

FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES FOR THE CLASSICS DEPARTMENT

The Classics Department of the University of Puget Sound will use the following guidelines in evaluating its faculty members.

TEACHING

The Classics Department endorses the University's commitment to excellent teaching. An excellent teacher is able to convey knowledge in an organized fashion to students of diverse personal and academic background; to demonstrate the interrelatedness of knowledge; to promote students' critical thinking; and to convey and inspire an enthusiasm both for the teacher's chosen subject matter and for the enterprise of learning in general. These qualities should be manifest primarily in the design and content of courses and in the teacher's performance in the classroom. In addition, the Classics Department recognizes that a student's access to a teacher outside the classroom can be invaluable in the educational experience. The department, therefore, expects its faculty members to establish regular and reasonable office hours.

The Department will base its evaluation of teaching on the following:

- 1) a statement by the evaluatee explaining how his/her pedagogical methods reflect University and Department goals;
- 2) evaluatee's course syllabi and any other material that elucidates course design and content;
- 3) evaluatee's exam questions, paper assignments, and any other material that demonstrates how the evaluatee engages students in thinking critically;
- 4) classroom visitations by members of the evaluatee's evaluation committee
- 5) evaluatee's student evaluations, which the Classics Department believes are helpful in determining whether a teacher is successful in the classroom.

After class observations and review of the materials listed above, the department relies on its members' professional judgment to evaluate teaching.

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

The Classics Department believes that to be a successful teacher and to contribute to the intellectual vitality of the University, members of the Classics Department should remain active in their scholarly discipline. The Classics Department has set no quota for publication or participation in professional conferences. The Department is less interested in the quantity than in the quality of scholarly work, and it is most interested in evidence that the faculty member continues to challenge him/herself intellectually.

Evidence of professional growth includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- 1) publication of research in the form of books or articles in professional journals;
- 2) publication of book reviews;
- 3) presentation of papers or participation on panels at professional conferences;
- 4) participation in seminars at the University of Puget Sound or other institutions.

ADVISING

Undergraduates are often uncertain about both academic and career goals and frequently look to their academic advisors for guidance. It is the Classics Department's belief that advisors should assist students in making the important choices of their academic career. Such assistance does not mean making the choice for the student, but rather providing the student with information necessary for him/her to make an informed decision, helping the student identify viable alternatives, and asking questions that help the student to consider the full range of consequences of his/her possible choices. Advisors should be knowledgeable about University regulations and academic requirements as well as be accessible to their advisees for a reasonable number of hours.

UNIVERSITY SERVICE

The Classics Department recognizes that the quality of academic life at the University of Puget Sound is established not only in the classroom or in the scholarship of faculty members, but also, for example, in the committee and departmental meeting, in the presentation of research to interested students outside the classroom, or in informal gatherings with students. Classics faculty are expected to contribute to the life and atmosphere of the University. Such contribution might involve participation in:

- 1) University and Department governance;
- 2) co-curricular activities;
- 3) fostering and promoting intellectual life on campus (e.g. organization of and attendance at campus lectures and/or performances; participation in discussion groups; giving talks to student groups)
- 4) conveying the nature and mission of the institution to the outside world (e.g. giving talks or leading discussions for community groups, schools, etc.; phoning or making recruiting visits for Admissions; acting as a resource for journalists, members of the community, etc.)

PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION

I. The File

The evaluatee should compile a file containing:

- (1) a curriculum vitae;
- (2) a statement by the evaluatee assessing his/her teaching, professional growth, university service (evidence of distinguished university service is required for advancement to full professor); and advising (in the case of tenure-line candidates for advancement).
- (3) course syllabi, exam questions, paper assignments, and any other material the evaluatee believes will help the Department evaluate his/her performance as a teacher;
- (4) publications, conference papers, manuscripts of work-in-progress, and any other evidence of scholarly growth.

The Department chair will be responsible for including the required student evaluations in the evaluatee's file. The file should be left in the possession of the Department Chair three weeks in advance of the date when letters of evaluation are due.

II. The Evaluation Committee

Given the small size of the Classics Department, the committee evaluating a member of the Department will consist not only of Department colleagues but also of faculty from related departments. The membership of the evaluation committee will be determined by both the Department Chair and the evaluatee. The committee will have no fewer than four members.

Each member of the committee is responsible for visiting the evaluatee's classes, reviewing the evaluatee's file, and writing a letter of evaluation. Ideally, each member of the committee should visit a full range of the kinds of classes (e.g. elementary languages; upper-level languages; general ancient history or classical civilization courses; seminars on more specialized subjects) taught by the faculty member during the period when s/he is under evaluation. At a minimum, each committee member must make two classroom visits and must include in his/her letter of evaluation an indication of which courses formed the basis of evaluation. The letters should address the quality of the evaluatee's teaching, his/her professional growth, and his/her university service and advising as appropriate.

Before the letters have been written, the evaluatee should indicate whether he/she wishes the file to be open or confidential. When the letters have been written and submitted to the chair, the committee should meet to discuss the evaluatee's performance at the University. Each member will summarize or read his/her letter for the rest of the committee. After the meeting, the chair will write a summary of the department's deliberations and also, in the case of a closed file, a summary of faculty letters. This summary letter, committee members' letters, and the evaluatee's file will then be forwarded to the Academic Vice President. The day after the meeting of the evaluation

committee, the evaluatee will be notified of the committee's consensus and any minority opinions.

David Luper

David Luper
Chair, Classics Dept.

Last Revised: June 9, 2000