

Department Approved: 08/31/06
College Approved: 03/05/07
Dean Approved: 04/16/07
University Committee Approved: 05/08/07
Provost Approved: 05/30/07

Department of Psychology Criteria for Academic Rank, Tenure and Merit

Philosophy

The Department of Psychology is committed to the teacher-scholar model (Boyer, 1990) and views interaction with students as an essential element of the afore-mentioned model. Beyond that, department members have broad and diverse interests and the criteria for academic rank and tenure specified here attempt to reflect the Department's broad interests but also recognize the limitations inherent in any such scheme. The absence of a particular activity within the stated criteria is not meant to reflect the Department's disapproval of that activity or the view that such an activity lacks value. The Department recognizes that many accomplishments by faculty members may fall outside the actual criteria specified in this document. Faculty members are encouraged to document and substantiate the significance of any such accomplishments they regard as significant. Furthermore, with respect to the use of student evaluation data, the Department reminds its members that the responsibility for demonstrating that criteria are met ultimately resides with the faculty member. However, the Department does not specifically require that student evaluations be a part of the dossier presented by a faculty member. The Department recognizes that the use of such standardized rating forms or assessments may not adequately capture the effectiveness of one's teaching and that many other ways of demonstrating teaching effectiveness may better represent the faculty member's abilities and talents. In fact, presenting standardized student evaluations as the sole measure of one's effectiveness is inappropriate.

Further, the Department's criteria have been developed with an eye toward minimization of superfluous detail. With respect to the construction of the Record of Service, faculty members are encouraged to concentrate their energies on noting and substantiating those activities that they regard as significant contributors to their growth as a faculty member. The Department recognizes that the traditional conception of the Record of Service implicitly required the documentation of many more activities than was necessary for advancement in status or rank. Henceforth, the Department specifically instructs its members to document and substantiate ONLY those activities that relate specifically to their meeting the criteria qualifying them for advancement. As this instruction relates to the use of student evaluation data, the Department specifically directs its members seeking tenure, promotion, or merit to be guided by guidelines and requirements specified in the Faculty Handbook.

These criteria have also been developed with an eye toward the future, as far as such is possible. This document recognizes the likelihood that we will be unable to fully anticipate future developments in technological or other areas (electronic publishing, teleconferencing, etc.) but has included language that may accommodate such development. Further, concern for the future direction and orientation of the Department is also manifest in this document. Such concern is reflected in the Department's desire to provide clear, unambiguous, and explicitly stated criteria that will be applied uniformly and are consistent with the stipulations of the Faculty Handbook, with the criteria specified in this document, and with criteria that exist in other departments on this campus. Consistency in the nature and application of criteria is regarded as essential to the maintenance of faculty morale and the support of optimal faculty performance. Ambiguous criteria or the application of unstated (and unapproved) performance criteria by evaluators (administrators and their advisory bodies) is unfair and inconsistent with the fundamental nature of a collegial environment.

Categories to be Considered for Merit, Promotion and Tenure

Teaching Effectiveness
Professional Growth
Service

Performance Levels for Merit, Promotion and Tenure

Outstanding
Superior
Good
Unacceptable

Minimum Performance Levels for Merit, Promotion and Tenure

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Post-Professorial Merit: | Requires a rating of <i>outstanding</i> in one category and <i>superior</i> in the remaining two categories. |
| Professor: | Requires a rating of <i>outstanding</i> in one category and <i>superior</i> in the remaining two categories. |
| Associate Professor: | Requires a rating of <i>superior</i> in two categories (one of which is Teaching Effectiveness) and a rating of <i>good</i> in the remaining category. |
| Tenure: | Requires a rating of <i>superior</i> in two categories (one of which is Teaching Effectiveness) and a rating of <i>good</i> in the remaining category. |
| Assistant Professor: | A rating of <i>good</i> in all three categories |

Minimum time periods and other qualifying criteria associated with promotion, tenure, or merit are specified in the Faculty Handbook.

Minimum Standards of Performance Expected for All Department of Psychology Faculty Regardless of Rank or Tenure Status

The Department of Psychology has established minimum standards of performance for all faculty, which include the following:

- Instruct all assigned classes on a regular basis and make all reasonable efforts to have his/her classes covered during excused absences (e.g., professional travel, illness) during the semester when courses are assigned
- Collect student evaluations of instruction as described in the Faculty Handbook during semesters when courses are assigned
- Maintain regular office hours during semesters when courses are assigned
- Regularly attend department meetings during semesters when courses are assigned (exceptions may be approved by the chairperson)
- Conduct themselves in a collegial, respectful, and ethical manner toward colleagues, students, and staff

Criteria for Promotion and Tenure for Department of Psychology Faculty

Promotion in rank or the granting of tenure requires performance in the three categories of Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Growth, and Service that exceeds the minimum standards of performance expected of all department faculty.

In the document that follows, specific Areas of Evaluation within each of the three categories are identified. Following this, performance levels appropriate for each category are immediately specified.

Determination of whether a faculty member has sufficiently demonstrated and documented Teaching Effectiveness and the relevance of activities in Professional Growth and Service will be evaluated in a qualitative manner. Determination of whether the required number of activities achieved by a candidate for a specific performance level will then be made in a quantitative manner as described in the definitions of Outstanding, Superior, and Good for each category.

Because the primary mission of the University is teaching, the Promotion and Tenure Criteria emphasize activities that reflect effective teaching. However, research (Professional Growth) is an integral element of faculty professional life and contributes to teaching in a variety of ways. Further, service to the University and community is part of the mission of the Department and is an important element of faculty performance.

Time and effort devoted to each of those categories may vary across time; however, during the time spent in rank a candidate for promotion should distribute his or her time so that an appropriate level of performance is achieved in all three categories. The activities listed in each category are suggestive, but by no means prescriptive nor exhaustive. As technology and the field of psychology expand, professional activities may also change. Faculty advancing their case for tenure, promotion, or merit should feel free to list activities that they regard as significant in their professional lives, and to provide a rationale for and evidence of the significance of those activities.

Definitions of terms used in these criteria:

Sustained: Ongoing performance for the period of time in rank with an emphasis on the last four years. In the case of post-professorial merit, for the last five years.

Satisfactory: In general, the quality and quantity of achievements represent an acceptable level of performance, but do not exceed the minimum standards of performance expected of all faculty specified in the preceding section.

Significant: Performance that represents a meaningful contribution resulting from sustained effort that exceeds the level defined as satisfactory.

Considerable: An achievement evidenced by a meaningful contribution that may not reflect a sustained effort.

Categories Considered: Specification of Areas of Evaluation and Performance Levels with Each Category

I. Category: Teaching Effectiveness

Philosophy

The Department of Psychology regards Teaching Effectiveness as the most important of the three major responsibilities of any faculty member. All faculty are expected to be well organized and present appropriate content to students, to provide timely evaluations of student work and to promote a positive classroom atmosphere in which learning can

occur. Moreover, faculty are expected to conduct student evaluations of instruction in accordance with University and Department policy each semester in each class.

A. Areas of Evaluation for Teaching Effectiveness

Documentation of specific activities that clearly shows Teaching Effectiveness to students should be included here. Entries are neither prescriptive nor exhaustive. The following categories (e.g., a, b, c, or 1, 2, 3) are not rank ordered in importance, unless otherwise noted.

1. Delivery of Effective Classroom Instruction to Students

- a. Student evaluation data
 1. Explanation of how student evaluations of performance have been used to improve effectiveness of teaching. Summary evaluation data emphasizing the last four (or five) years *may* be used to substantiate sustained or improved teaching effectiveness but the actual student evaluation data sheets specific to each class need not be presented.
 2. Inclusion of formal student evaluations of instruction reporting the results from individual classes using the Department's approved form clearly showing a satisfactory level of teaching performance (at or above a midpoint of 3 on a 5-point scale for most items included on the evaluation instrument, with adequate explanations for items that may fall below the midpoint). Extensive longitudinal data related to the use of its evaluation instrument provides a normative reference for the use of the midpoint of the scale.
 3. Inclusion of informal student evaluations in narrative form that clearly show that instructional delivery was effective.
- b. Observational evaluations of instructional delivery by other professionals (e.g., chairperson, peers, dean, etc.) that clearly show effective delivery of instruction.
- c. Use of innovative teaching techniques, teaching aids, informational systems technology, or demonstrations that clearly contribute to improved effectiveness of instructional delivery.
- d. Other activities that clearly show effective classroom instructional delivery to students and are deemed relevant to Area 1.

2. Delivery of Effective Individual Instruction to Students

- a. Chair or Member of Graduation with Distinction Committee (can only be listed once: here or in II. A. 3 or III. A. 2)
- b. Faculty Mentor of PY484 Student Project
- c. Chair or Member of Master's Thesis Committee/Ph.D. Committee (can be listed here or in III. A. 2, but not both)
- d. Contracts with Honors Students

- e. Supervision of the Publication or Presentation (at local, state, regional, or national conferences) of Student Work
- f. Supervision of Independent Readings or Independent Research/Studies by Students
- g. Other activities that clearly show effective individual instructional delivery to students and are deemed relevant to Area 2.

3. Course/Curriculum Development or Improvement

- a. Significant development or incorporation of new course materials as necessary to enhance learning experiences for students or to keep course content current with the discipline
- b. Major revision of current courses
- c. Attendance/participation in organized activities that significantly contribute directly or indirectly to course improvement or improvement in teaching techniques
- d. Course/program development or revision of program in major or minor
- e. Evidence of significant evaluation of existing teaching techniques or significant development/improvement of teaching techniques
- f. Obtaining internal funding, or applying for or obtaining external funding, for the improvement of teaching
- g. Pedagogical presentation or publication (a specific accomplishment may be included here or under Professional Growth, but not both)
- h. Reviews of textbooks reflecting a significant investment of time and effort.
- i. Other Activities Deemed Relevant to Area 3 as determined by the candidate.

B. Specification of Performance Levels for Teaching Effectiveness

Outstanding:

All elements of the Department's Philosophy regarding Teaching are evidenced in the sustained performance of the faculty member.

Evidence of achievement of five activities in Areas 1, 2, and 3 (at least one activity in each of the three Areas is required) for the period of time in rank with an emphasis on the last four (or five) years.

Within Area 1, faculty members must specifically address either a. 1. or a. 2. Accomplishment of the number of activities required constitutes significant achievement.

Superior:

All elements of the Department's Philosophy regarding Teaching are evidenced in the sustained performance of the faculty member.

Evidence of achievement of four activities in Areas 1, 2, and 3 (at least one activity in each of the three Areas is required) for the period of time in rank with an emphasis on the last four (or five) years.

Within Area 1, faculty members must specifically address either a. 1. or a. 2. Accomplishment of the number of activities required constitutes significant achievement.

Good:

All elements of the Department's Philosophy regarding Teaching are evidenced in the sustained performance of the faculty member.

Evidence of achievement of three activities in Areas 1, 2 and 3 (at least one activity in each of the three Areas is required) for the period of time in rank with an emphasis on the last four (or five) years.

Within Area 1, faculty members must specifically address either a. 1. or a. 2.

Unacceptable:

All elements of the Department's Philosophy regarding Teaching are not evidenced in the sustained performance of the faculty member or insufficient evidence is presented regarding teaching effectiveness.

II. Category: Professional Growth

Philosophy

The Department of Psychology regards activity in the category of Professional Growth as an essential part of being an effective faculty member. All department faculty should participate in ongoing scholarly activity that promises to lead to a peer-reviewed presentation or publication (an example might be "substantial evidence of scholarly work" on a specific manuscript to be submitted). In addition department faculty should maintain currency in and connection with their profession by engaging in professional activities related to licensure or certification, or by attendance at professional meetings.

A. Areas of Evaluation for Professional Growth

Documentation of specific activities that clearly shows evidence of Professional Growth should be included here. Entries are neither prescriptive nor exhaustive. The following categories (e.g., a, b, c, or 1, 2, 3) are not rank ordered in importance, unless otherwise noted.

1. Significant Involvement in Professional Growth

- a. Peer reviewed, scholarly publication: journal articles, books, chapters in edited books, monographs, etc., in traditional paper or electronic form.*
- b. Peer reviewed, scholarly presentations at international, national or regional professional meetings*
- c. Invited presentations at professional meetings
- d. External grant applications or receipt
- e. Member of editorial board for professional journal
- f. Sabbatical leave at external site related to development of ongoing scholarly activity

- g. Other activities deemed relevant to Area 1 as determined by the candidate

*Professional journals and professional conferences in Psychology do not provide data on acceptance rates. Moreover, such data would be flawed by virtue of self-selection. However, clear evidence is available regarding whether a paper is peer-reviewed.

Note: Achievement of "significant" can be accomplished by sustained activity OR by a single act of considerable merit (e.g., being elected as President of APA, serving as the Editor of an APA journal).

Note: Publications/presentations with student co-authors may be listed here or in I: A, 2, but only in one category. For other publications with multiple authors, the candidate's level of contribution to publication should be indicated.

2. Involvement in Professional Growth

- a. Presentations at state or local professional meetings
- b. Other publications: book reviews, articles in professional magazines, consulting reports
- c. Internal grant application or receipt
- d. Serving as anonymous reviewer for professional journal or professional conference
- e. Preparation of manuals, research instruments/methods
- f. Submission of manuscript for professional review
- g. Other activities deemed relevant to Area 2 as determined by the candidate

3. Involvement in Other Professional Activities

- a. Chair of Graduation with Distinction Committee (can be listed here or in I: A. 2. or III A. 2., but not both)
- b. Faculty Mentor of PY484 student project (can be listed here or in I: A. 2., but not both)
- c. Member of Graduation with Distinction Committee (can only be listed once: here or in I. A. 2 or III: A. 2)
- d. Leadership in professional/academic organizations at the state, regional, or national level
- e. Activities at professional conferences (chairs, organizing, etc.)
- f. Attendance at professional meetings or workshops (for professional self-development and/or maintaining licensure/certification)
- g. Membership in professional organizations with clearly demonstrated benefits for professional growth
- h. Sabbatical leave on-campus
- i. Post-doctoral study
- j. Professional consultation
- k. Reviews of textbooks for publishers or for professional journals
- l. Other activities deemed relevant to Area 3 as determined by the candidate

B. Specification of Performance Levels for Professional Development

Outstanding:

All elements of the Department's Philosophy regarding Professional Growth are evidenced in the sustained performance of the faculty member.

Evidence of achievement of five activities in Areas 1, 2, and 3 (at least one activity in each of the three Areas is required) for the period of time in rank with an emphasis on the last four (or five) years.

Within Area 1, candidates must have a minimum of two publications in the time period specified or the candidate must make a strong case that other activity is equivalent to two publications.

Superior:

All elements of the Department's Philosophy regarding Professional Growth are evidenced in the sustained performance of the faculty member.

Evidence of achievement of four activities in Areas 1, 2, and 3 (at least one activity in each of the three Areas is required) for the period of time in rank with an emphasis on the last four (or five) years.

Within Area 1, candidates must have a minimum of one publication in the time period specified or the candidate must make a strong case that other activity is equivalent to one publication.

Good:

All elements of the Department's Philosophy regarding Professional Growth are evidenced in the sustained performance of the faculty member.

Evidence of achievement of three activities in Areas 1, 2 and 3 (at least one activity in each of the three Areas is required) for the period of time in rank with an emphasis on the last four (or five) years.

Unacceptable:

All elements of the Department's philosophy regarding Professional Growth are not evidenced in the sustained performance of the faculty member or insufficient evidence is presented regarding professional growth.

III. Category: Service

Philosophy

The Department of Psychology regards activity in the category of Service as an important part of being an effective faculty member. All department faculty should actively participate in the advising of department majors and regularly attend faculty meetings. During the evaluation period, faculty should serve on at least one departmental committee and participate in at least one on-campus University advising or recruitment activity.

A. Areas of Evaluation for Service

Documentation of specific activities that clearly shows evidence of Service should be included here. Entries are neither prescriptive nor exhaustive. The following categories (e.g., a, b, c, or 1, 2, 3) are not rank ordered in importance, unless otherwise noted.

1. Academic/Administrative Service

- a. Chair of departmental/college/university committee

- b. Evidence of significant contributions to at least one university, college, or departmental committee
- c. Membership on at least one college/university/community committee (candidate should demonstrate how community memberships are related to one's profession)
- d. Other activities deemed relevant to Area 1 as determined by the candidate

2. Other Service

- a. Sponsorship of a student group
- b. Use of professional expertise on campus or in community (e.g., schools or other community organizations)
- c. Representation of the department in on- or off-campus activities that promote the University
- d. Submission or receipt of non-research grants and contracts in support of institutional programs
- e. Other service to the university (e.g., report writing, service on task forces, other service assignments)
- f. Sharing expertise with other faculty members (e.g., CSTL, mentoring)
- g. Regular advising in excess of a normal load
- h. Regular teaching in excess of a normal load
- i. Chair or member of a master's thesis committee (can be listed here or in I. A. 2, but not both)
- j. Chair or member of a Graduation with Distinction committee (can only be listed once (here or in I. A. 2 or in II. A. 3)
- k. Professional consultation with individual university faculty (e.g., statistics, research design, grants, web course design, etc.).
- l. Engaging in advising or recruiting in special circumstances (e.g., Show Me Days, First Step, etc.)
- m. Regular participation in Psi Chi or Psychology Club events
- n. Other activities deemed relevant to Area 2 as determined by the candidate

B. Specification of Performance Levels for Service

Outstanding:

All elements of the Department's Philosophy regarding Service are evidenced in the sustained performance of the faculty member.

Evidence of participation in four activities in Areas 1 and 2 (at least one activity in each of the two Areas is required); two of which should be in Area 1, for the period of time in rank with an emphasis on the last four (or five) years.

In order to receive a rating of outstanding, the faculty member must engage in activities that extend beyond the University to the community and serve to significantly advance the reputation of Psychology.

Superior:

All elements of the Department's Philosophy regarding Service are evidenced in the sustained performance of the faculty member.

Evidence of participation in three activities in Areas 1 and 2 (at least one activity in each of the two Areas is required) for the period of time in rank with an emphasis on the last four (or five) years.

Good:

All elements of the Department's Philosophy regarding Service are evidenced in the sustained performance of the faculty member.

Evidence of participation in two activities in Areas 1 and 2 (at least one activity in each of the two Areas is required) for the period of time in rank with an emphasis on the last four (or five) years.

Unacceptable:

All elements of the Department's Philosophy regarding Service are not evidenced in the sustained performance of the faculty member or insufficient evidence is presented regarding involvement in service.