

STATEMENT OF EVALUATION STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES

PROGRAM IN SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND SOCIETY UNIVERSITY OF PUGET SOUND

Drafted May 2008/ Revised October 2008

Approved by the Professional Standards Committee, October 31, 2008

I. This document governs the evaluation of faculty in the Program in Science, Technology and Society (STS). This statement complements the provisions of the *Faculty Code* regarding faculty evaluation.

II. The mission of the Program in Science, Technology and Society at the University of Puget Sound is to educate undergraduate students in the processes by which people and cultures discover the operations of the natural world and apply these discoveries in their own societies. For science and technology are not isolated activities: they are inextricably linked to every other aspect of human experience. Science and technology have important connections to literature, philosophy, religion, art, economics, and to social and political history. Scientific evidence and argument are part of continuing lively debates on issues at every level of generality: social policy, the utilization of natural resources, the allocation of health care, the origin and evolution of life, the place of humankind in the natural order, and the nature of the universe. Students in the STS Program should develop an understanding of (1) how the broader culture influences the development of science and how science influences different societies and cultures, and (2) the interplay between science and economics, politics, religion, and values in contemporary decision making. The STS faculty are committed to fostering an atmosphere of scholarly inquiry and discovery in order to prepare students for careers as well as for lives as active and responsible citizens. Faculty members of the Program affirm their commitment to excellence in teaching and to professional growth as scholars. As part of that commitment, members of the faculty participate in periodic evaluation of our colleagues, following the standards, criteria, and procedures described below, in the *Faculty Code*, and in the document *Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures*.

III. Standards and Criteria

In general (except in the case of a tenure decision), the STS Program will evaluate a faculty member having the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor on the basis of his or her teaching, professional growth, university service, advising, and potentially community service. But, in conformity with the *Faculty Code*, an evaluation for tenure will be made on the basis of teaching, professional growth, university service, and the needs of the STS Program and the university. See Section V for the evaluation of instructors.

A. Teaching

The STS Program's benchmarks for excellent teaching include:

1. that faculty members demonstrate expertise in one or more of the subjects usually associated with the undergraduate STS curriculum. These include history of science, technology and medicine; philosophy of science; social studies of science; science and religion; science and literature; science and public policy. Faculty should also have the range to teach courses outside their areas of expertise, including courses for non-STs majors.

2. that faculty members teach their courses in ways that address significant issues in STS.

3. that faculty members communicate effectively with students, showing an ability to formulate and express ideas clearly, and an understanding of the difficulties students may have facing the ideas for the first time.

4. that faculty set high standards for students and are effective in motivating students to meet those standards.

5. that faculty encourage students to assume responsibility for their own learning, in their day-to-day course work, as well as in independent study and research.

6. that faculty are accessible to students.

7. and that faculty draw on a variety of learning and teaching techniques in their courses, such as lectures, discussions, demonstrations, expository writing, and others. The Program encourages faculty to develop as teachers by trying new methods in their quest to improve their teaching. The Program recognizes that a wide range of teaching styles can be effective and that not everyone teaches most effectively in exactly the same way.

These benchmarks provide goals for all teachers in the program. A faculty member completing a successful evaluation will normally demonstrate teaching effectiveness in terms of these benchmarks; but he or she need not be judged excellent against every single benchmark to be judged an excellent teacher.

Evidence to be considered in the evaluation of a colleague's teaching will include:

1. that colleague's personal statement of teaching philosophy and self-evaluation,

2. the colleague's effectiveness in the classroom, as assessed through class visitation,

3. student course evaluations, and
4. course materials, including syllabi, assignments, and tests. The STS Program recognizes that important teaching also takes place outside the classroom. The faculty member's effectiveness in informal teaching settings may also be taken into account.

B. Professional Growth

The STS faculty's primary mission as teachers must be supported by ongoing professional growth and active intellectual engagement with the discipline. The Program values the intellectual growth of its faculty and an atmosphere of vigorous scholarly inquiry. Consequently the STS Program stipulates:

1. that a faculty member should show professional growth throughout his or her career. Thus, a significant portion of each year should be devoted to professional growth. It is also expected that sabbatical leaves will contribute to this work. The Program holds a broad view of professional growth. Examples of activities that contribute to professional growth include: (1) original scholarly research and publication. (2) scholarly research that does not necessarily lead to publication, but is presented to the scholarly community in some form. The Program recognizes that not every research project leads to a result publishable in a research journal. This is especially likely to be true of projects undertaken to develop a course in a new subdiscipline, or of projects designed to provide student research opportunities. The Program values such activities; but it is important that the results of such efforts be communicated in some form—whether as a paper, or a seminar or colloquium. (3) other kinds of scholarly writing and publication. These include, but are not limited to, the writing of textbooks, contributions to the literature of STS pedagogy, and science writing for the general public. (4) participation in seminars, professional meetings or other scholarly activities that assist in maintaining one's currency in the discipline or extend one's expertise into a new specialty. (5) the development of new teaching methods, experiments, demonstrations, or entire courses when such development goes well beyond ordinary course preparation.

2. that at each evaluation the faculty member should present written evidence of professional growth. Examples of acceptable evidence include: Published articles or books, manuscripts submitted for publication, progress reports, proposals for funding, manuscripts in progress, detailed written descriptions of new projects that have been implemented, and texts of public lectures.

3. that a faculty member should be engaged with the STS community both at the University of Puget Sound and in the broader world outside. Engagement with the STS community at the University contributes to the scholarly and educational endeavors of the Program. Engagement with the STS community outside the University fosters the intellectual growth of the individual faculty member and helps to keep the University STS Program lively and up-to-date. There are many ways of being engaged with the STS community at the University of Puget Sound. They include: presenting the results of one's research at seminars or colloquia at the University of Puget Sound,

collaborating on research projects with UPS colleagues, or involving students in research. Ways of being engaged with the STS community outside UPS include: participating in professional societies, collaborating with scholars at other institutions, presenting papers at conferences, editing a journal, reviewing proposals for support or papers for publication, organizing scientific meetings, reviewing books for scholarly and publications, and so on.

4. and that a faculty member may not always have been engaged in every one of these activities in a single year or a single evaluation cycle. In a normal career, a faculty member may move back and forth among several different kinds of professional growth.

5. but that tenure, promotion to associate professor, and promotion to full professor will always require the demonstration of scholarly accomplishment through publication. Articles, books, and other forms of publication will be considered as meeting this requirement, provided that they have been published or accepted for publication at the time of the evaluation. While evidence of publication in this form is required for these three evaluations, a broader array of evidence may still be considered in making an overall assessment of professional growth, including works in progress and works submitted for publication for which a decision is still pending.

University Service

Faculty members are expected to contribute to the goals of the Program and University through service on faculty committees and by sharing administrative duties. Examples of contributions are service as a member of the STS Advisory Board or as Program Director, acting as library liaison, coordinating the STS Seminar Series, serving as the Program representative to University public-relations functions, serving as Program representative on projects involving the admissions office or scholarship committees, service on Program or University search committees, serving as faculty advisor to a student group. Participation in the intellectual and cultural life of the University is also a form of service. While a record of service is expected of faculty members, it is of less importance in the evaluation process than teaching or professional growth.

Advising

All members of the STS Program are expected to participate in the University's advising program. Effective advising requires that a faculty member be acquainted with Program and University requirements and procedures. It also requires faculty members to recognize the different needs of different students while striving to foster independence in all students. Effective advising will be considered in evaluations, but it is less important than teaching and professional growth.

Community Service

Consideration should be given to community service outside the university that is related to professional interest and expertise and that enhances a person's value to the

university or enriches teaching. While such community service is valued, it is not required, and it should in any case weigh less in evaluation than teaching, professional growth, university service or advising.

IV. Procedures

A. Responsibility of the individual being evaluated.

The individual being evaluated shall prepare a file containing the following material:

1. A statement regarding his or her philosophy, professional objectives, and accomplishments.
2. Samples of course materials, e.g., syllabi, assignments, and tests.
3. Written evidence of professional growth.
4. Student evaluations of all courses taught during the previous two semesters of teaching in promotion, 3-year, and 5-year evaluation cases, and during the previous 4 semesters in tenure cases.
5. Any other information the faculty member believes will be useful to the Program members and the Faculty Advancement Committee.

B. Responsibility of program colleagues in the evaluation process.

1. An evaluation committee shall be formed in conformity with the section of *Faculty Code* pertaining to evaluations in interdisciplinary programs. Its members may be drawn from: (1) members of the STS Program, (2) members of the STS Advisory Board, and (3) the faculty of cognate disciplines. In cases involving tenure or promotion, the minimum size of the evaluation committee shall be five. In other cases the minimum size of the committee shall be three.
2. Members of the evaluation committee shall read the file prepared by the individual being evaluated.
3. Members of the evaluation committee should be involved in an ongoing process of class visitations.
4. Each member of the evaluation committee shall write a letter evaluating the individual in light of the program needs and the criteria and standards stated in Section III. These letters must be delivered to the chair of the evaluation committee before any deliberative meeting of that committee takes place.

5. The evaluation committee shall meet without the candidate to formulate a program recommendation.
6. The chair of the evaluation committee shall inform the candidate of the results of the program deliberations and its recommendation to the Academic Dean and the Advancement Committee.

V. Instructors

Instructors are expected to meet the same high standards of teaching that are expected of assistant, associate, and full professors. However, the expectations for professional growth are not the same. A level of study and professional involvement is expected, as required to maintain currency in areas related to the instructor's teaching responsibilities. Instructors are expected to serve the Program by sharing equally in those duties related to the teaching program, such as design of courses, curriculum revision, and so on. Instructors are also expected to participate effectively in the University's advising program.

The procedures for evaluation of an instructor are the same as those described in Section IV.