

**A STATEMENT OF EVALUATION STANDARDS  
AND PROCEDURES**

**THE DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS  
AND COMPUTER SCIENCE**

**Revised: May 24, 2012  
Approved: September 12, 2012**

This is a statement of criteria, standards and procedures to be used by the Department of Mathematics & Computer Science in evaluating its members.

Prologue: The Department of Mathematics & Computer Science is committed to the development and maintenance of standards of professional excellence on the part of its members and the Department as a whole. As part of this commitment, we participate in a periodic evaluation of our members for the purposes of supporting each other in our efforts to develop and maintain excellence and to make a fair and impartial decision at a crucial point in a member's career.

The following presents the guidelines developed by the Department of Mathematics & Computer Science for the evaluation of its members, setting forth the criteria to be used in the evaluation of members, the standards against which they will be measured and the procedures to be followed.

### ***SECTION A. Statement of evaluation criteria and standards.***

General: The Department shall evaluate a faculty member in the following areas. In the case of tenure decisions, only areas 1, 2 and 4 will be evaluated, and additionally, the needs of the department and the university will be considered.

- 1) Excellence in teaching
- 2) Professional growth
- 3) Academic & Career Advising
- 4) University Service

In the following, we have attempted to present major points to be considered by the Department in the evaluation process. While the Department concurs that these points are aspects of professional excellence, we agree with the statement, attributed to the mathematician and educator, G. Polya: That it is impossible to define excellent teaching, but everyone recognizes it when she or he sees it.

Therefore, in accordance with this belief, individuals will form composite assessments of colleagues consistent with the following criteria. The Department feels that only those not versed in the use of numbers would attempt to give numerical ratings to these criteria. We do hold, however, that excellence in teaching is of primary importance.

#### **1. Excellence in Teaching**

The following items shall be considered in evaluating a colleague:

- a. The individual's organization and clarity of presentation of the course material. How well the material is received and understood by students. How responsive the individual is to the needs of students.
- b. The individual's ability to instill within a student an interest and enthusiasm for the subject matter.
- c. The access that students have to the individual.
- d. The individual's maintenance of appropriate and reasonable academic standards.
- e. The individual's ability to choose pertinent material and to set and meet reasonable objectives within the framework of the selected material.

## 2. Professional Growth

We hold that a sustained effort that contributes to the maintenance of currency in discipline, the development of new areas of expertise, and the development of the Department's curriculum is evidence of professional growth. Active participation in scholarly pursuits such as:

- < publication
- < directing student research, advanced independent study, or students' theses.
- < developing new courses
- < expanding areas of expertise to meet the needs of the Department
- < application of academic expertise to problems arising in other disciplines and contexts
- < working to stay current in one's discipline
- < seminars
- < colloquium talks
- < sabbaticals
- < professional meetings
- < professional organizations

are examples which might be cited to support a claim of professional growth. No one activity by itself is sufficient to ensure tenure or promotion, nor is the absence of any single activity by itself sufficient reason to deny tenure or promotion.

## 3. Academic & Career Advising

The Department feels that advising is a generally pervasive activity within the Department that is not limited to the formal advisor-advisee relationship. An individual's willingness to advise students may be measured, but the quality of that advising is difficult to measure, as its effects may not be felt until years after the advisee has left the University. Generally the Department equates good advising with the creation of a climate which fosters realistic discussions with students about their goals and abilities.

## 4. University Service

The Department feels that University Service should not be defined narrowly as participation in University governance. We hold that University Service includes efforts in the following areas:

- a. Departmental service
- b. University governance
- c. extra-curricular activities
- d. activities that enrich the intellectual and cultural life of the University.

We feel that all members of the Department must participate in departmental service and are encouraged to serve the University in the other areas listed above. Faculty in the early stages of their career should not feel obligated to serve on the Standing Committees of the Faculty.

We give primary importance to areas 1 and 2 in our evaluations. In the case of Instructors, all areas will be evaluated consistent with the Faculty Code Interpretation of Chapter III, Section 3 (and 4 in the June 2003 Code), Evaluation of Instructors (Professional Standards Committee Report to Faculty Senate 5 May 1986).

## **SECTION B. Evaluation Procedures**

In cases where the Chair is being evaluated, the tenure-line members of the department will choose another of its members to conduct this evaluation. References below to the Chair are to this replacement in these instances.

### **1. Responsibilities of the individual being evaluated:**

The individual undergoing evaluation shall prepare a file containing the following material:

- a. A statement by the individual regarding his or her professional objectives, both short-term and long-term.
- b. Other material believed by the faculty member to be useful.
- c. Student evaluations of all courses taught during the previous two semesters in promotion, 3-year, or 5-year evaluation cases, and during the previous four semesters in tenure cases.

### **2. Responsibilities of colleagues in the evaluation process**

A list of colleagues participating in the evaluation of the individual will be provided to the evaluatee at the time the file is submitted. Those individuals will have the following responsibilities:

- a. Review of file.  
The colleagues participating in the evaluation process of a given individual shall read the file prepared by the individual.
- b. Classroom observations.  
For all evaluations from the third year on, and excepting decisions about tenure, the Chair is responsible for ensuring that at least three departmental members conduct an adequate number of classroom visitations. For decisions about tenure, all available tenure-line faculty are expected to familiarize themselves with the evaluatee's teaching through classroom visits. In every case, all members of the department may choose to visit the evaluatee's classes and are encouraged to do so, and especially for 3-year Assistant Professor evaluations and decisions about promotion.
- c. Student evaluations.  
Student evaluations placed in the individual's files shall be reviewed.
- d. Letter of evaluation.  
After performing items a-c above, each colleague shall write a careful and thoughtful letter evaluating the individual in the light of Departmental Standards.

### **3. Procedures**

- Step 1: The individual under review builds his or her file as described above, and submits it to the chair by the stated deadline.
- Step 2: Colleagues read the material in the file, visit the individual's classes (when appropriate or requested), review student evaluations, and write letters of evaluation. These letters are submitted to the Chair in advance of the meeting described in the next step.
- Step 3: The Department will meet to consider the Department's recommendation.. This will be deliberated in the absence of the individual undergoing evaluation.
- Step 4: As a result of these deliberations, colleagues may file addenda to their previous letters of evaluation.
- Step 5: The departmental summary letter is given to the evaluatee.
- Step 6: The file is submitted to the Dean.