

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

Statement of Evaluation Criteria,
Standards and Procedures

PURPOSE

This document is intended to serve as a guide to Economics faculty in the evaluation process and is designed to serve both the evaluatee and those undertaking the evaluation. It also serves to fulfill the requirement of the Faculty Code of the University of Puget Sound that “Departments shall state in writing the criteria, standards and needs of the department used in the deliberative process in relation to the University’s standards and needs.” This document should be viewed as a complement to the criteria and procedures for tenure and promotion that are detailed in the Faculty Code (or, the Code). Evaluatees, in particular, should review the Code and discuss any questions about it or this document with the department chair and other colleagues. Additionally, the evaluatee should carefully review the “University Evaluation Criteria” and “Evaluation Procedures” memoranda distributed by the Professional Standards Committee, in consultation with the Faculty Advancement Committee. These documents are sent to evaluatees in the summer prior to the year of evaluation.

The Faculty Code identifies several areas of assessment for tenure and promotion. For tenure, they are teaching, professional growth, university service and the needs of the department. The factors for promotion are similar, but not identical: teaching, professional growth, advising students, university service, and community service related to professional interests and expertise. To be granted tenure, the evaluatee must demonstrate excellence in the areas of teaching and professional growth and also establish a record of service. To be promoted, the evaluatee must demonstrate the “highest standards,” while advancement to full professor requires “distinguished service in addition to sustained growth” in the above areas. At the departmental level, the same high standards are applied equally to all evaluations. In all cases, as the Faculty Code states, “the responsibility for demonstrating he or she meets the standards for tenure or promotion rests with the evaluatee.”

This document is organized according to the criteria identified in the Faculty Code. For each criterion, the departmental standard is defined and evidence to establish that the standard has been met is discussed. The last section of the document outlines the departmental procedures to be followed for evaluation.

DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS FOR TEACHING EXCELLENCE

Teaching excellence is the first and most important criterion against which performance by professors is evaluated. There is no simple working definition of teaching excellence that is appropriate for all situations, nor an unambiguous way to determine when excellence has been achieved. The following guidelines, however, represent generally accepted components of teaching excellence and evidence that can be used to evaluate teaching performance.

COMPONENTS OF TEACHING EXCELLENCE

Excellence in teaching necessarily requires success in the following four areas: course content, course design, teaching pedagogy, and course management/student relations.

Course Content

1. Currency: Courses should reflect or be informed by current theory, policy, and real-world events.
2. Level: Content should be appropriate given the course level and the students' backgrounds.
3. Rigor: The course should present an appropriate degree of rigor given the nature of the material and the general standards set by other departmental courses at the same level.
4. Specific Content: Content should be consistent with the role of the course within the department and the university.

Course Design

1. Texts and Readings: Written materials should be appropriate to the content of the course; they should be chosen so as to maximize student mastery and understanding of the course material.
2. Assignments: Student assignments should be designed to maximize student understanding of the course content.
3. Quantity and Quality of Effort: The course should require of students an appropriate amount of high quality effort.

Pedagogy

1. Effective Communication: Professors should communicate course ideas and concepts clearly and monitor student understanding effectively.
2. Student Feedback: Professors should solicit and respond to student questions effectively and provide prompt and appropriate feedback to students regarding their performance on class assignments.
3. Motivation: Professors should use appropriate and successful techniques to motivate students to complete course assignments and to master course content.
4. Flexibility: Professors should realize when class performance has failed and take swift action to remedy any situation that is detrimental to the quality of the course.

Course Management And Student Relations

1. Course Expectations: Expectations regarding student behavior and student performance, both in general and for particular assignments, should be clearly and regularly communicated.

2. Appropriate Behavior: Professors should engage in appropriate behavior with regard to students in all academic settings.
3. Student Contact: Professors should provide ample opportunities for student contact outside the classroom, especially through regularly-scheduled office hours.
4. Enthusiasm for Learning: Professors in their dealings with students should attempt to display and communicate an enthusiasm for learning.
5. Honesty: Professors should be honest with their students and demonstrate respect for them.

EVIDENCE OF TEACHING EXCELLENCE

While a wide variety of measurements may be used to assess teaching excellence, every evaluation must include the following four types of evidence:

- A. Student evaluations, for the previous four semesters of teaching in tenure cases, and two semesters of teaching in cases of promotion, 3-year and 5-year evaluations;
- B. Course materials for all evaluated courses, including syllabi, examinations, assignments, and assigned written materials.
- C. A personal statement of teaching philosophy and performance assessment. (This constitutes part of the self-evaluation described under “Procedures” at the end of this document.)
- D. An on-going process of classroom visitation.

It is the responsibility of the evaluatee to include the first three types of evidence in his or her file. Classroom visitation, however, is the collective responsibility of the evaluatee’s departmental colleagues.

Other types of evidence that the evaluatee may wish to submit or that colleagues may wish to consider as evidence for teaching excellence include: letters from university colleagues with whom the evaluatee has collaborated on teaching activities; materials from non-evaluated departmental courses or courses taught outside the Economics department; student performance on course assignments, discussions with colleagues, team-teaching experience, video-recording of classroom activities, attendance at teaching seminars, letters from students, or a demonstrated novel or innovative teaching pedagogy.

**DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS FOR EXCELLENCE:
PROFESSIONAL GROWTH**

Successful evaluation at tenure and promotion is predicated upon the evaluatee achieving and maintaining excellence in the area of professional growth. Within the liberal-arts environment, it is desirable that the Economics faculty be composed of diverse individuals with varying interests and different areas of expertise within the discipline. Because of this heterogeneity it is to be expected that the set of activities which constitute a high level of professional growth and development will vary from individual to individual within the department. Nonetheless, the department is able to delineate, in broad terms, the parameters defining professional growth for its members.

COMPONENTS OF EXCELLENCE IN PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

The department clearly recognizes that there are a number of different types of activities that constitute professional growth. Particular evaluatees, therefore, may have very different research agendas and developmental strategies depending upon their own individual areas of inquiry. In recognition of these differences among individuals, the department has established a two tier system for classifying the kinds of activities which are acceptable in demonstrating excellence in professional growth. These tiers are identified as General Activities (Tier I) and Specific Activities (Tier II).

In order for an individual to meet the departmental standards for excellence in professional growth, the department must be convinced that the individual has:

- A. Met all criteria identified in Tier I: General Activities, and
- B. Engaged in a reasonable number of activities from Tier II which indicates, in both the level of effort and quality of output, a sustained and continuing intellectual commitment to professional growth.

TIER I: GENERAL ACTIVITIES

- 1. Maintain currency in the areas of macroeconomic and microeconomic theory consistent with the requirements for effectively teaching the Intermediate Theory Courses.
- 2. Remain current and informed on changes in the discipline and the general condition of the economy.
- 3. Maintain an interest and currency in at least two upper-level teaching areas acceptable to the department.

TIER II: SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES

- 1. Publish in scholarly journals in the appropriate field;
- 2. Author, edit, or contribute to research monographs, books, or more general works in a relevant area;
- 3. Present papers or participate as a discussant in national/regional/specialty area conferences;
- 4. Conduct consulting-based research which contributes to the individual's professional development by clearly making a substantive or novel contribution to the evaluatee's research program;
- 5. Author texts or develop software suitable for classroom use;
- 6. Contribute to the department's working papers series;
- 7. Participate in community service activities where the individual is involved in professional development;

8. Share in the governance of the professional organizations in the individual's area of expertise;
9. Participate in seminars or colloquia which present recent advances in economic theory or formal modeling techniques;
10. Referee or review manuscripts for scholarly journals or academic publications;
11. Engage in certain, specific types of class related activities (See below*).

*Arguments necessary for considering coursework as part of professional growth must include evidence that the faculty member has: developed a new course outside the individual's (previous) area of expertise, used the results of their own professional development to improve course material, or integrated new theoretical developments or empirical analyses into class materials. The department will use the evaluations together with course material submitted by the individual being evaluated to determine if these objectives have been met. The burden of proof, though, is always on the evaluatee to demonstrate that any particular professional activity qualifies as professional growth and development.

EVIDENCE OF EXCELLENCE: PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

The evaluatee is responsible for providing the following evidence to the department as part of the evaluation file:

- A. A personal statement which should include a description and assessment of past activities related to professional growth as well as the evaluatee's future research agenda. (This constitutes part of the self-evaluation described under "Procedures" at the end of this document.)
- B. A copy of all published and unpublished research, reports, and/or documents related to professional growth. (In the case of conflict arising from the release of proprietary information, the individual and the chair of the departmental evaluation committee will agree on a mutually acceptable form for disseminating this evidence.)
- C. Course syllabi, reading lists, class handouts, and any other material which might be needed by the department in order to judge the content of a course being offered as a contribution to professional growth in either tier I or II. (Because many of these materials would be provided as part of the evidence pertaining to excellence in teaching, only those which were not reproduced earlier are necessary here.)

The evaluatee may choose at his or her discretion to include other types of evidence to establish excellence in the area of professional growth. Such evidence could include the names and addresses of any individuals outside of the department or the university who can provide evidence of professional growth, letters of evaluation from outside referees, or any other materials as deemed appropriate by the evaluatee.

DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS FOR ACADEMIC AND CAREER ADVISING

The department recognizes the vital role that advising plays in the educational mission of the university. Therefore, department members must conscientiously undertake advising duties consistent with the needs of the department and the university.

COMPONENTS OF SATISFACTORY ADVISING

Advisors should foster independence of thought and action and a sense of responsibility for academic and career planning in their advisees. Although individual advising styles may differ considerably, the common elements in every effective style include appropriate knowledge, openness and availability.

Knowledge

Advisors must have a good working knowledge of university curricula, rules, regulations and policies; an in-depth knowledge of their own departmental curriculum; a sufficient awareness for student support offices to make appropriate referrals; and a familiarity with advising resources. Advisors should maintain and be familiar with their advisees' academic records and any other pertinent information provided by the university.

Openness

Advisors must show a readiness to serve in advising; to welcome student questions and concerns (personal, academic, and career-related); and to make appropriate referrals.

Availability

Advisors must make themselves available to students at reasonable times both formally through regular advising appointments and informally, including discussions with students who are not their advisees.

EVIDENCE OF SATISFACTORY EXCELLENCE

It is the responsibility of individuals being evaluated to demonstrate an awareness of the components of satisfactory advising and to describe and evaluate their advising accordingly.

DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS FOR UNIVERSITY SERVICE

University service is one of the areas of assessment for tenure and promotion identified in the Faculty Code. While department members are required to undertake their share of university service, such service carries less weight than teaching and professional growth in evaluation decisions.

University service results in public goods which collectively benefit the university community. Because of its public and collective nature, the overall benefits of university service and the contributions of an individual faculty member to the final product are difficult to assess and measure. Nonetheless, the Department has delineated various types of service and specified its expectations regarding each component.

COMPONENTS OF UNIVERSITY SERVICE

The components of university service have been divided into three sets. The first set (I) identifies general departmental service activities. The second set (II) identifies specific departmental service activities. The third set (III) identifies specific university service activities outside the department. Individuals in the department are responsible for all of the activities in set (I). Individuals in the department should choose activities from both

set (II) and set (III) which complement their talents and interest. Non-tenured career faculty are not expected to participate in either (II) or (III) for the first year.

I. General Departmental Service Activities

1. Recruitment and hiring of economics faculty;
2. Evaluation of departmental colleagues;
3. Selection of departmental teaching assistants;
4. Participation in departmental meetings and functions.

II. Specific Departmental Service Activities

1. Acting as department chair;
2. Acting as departmental representative;
3. Drafting statements on departmental statements and procedures;
4. Drafting statements for periodic curriculum reviews;
5. Drafting departmental statements for accreditation report;
6. Participation in other department service activities.

III. University Service Activities Outside The Department

1. Member of the faculty senate;
2. Member of a standing committee;
3. Member of a trustee committee;
4. Member of an ad hoc committee;
5. Participation in cocurricular activities;
6. Participation in activities that contribute to a creative and intellectual atmosphere on campus;
7. Participation in other university service activities.

EVIDENCE OF SATISFACTORY UNIVERSITY SERVICE

The individual being evaluated is responsible for providing an evaluation of her or his university service activities. The evaluatee may choose to include letters from university colleagues or written reports of their service activities.

DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE

Community service related to professional interests and expertise is one of the criteria identified in the Faculty Code for promotion. Community service can enhance the reputation of the university, contribute directly to the professional growth of a faculty member and add significantly to the mission of the university. Community service that enhances the reputation of the university or adds significantly to the mission of the university can also contribute to university service.

Community service activities will vary among individuals, depending upon their interests and the manner in which they choose to apply their expertise to community needs. Individuals should choose those community activities appropriate to their interests and preferences.

Similar to university service, community service is a shared, public enterprise and thus an individual's contribution is difficult to measure. The evaluatee should include a description of any community service activities related to professional interests or expertise in the evaluation file.

**ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT
STATEMENT OF PROCEDURES
DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION OF COLLEAGUES**

Responsibilities of the Evaluatee

As required by the Faculty Code, the evaluatee should prepare an evaluation file, including in it a current curriculum vita. The file should also include a self-assessment of performance with respect to each of the criteria, identifying specific ways in which concerns or weaknesses will be addressed or improvements will be sought. The self-evaluation should also include a statement of goals and objectives, both for the period leading up to the current evaluation and for the time to be covered in the next one. The file should also contain all evidence required to establish excellence in teaching and professional growth, and evidence necessary to establish that satisfactory standards have been met in advising, university, and community service. Specific types of evidence required for each criterion are discussed earlier in this document. The evaluatee may also choose to include any other types of evidence he or she believes is appropriate for the evaluation process.

Timing of Evaluation

Evaluation as discussed in this document pertains to all evaluations after the first and second-year evaluations. In those cases, the evaluation file is prepared as discussed here and submitted to the Faculty Advancement Committee. At the end of each year of the first two years of a non-tenured faculty member's appointment, the department chair shall write an evaluation report and send it to the individual, to the Dean, and to the Faculty Advancement Committee, as required by the Faculty Code.

Departmental Recommendation Procedure

When a member of the Economics department is being evaluated, the departmental recommendation procedure shall be:

1. Tenure-line faculty members of the department shall examine the evaluation file prepared by the candidate and take whatever other actions as shall be required by the Code in such cases. Faculty on leave may be excused by the department chair. Members shall determine if, based on this evidence, the candidate meets the departmental criteria for tenure and/or promotion. Individual members will write a letter of assessment based on the evaluation file and any other appropriate evidence the individual considers in his or her recommendation. The letter should include a specific recommendation regarding the tenure and/or promotion decision. Additionally, the Professional Standards Committee requests that faculty include in their individual letters "a statement detailing the courses they visited and the days they visited them."
2. Tenure-line faculty members of the department will forward their individual letters of evaluation to the chair or some person appointed by the chair who will prepare a written draft of the departmental recommendation. After the draft has been reviewed by all members of the department participating in the review, excluding the evaluatee, a meeting shall be held to discuss the recommendation. The recommendation letter shall then be revised as necessary to include suggestions and concerns made by departmental members during its review and meeting. If a consensus cannot be reached regarding the recommendation, the departmental letter shall reflect the lack

of consensus. The letter shall include a summary of the substance of the individual letters and a summary of the department's deliberations. (Note that the Faculty Code allows for faculty members to send their individual letters and recommendations directly to the Dean; the recommendation of any who chose this option would not then appear in the departmental recommendation.)

3. Evaluators will be asked to sign the departmental recommendation letter. An evaluator's signature indicates s/he has participated in the evaluation process and that the letter accurately reflects the department's deliberative process.
4. The departmental recommendation shall then be given to the evaluatee for his or her review and signature. The evaluatee's signature is to indicate, as required by the Faculty Code, that she or he was provided with a list of faculty members participating in the departmental recommendation (indicated by their attached signatures) and had an opportunity to review, though not necessarily endorse, the departmental recommendation which includes a summary of the substance of the letters and departmental deliberations.
5. All materials collected in the course of the departmental evaluations will be forwarded to the Advancement Committee.

Mentor Teams for Non-Tenured Faculty Members

In the first year of a non-tenured faculty member's appointment, a three-member mentor team shall be established. It is the responsibility of the mentor team to provide guidance and evaluative suggestions to the new faculty member through the tenure evaluation. It is also the responsibility of the mentor team to engage in a process of regular, on-going classroom visitation, beginning with the second semester of the first year of appointment and extending until the tenure evaluation. (Individuals who are not mentor team members are encouraged to visit classes.) The mentor team should meet with the new faculty member in the first year of his or her appointment to discuss this document and relevant portions of the Faculty Code, along with any questions of the new faculty member. It is the responsibility of the mentor team to address any questions about the faculty member's role in the department and to offer advice on achieving success as a teacher-scholar at the University of Puget Sound. At the end of each of the first two years of the faculty member's appointment, the mentor team should meet with the chair to participate in preparing an evaluation report of the new faculty member. A copy of this report, as discussed above under "Timing," is given to the individual, the Dean, and the Faculty Advancement Committee.

Note that no part of this document should be construed to supersede or prevail over any portion of the Faculty Code. In all cases, the departmental criteria, evaluation and procedures shall be subject to criteria, evaluation, and procedures as established in the Faculty Code.