: an evaluatee is welcome to include additional materials that s/he believes are relevant to making her/his case.

The evaluatee, in taking the lead in requesting “outside” letters, is also responsible to ensure that letter writers are aware of the date by which such letters must be submitted, whether to the department chair (as part of the evaluatee’s record and for perusal by all department evaluators) or to the Advancement Committee.

### **D. Responsibilities of Colleagues Participating in the Evaluation**

Evaluation of colleagues lies at the core of our professional responsibilities and serves to build a community of informed and supportive colleagues.

Colleagues should develop their assessment of the performance of the evaluatee by a careful review of the file prepared by the evaluatee.

As teaching is our most important task, it is crucial that colleagues’ assessment of the evaluatee be thorough and based on an examination of the following:

1. The evaluatee’s reflections on her/his teaching and pedagogy;
2. The teaching materials included in the file;

3. The student evaluations for relevant semesters.
4. While we do not require all faculty to visit every colleague's classes before each review, we expect colleagues will observe one another's classes, especially at the third-year, tenure, and promotion evaluations, for the purposes of making an informed assessment of teaching. We encourage colleagues to compare direct observation of classroom performance, course material included in the file, and student evaluations.

Department colleagues shall prepare individual letters of evaluation and submit them to the head officer by the established deadline. The letter should consist of: (1) an assessment of the evaluatee's teaching that is based on a reading of the statement, course materials provided, student evaluations, and, where applicable, classroom observations, including dates of visit(s); (2) an assessment of the professional growth materials, focusing on both completed projects and future plans, where relevant; (3) discussion of department/university service, advising, and community service, where relevant; (4) an evaluation of the need for the position, in the case of tenure.

In cases regarding tenure or promotion, the letter should culminate in a formal recommendation to tenure and/or promote or not; in all other cases, colleagues should note if the evaluatee's performance is satisfactory or not.

If a departmental colleague wishes to make changes to his/her letter after the departmental discussion, he/she may add an addendum to the original individual letter.

#### **E. Departmental Evaluation Process**

Due to the size of our department, an evaluatee must make her/his complete file available to the department thirty calendar days in advance of the department deliberation meeting.

In order to ensure that the head officer has time to craft a summary letter of the deliberations and all colleagues who participated in the deliberation have an opportunity to read and comment on the letter, the deliberation meeting is generally scheduled at a minimum one week in advance of the day the file is to be delivered to the Dean's office (the day that files are due in the Dean's office is published in each year's "buff document").

Faculty should base their letters on a careful reading of the evaluatee's file and assess the evaluatee on all the criteria required by the *Code* and cited in Section I.

Faculty should submit letters to the head officer three days prior to the deliberation meeting.

Only faculty who write letters and submit them to the head officer by the stated date are permitted to attend and participate in the deliberations.

The deliberation will culminate in a department recommendation of the evaluatee. Faculty present will "vote" and the head officer will report the outcome of this vote in the deliberations letter. In general, the vote shall consist of a show of hands, but if any faculty calls for a paper ballot, the department shall comply.

Faculty who have read the file and written a letter but cannot attend the deliberation meeting may submit their letters to the head officer and their letters are forwarded to the Advancement Committee.

Faculty who wish to may attach an addendum to their letters. (Note: the *Code* does not require faculty to append an addendum to explain differences between views stated in the letter and those expressed in the meeting. The option, however, exists for those faculty who choose to exercise it). Such addendum should be forwarded to the head officer within a day of the deliberation meeting.

### **III. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND STANDARDS**

According to the *Code* and instructions from the Professional Standards Committee, the English Department must evaluate each faculty member as an effective member of the university and, in the case of tenure, consider the needs of the department in the evaluatee's area of professional competence.

Excellent teaching and sustained professional growth are of primary importance in the evaluation of a faculty member. Department or university governance, while required, must not be substituted for the minimum expectations in quality teaching and professional growth.

#### **F. Teaching**

The English department recognizes that excellent teaching comes in a variety of forms, including but not limited to lecture, discussion, student presentations, in-class writing assignments, small-group work, student-led discussion, and out-of-class writing assignments. We welcome a diversity of pedagogies and texts to achieve competence in the study and production of literature and culture. A teaching style that is effective for one person might not be effective for another. We encourage faculty to develop as teachers by trying new methods in their quest to improve their teaching, recognizing that new methods may not be successful initially and that the hallmark of a good teacher is continual fine-tuning. We also recognize that as faculty's interests change and shift, their teaching may too. The department welcomes and recognizes colleagues' work on developing new courses to enhance our curriculum and to keep current.

While we welcome diverse teaching styles, we believe that teaching excellence requires at a minimum the following:

1. the faculty member's expertise and competency to teach the subject matter;
2. a carefully constructed syllabus that organizes the materials, students' responsibilities, course objectives, requirements, and grading practices in a clear fashion;
3. readings, requirements, and writing assignments appropriate to the level of the course taught;
4. carefully selected activities, assignments, and texts that develop students' analytical thinking, independent learning, and skills of strong writing and oral communication;
5. clarity in communicating ideas, including the ability to formulate and express ideas clearly and an understanding of the difficulties students may have encountering ideas for the first time;
6. establishing high standards for students, coupled with motivating and helping students to meet those standards;
7. accessibility to students.

Each colleague brings unique abilities and gifts to our department and institution, and each is welcome to make a case for additional factors that may not be included on this list.

#### **G. Professional Growth**

The department recognizes that there are a number of different types of activities that constitute professional growth and countless paths to colleagues' professional development. No list can anticipate the scholarly growth of every successful evaluatee through every stage of his or her career. We seek here to provide guidance to colleagues. In general, we expect all faculty to maintain demonstrable currency

in their field(s) of expertise. In addition, we expect tenure-line colleagues to demonstrate significant activity in the items listed in Tier I. Activities in Tier II demonstrate a sustained and continuing intellectual commitment to one's discipline and service in the profession; they are desirable but should not substitute for activities in Tier I.

#### Tier I

1. Publishing. We recognize:
  - a. Books (published by a scholarly or trade press). Books may include the following:
    - i) Scholarly monographs;
    - ii) Novels or collections of short stories, creative non-fiction, or poems;
    - iii) Reference works;
    - iv) An edited collection of scholarly or creative writings with a scholarly introduction;
    - v) A textbook;
  - b. Articles published in scholarly journals, whether online or in print;
  - c. Poems, short stories, or non-fiction prose essays in appropriate journals;
  - d. Chapters/essays/poems/stories in books or collected volumes;
  - e. Substantial articles in reference works;
2. Editing or guest-editing a scholarly journal;
3. Book reviews of substantial length (more than 600 words), published in scholarly journals;

Tier I activities that have undergone peer review are valued most highly, and the acceptance rate of the journal, press, or conference plays a significant role in our assessment.

#### Tier II

1. Conference participation. We value:
  - a. The presentation of scholarly work at professional conferences
  - b. The performance/reading of creative work at pertinent venues.
2. Brief reviews;
3. Shorter articles in reference works;
4. Organizing a scholarly conference;
5. Refereeing or reviewing manuscripts for scholarly journals or academic publications.
6. Serving on the editorial board of a journal or press;
7. Participating or sharing in the governance of professional organizations;

Instructors should remain current in the relevant parts of the discipline that bear upon their teaching duties. In all areas, instructors will be evaluated consistent with the *Faculty Code* interpretation of Chapter III, Section 3, Evaluation of Instructors (Professional Standards Committee Report to Faculty Senate 5 May 1986).

#### **H. Advising**

Each member of the department must contribute to university efforts to provide good academic and career advising by participating in departmental efforts to advise students. Advising classes will be assigned to faculty in a regular rotation, as needed, and majors will select or be recommended to individual faculty members. Advising includes appropriate interaction with students on an individual or small group basis. Evidence for advising *may* include an evaluatee's current roster of advisees and, if available, any significant efforts to direct and guide students (keeping in mind the obligation to maintain confidentiality).

**I. Department/University Service**

The department expects its faculty to be active and contributing participants in its efforts to provide an outstanding program. Regular participation in department meetings, reliable and responsible contribution to ad-hoc committees, and representation of the department in university functions are among the ways in which a colleague can contribute. The departmental duties and responsibilities of Instructors will be determined in discussion with the department chair and based on the needs of the department.

Tenure-line faculty are also expected to serve on one of the university's standing committees and/or provide direct service to the institution in some other fashion.

**J. Need**

In the case of tenure, the *Code* notes one criteria as "the need of the department, school, or program and the university" (Chapter III, Sec 3, d, p. 11). Typically, department members evaluating a colleague make the case for the need for the position in their evaluation letters.

**K. Community Service**

Activities that represent or promote the university or enhance a faculty member's teaching and scholarly trajectories are recognized and encouraged. For promotion, participation in community service related to the faculty member's professional interests and expertise is required. Examples of such activities may include performances or readings of creative work at community affairs, leading discussion for local book groups, or blogging activities in related areas of expertise.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE POSITION OF  
Director of the Center for Writing, Learning, and Teaching  
Approved by Professional Standards Committee on March 25, 2013

**I. Preface**

This document is an addendum to the evaluation processes and criteria established by the home department of the Director of the Center for Writing, Learning, and Teaching (CWLT). It is the responsibility of all participants in the evaluation process to review this document together with a) the home department's evaluation criteria, b) the provisions of the Faculty Code relating to tenure and promotion, and c) the Professional Standards Committee document entitled "Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures."

**II. Participation in the Evaluation Process**

The CWLT Director will be evaluated by the home department along with two additional faculty members chosen by the Academic Dean and the chair of the home department, in consultation with the evaluatee. Normally, the Associate Dean who works most closely with the CWLT will be one of the two additional faculty members. The additional faculty members will be part of the deliberation process, including any recommendation on change of status.

**III. Criteria Unique to the Position of Director of the Center for Writing, Learning, and Teaching**

The position of Director of the Center for Writing, Learning, and Teaching is 2/3-3/4 of the faculty member's load. The Director will be held to the same high standards in teaching, professional growth, advising, and university and department service that are indicated in the home department's evaluation criteria, but due to the demands of the position, the kinds of activities within and the balance and distinctions among these categories may differ from more typical cases in the home department.

In recognition of the unique position of the CWLT Director and because the Director's teaching responsibilities extend beyond the formal classroom, "class visits" will be interpreted more flexibly than is customary. Colleagues participating in the evaluation may also observe the CWLT Director in less formal "teaching" situations that occur as part of the Director's CWLT responsibilities.

The role of the Director is neither a purely instructional nor a purely administrative position but, rather, one that blends the two in distinctive ways. For instance, when the Director leads faculty in longitudinal campus-wide assessment of student writing, the Director is engaging in research as well as service and teaching. These tasks must be informed by ongoing relevant professional development in the field. In writing review statements, the Director will—where possible—address the categories of teaching, professional growth, advising, and service separately, but will necessarily need to address many aspects of CWLT work holistically.

In providing a sense of direction for the Center for Writing, Learning, and Teaching as a

whole, the special responsibilities of the CWLT Director include activities such as:<sup>1</sup>

- maintaining effective working relationships within the CWLT (e.g., among Tutors and Writing Advisors, staff, and faculty), and with key constituencies outside the CWLT (e.g., faculty, administration, student services, and academic advising);
- selecting, supervising, and evaluating the CWLT staff, including the Director of Disability Services, the Learning Support Specialist, and the Administrative Assistant;
- administering the work of the Writing Advisors through such activities as recruitment, selection, training, mentoring, and evaluation of the work of Writing Advisors;
- promoting effective teaching at Puget Sound, through such activities as organizing faculty workshops or discussion groups, and through working with individual faculty and students;
- overseeing both the maintenance of the physical facilities of the CWLT, including space, equipment, and technology and the preparation and/or purchase of instructional materials needed in the CWLT;
- keeping careful records of instruction in the CWLT and providing appropriate reports on the activities, progress, and problems of the CWLT;
- administering budget allocations responsibly;
- publicizing services and opportunities provided by the CWLT to appropriate constituencies;
- ongoing professional growth in relation to CWLT work, through such activities as appropriate reading, courses, studies, research, and participation in professional organizations and workshops;
- and engaging in regular and thorough evaluation of the CWLT and its programs.

The evaluation committee will consider all information and documentation provided by the evaluatee. The committee will carefully consider the evaluatee's self analysis of his or her efforts to meet the obligations of the position.

---

<sup>1</sup> These criteria adapted from "What Lies Ahead for Writing Centers: Position Statement on Professional Concerns" available at the International Writing Centers Web page.