

Approved by PSC  
Spring 04

**Criteria, Standards, and Procedures for Evaluation**  
**Department of Psychology**  
**University of Puget Sound**

Revised 4/27/04

Approved by the Professional Standards Committee

I. Introduction

- A. Purpose. This document was developed by the members of the University of Puget Sound Psychology Department to serve as a guide for evaluation of members, regardless of rank or type of review. This document is to be used for evaluation in conjunction with the Professional Standards Committee's document *University Evaluation Criteria* and the appropriate sections of the *Faculty Code*.
- B. Goals of the Psychology Department. The following objectives are listed in their order of relative importance to the mission of the department:
1. To contribute to the liberal arts education of students in a manner consistent with the stated goals of the University;
  2. Within the context of psychology, to contribute to students' understanding of the philosophy and purpose of science, the methods of empirical research, and the application of research;
  3. To contribute to students' understanding of the profession of psychology as a diverse discipline.
- C. Goals for Psychology Students. The department places heavy emphasis on educating students to be well-rounded individuals, knowledgeable about the discipline of scientific psychology. Our objectives for students include:
- a desire to learn that extends beyond the classroom;
  - a desire and capacity for self-reflection and the exploration of values;
  - an ability to think clearly and critically, acquiring, organizing and analyzing information effectively;
  - an ability to express ideas effectively, orally and in writing, within the discourse of the discipline;
  - an ability to operate in an increasingly technological world;
  - knowledge of interdisciplinary connections reflecting social science, natural science, and applied approaches to understanding human behavior;
  - an appreciation of the ethical concerns involved in the science and practice of psychology;
  - an appreciation and respect for diversity of behavior and opinions;

- an ability to think scientifically, including constructing arguments, using data as the primary source of evidence and understanding the relationships between theories, observations, and conclusions;
- a mastery of core concepts within a variety of psychology's sub-disciplines;
- proficiency in a core set of research skills common to the behavioral sciences;
- a depth of understanding in one or more topics within psychology;
- an understanding of the discipline of psychology as both a science and profession.

## II. Teaching

Teaching is a critical dimension in all evaluations, and proven excellence in teaching is required for tenure. With their passion for teaching, effective undergraduate instructors inspire students and serve as role models for the profession. Effective teachers promote critical thinking and communication skills. They foster an appreciation for the dual role of psychology as a scientific and applied discipline (as outlined in Section I.C).

This section outlines separately the qualities that contribute to teaching excellence (Section II.A) and the sources of evidence by which teaching excellence may be evaluated (Section II.B).

A. Dimensions of Teaching Excellence. High quality undergraduate instruction involves the development of mastery along the nine dimensions described below. At the time of tenure and beyond, faculty should provide evidence of overall excellence in teaching. Because excellent teachers have different instructional styles and strengths, individuals will vary in their approaches and methods, and the degree to which they emphasize each of the nine dimensions.

- Organization is characterized by efficient management of class time, clearly stated expectations of learning objectives and standards, and appropriate and timely feedback to students. Course objectives and scope should be carefully conceived and clearly communicated through well constructed syllabi.
- Course content should reflect the evaluatee's mastery of the subject and currency in the field. Content should also be consistent with the role of the course in the department and university, and include materials appropriate to the academic level of the course.
- Presentational skills include the stylistic techniques and materials needed to communicate information clearly and effectively.
- Faculty need to display the ability to engage students and to promote interest and curiosity about the subject. Engaging students requires an enthusiasm for the subject and for teaching, depth of knowledge about the subject, and carefully planned assignments, exercises, and readings.
- Faculty should promote students' intellectual growth by challenging students with creative, carefully conceived assignments, and providing opportunities for independent

thinking, reasoning, and writing. At the same time, faculty should set reasonable performance objectives and provide appropriate guidance.

- Assessment involves applying tools of appropriate rigor and scope to evaluate student performance, including students' abilities to reason, analyze, and write. Faculty should demonstrate careful evaluation of student work and provide feedback about areas necessary to improve performance.
- Innovation includes continued course development by incorporating current material, demonstrating a willingness to revise and refine assignments, and experimenting creatively with courses and assignments.
- Responsive and adaptable teachers are sensitive to individual differences among students. They have the flexibility to work with students of different backgrounds, at different academic levels and in a variety of teaching situations.
- Faculty should be accessible to students during posted office hours, by appointment, and through informal interactions.

B. Evidence of Teaching Excellence. The materials and methods used in the evaluation of teaching excellence are described below. The evidence should document the extent to which the faculty member demonstrates excellence along the aforementioned dimensions of teaching excellence and displays a passion for undergraduate education. Other supporting materials may be included at the faculty member's discretion.

- Course materials, including syllabi, examples of exams, and course assignments;
- The faculty member's self-reflective statement of professional objectives and philosophy;
- Regular class visitation by department faculty is an essential component of the process to provide ongoing constructive feedback and to evaluate teaching performance and effectiveness.
- Student evaluations are an important consideration in the evaluation of teaching excellence. However, because this type of evaluation can be influenced by factors other than teaching skill, student evaluations should typically be used in conjunction with other forms of evidence (e.g., class visitation, course materials).
- Availability to students outside of class may be evidenced by scheduled office hours, and colleagues' observations and personal knowledge of the faculty member's out-of-classroom interactions with students.
- Other relevant material may be used as evidence of teaching performance and pedagogical skill. Examples include video records of classroom instruction, class exercises, student accomplishments, and written statements from colleagues in team-taught interdisciplinary courses.

### III. Professional Growth

The Psychology Department expects faculty to engage in professional activities that contribute to the intellectual vitality of the department, university, and discipline. We recognize that teaching of the highest caliber is directly related to the intellectual strength and vibrancy of each faculty member. Sustained professional growth throughout the course of a faculty member's career ensures that students receive a solid education in the field of psychology as it evolves over time. It also increases the range and sophistication of our offerings to students as they prepare for graduate school and employment. Thus, currency in the field, extension of expertise in areas of specialization, and development of professional acumen are highly valued activities.

While we talk about psychology as a single discipline, it is increasingly evident that we have a diverse faculty whose training is grounded in a variety of sub-disciplines. This breadth of training supports a broad curriculum designed to meet the varied interests of students who major in psychology as well as those who take psychology courses to fulfill other requirements. The department values the diversity of faculty interests, goals, and theoretical emphases, recognizing that individual strengths enhance the collective effort. Such differences may lead to varied approaches to psychological inquiry in terms of theory, methodology, subject, and scope. It is therefore our goal to encourage the scholarly and professional development of faculty as best fits the values and methods of each person's particular sub-discipline.

Interdisciplinary research and collaborative research are encouraged when appropriate to the professional development of each faculty member. In particular, the involvement of students in faculty research is especially valued because it contributes to teaching and mentoring. However, student involvement may be less appropriate in some cases, given the nature of an individual faculty member's research. Thus the development of appropriate avenues for student collaboration in a given research program is left to the discretion of each faculty member.

Evaluation of Professional Growth. At the time of evaluation, each faculty member bears responsibility for demonstrating the vitality of his or her program of professional growth, as well as its relevance and scholarly value within the contexts of teaching and the discipline. A statement regarding professional growth must be included in the evaluation file and should describe in detail the faculty member's current and future activities related to professional growth. It should also clarify the goals, methods, time-lines, and expected outcomes related to professional activities and should include copies of all published and unpublished research, as well as documents related to other scholarly activity. The following dimensions of professional growth may be documented in the file, along with other aspects of scholarly work deemed relevant by the faculty member who is to be evaluated.

- A. Scholarship in the form of writing and publication is evidence of professional growth. Writing may focus on theoretical issues, empirical research, or applied topics. While publication in peer-reviewed journals is perhaps the clearest way to illustrate the impact of one's work in a given subfield, other forms of publication or activity may serve to document the relationship of a faculty member's work to the ongoing dialogue within a field or discipline. Several types of writing may serve as evidence of scholarly development including; journal articles (peer-reviewed and otherwise), books (single or edited volumes), chapters in edited volumes, monographs, reviews and commentary, research reports submitted to government agencies or other institutions, manuscripts of papers presented at professional meetings, research proposals submitted for funding, manuscripts in progress, professional writing published in other venues such as

organizational publications, collected abstracts or encyclopedias, as well as textbooks and published materials suitable for classroom use.

- B. Other activities may be documented as part of a faculty member's professional growth, including efforts to maintain currency in one's subfield, or to develop new areas of expertise. Documents supporting the following types of activity may be included in the file as evidence of professional growth and scholarly vitality.
- Professional consultation, research, and applied work. Such work is important to the degree that it increases faculty expertise and contributes to teaching excellence, scholarship and the mission of the University.
  - Educational pursuits which augment currency in one's field or support the development of new areas of expertise and competence. Such activities may include participation in conferences, workshops, programs of intensive study, graduate level courses, or other training experiences.
  - Editorial work in conjunction with journal editorships or ad-hoc editorial positions, grant reviewing.
  - Active involvement in the governance of the professional organizations in the individual's area of expertise.
  - Participation at professional conferences including presentations, chairing sessions, serving as a discussant, and attendance at relevant sessions.
  - Presentations of scholarly work and research to colleagues at other institutions or on campus.

#### IV. University Service

The Psychology Department values colleagues who are actively engaged in providing service to the department and university. Fulfilling this service requirement is important and can be done in a variety of ways. As stated in the University of Puget Sound Faculty Code:

"Reasonable participation in university service is expected of tenure-line faculty members. Service that advances the mission of the university includes participation in departmental and university governance, in co-curricular programs, in promoting intellectual vitality and a high quality of life on the campus, and in activities which help convey the nature and purpose of the university to its constituencies."

- A. Departmental service includes contributing to the curriculum review process, evaluating departmental colleagues, research or writing on behalf of the department, serving as department chair, attending departmental functions, organizing colloquia, bringing speakers to campus, and representing the department at university functions such as fall campus day.
- B. University service may include serving on university standing committees and ad hoc committees, advising or assisting student groups, recruiting and hiring (students and faculty), co-curricular involvement, and community service to the extent that it furthers the mission of the university.

## V. Advising

The Psychology Department endorses the statement on advising presented in the Professional Standards Committee memo (revised 5/99) which states:

“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 student’s 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 those who are.”

## VI. Needs of the Department and the University

In cases of tenure, the needs of the department and university will be assessed in relation to the goals listed in Section I of this document.

## VII. Faculty Evaluation Procedures

Deviations from the prescribed timeline for procedures are to be approved by the evaluatee and by departmental members participating in the evaluation. References to days indicate working days.

### A. University Level Evaluation.

1. The faculty member being evaluated will prepare a file according to the guidelines given in the *University Evaluation Criteria* which will include: a) a self-evaluative statement of performance during the review period; b) a summary of short- and long-term professional objectives regarding teaching and professional growth; c) course materials including syllabi, examples of examinations and assignments, and other pertinent materials; d) student evaluations; and e) materials relating to the faculty member's professional development. As indicated in Chapter III, Section 4a(1)(a) of the *Faculty Code.*, the evaluatee is responsible for providing relevant evaluation material.
2. The evaluatee is encouraged to plan ahead in cases of sabbaticals and leaves of absence to ensure that four semesters of student evaluations are available for cases of tenure and student evaluations for two semesters are available for promotion, three-year, and five-year reviews. The evaluatee will notify the head officer at the time the faculty member submits the file to the department as to whether the file is open or closed (required in tenure reviews). The file is to be submitted at least six weeks prior to the date on which evaluation materials are due in the office of the Dean.

3. Full-time tenure-line faculty will normally participate in the evaluation. Non-tenure-line faculty will not participate as evaluators.
4. Colleagues are encouraged to discuss informally the file with the evaluatee during the review process.
5. Departmental colleagues are expected to visit the evaluatee's classes and to document class visitation in their individual letters. To encourage visitation prior to the evaluation deadline, at the beginning of spring semester the Chair will notify colleagues about which faculty are scheduled for evaluation the following academic year.
6. At least ten working days prior to the deadline for submission of the file to the Academic Vice President's office, individual letters of evaluation, which are to include a recommendation concerning the evaluation review, are to be submitted to the head officer. Letters may also be submitted directly to the academic dean. In the case of closed files, letters from UPS faculty members sent directly to the dean will be summarized by the advancement committee. For both open and closed reviews, the head officer will summarize other individual letters from psychology department faculty. The head officer will provide the evaluatee with a copy of the departmental summary letter at least three working days prior to the deliberative meeting. The summary letter is to be signed by all letter writers to indicate that the major points of their letters are presented in the summary. Consistent with the statement issued from the Professional Standards Committee, outside letters of evaluation must be received by the chair or head officer ten working days prior to the published date that the file is due at the Dean's office. In the case of an open file, the head officer will not summarize outside letters of evaluation. In the case of a closed file, the head officer will provide a separate summary of outside letters to the evaluatee at least two working days prior to the deliberative meeting. Outside letters may also be included in the file directly by the evaluatee.
7. Within three working days after receiving the summary of individual letters, the evaluatee has the option of requesting a formal group meeting with departmental members before the deliberative meeting.
8. The purpose of the deliberative meeting, which is held in the absence of the evaluatee, is to review the contents of the evaluatee's file and to reach a departmental recommendation about the evaluatee's performance during the review period. Only department members who have submitted individual letters to the head officer or Dean prior to the deliberative meeting may participate in the meeting. During the meeting, each area being evaluated--teaching, professional growth, advising, service, and, in the case of tenure, needs of the department--is to be discussed. After discussion, the head officer will conduct a formal written vote to determine the department's recommendation. In cases of tenure or promotion, the vote will concentrate on whether or not the department recommends the change of status. For all other evaluations, the vote will consider whether the evaluatee meets or does not meet expectations for the evaluation. All discussion in the deliberative meeting is confidential.
9. The head officer will provide the evaluatee with a copy of a summary of the deliberations and the departmental recommendation within one week after the deliberative meeting. The summary will contain an explicit count of votes in cases of tenure and promotion. An explicit count of votes will not be included in cases where there is no change of

status. All participating members will sign the deliberations summary to indicate that it is an accurate summary of the deliberative meeting.

10. Individual faculty members who submit letters to the head officer may provide the head officer with addenda to those letters no later than two days after the deliberative meeting. Within a week of receiving addenda, the head officer will inform the evaluatee in writing of the names of individuals who submit addenda and, in the case of a closed file only, will provide the evaluatee with a summary of the content of addenda. Department members who submit individual letters to the head officer may not submit addenda to the Dean.

Individuals who submit individual letters directly to the Dean may not submit addenda to the head officer, but may submit addenda directly to the Dean by the date that the file is due to the Dean. When addenda are submitted directly to the Dean's office, in the case of a closed file only, the FAC will provide the evaluatee with a summary.

11. At any time after the evaluatee has received the departmental summary letters and the evaluatee's file has been forwarded to the Dean, if the evaluatee wishes to discuss the summary letters, the evaluatee may request to meet with the Chair, with individual members of the department, or with the department as a whole.
12. After the evaluatee has been notified by the Office of the Dean that the file is ready for review and after the evaluatee has reviewed the file (non-confidential letters) or the file and head officer's summary of confidential letters, then as stated in the Faculty Code (Chapter III, Section 4, b.), if "the individual feels that he or she has been unfairly or inadequately evaluated by the department, school or program, that individual has the right to pursue those concerns (1) informally or (2) formally." Both formal and informal challenges to the department evaluation should follow timelines and procedures described in the Faculty Code.
13. As stated in the code (Chapter III, Section 4.d. (1)), "Within a reasonable period, but no later than four months after receiving the report of the evaluation from the Advancement Committee--or in the case of a tenure decision, upon report of a favorable decision by the Board of Trustees--the head officer shall review with each evaluatee the results of the evaluation."

#### B. Departmental Level Evaluation

As required by the *Faculty Code* (Chapter III, Section 2b.), for the first two years of a non-tenured faculty member's appointment, the Chair will conduct an evaluation of the individual's performance. This evaluation will be based upon review of student evaluations, class visitations, and discussions with the evaluatee. The evaluation may also include information provided by other departmental colleagues at the request of the evaluatee. Copies of the summary of the evaluation at the end of each year will be provided to the evaluatee and will be forwarded to the Dean of Faculty.

If a full-time non-tenure-line faculty member anticipates the possibility of continued full-time employment beyond a third year, then the necessity of conducting a third-year review should be discussed with the Chair.



C. Teaching Mentoring Committee

1. In consultation with the department chair, a tenure-line faculty member may request a team of up to three members beginning in the first year of the appointment. The team will usually include the chair and two additional faculty members. Membership of this team may change as needed or desired. It is the function of the mentoring team to provide guidance and suggestions to the new faculty member through the tenure evaluation. It is also the function of the mentoring team to engage in a process of regular, on-going classroom visitation, extending until the tenure evaluation. Responsibility for demonstrating that he or she meets the standards for tenure or promotion rests with the evaluatee. The existence of mentoring teams is not meant to preclude or discourage other members of the department from class visitation, from giving feedback and encouragement, and from fulfilling their obligations for evaluation according to the Faculty Code. All faculty members are expected to visit colleagues' classes as outlined in our evaluation guidelines. At the end of each of the first two years of the faculty member's appointment, the chair will prepare the evaluation report of the new faculty member in consultation with the mentoring team.
2. Full-time non-tenure-line faculty in a multi-year position may also request a mentoring team consisting of the Chair and up to two additional faculty members. Membership of this team may change as needed or desired. It is the function of the mentoring team to provide guidance and suggestions to the new faculty member and may include classroom visitation, feedback regarding student evaluations, and discussions with the faculty member. At the end of each of the first two years of the faculty member's appointment, the chair will prepare the evaluation report of the new faculty member in consultation with the mentoring team.