Department of Psychology

College of Letters, Arts and Sciences
University of Colorado Colorado Springs

Criteria, Standards and Evidence for Reappointment,
Promotion and Tenure

July 1, 2020

Psychology Department
Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Processes

Introduction

Standards and processes for reappointment, promotion and tenure of faculty are governed by Article V and Appendix A of the Laws of the Regents. These are further delineated in a series of CU Administrative Policy Statements. Campus guidance is supplied in UCCS Policy # 200-001.

The criteria are to be considered guidelines for evaluation of candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure in the Department of Psychology at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in our discipline. Each candidate's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. The department is committed to quality teaching and scholarship, and effective service and/or leadership to the university, the profession, and the community. The evaluation process assumes: possession of an appropriate terminal degree; competent education and training in the discipline(s); conduct which reflects the professional and academic standards for generating, validating, disputing, and transmitting knowledge; and an appreciation of and respect for the rights, duties, and privileges associated with academic freedom and collegial responsibilities.

When these criteria are applied to faculty who were granted time toward tenure, the work performed during the years granted toward tenure shall be considered equivalent to work performed at UCCS. While a faculty member's career record will be considered in personnel actions described here, the main emphasis of evaluation will be on work performed at UCCS and, in particular, on progress since the last review.

Processes

As the Primary Unit, the Psychology Department faculty will be responsible for the primary unit-level review of all faculty for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

The Psychology Department Chair (henceforth referred to as "the Chair") will meet with each candidate for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure (RPT) to inform them of the procedures and policies associated with RPT, the associated timelines, and discuss, composition of the primary unit evaluation committee (PUC).

The Department Chair will be empowered by the faculty to make a recommendation to the Dean for members of the PUC that is appropriate to perform the review of the qualifications of the candidate for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. A PUC must contain no fewer than 5 members. The PUC will have the majority of its members from the Psychology department; however, members from other academic units may be selected when their area of expertise allows for sound judgment of the candidate's record.

For promotion to Associate Professor and evaluation for tenure, the PUC will include only tenured faculty. Reviews for promotion to Full Professor require that the PUC be composed entirely of Full Professors. Individuals may participate in an RPT review at a single level in the process; for example, if a faculty member serves on a higher-level review committee, they may not serve on the PUC. The Department Chair will not serve on any PUC.

For promotion to Associate Professor and evaluation for tenure, and for promotion to Full Professor, the candidate must provide the Chair of the PUC with a list of possible outside reviewers (including addresses, telephone, email information, a brief biography of each, and a statement of any past interactions with each potential reviewer). The PUC Chair can select from that list and may add to it. The candidate has the right to request that specific people be excluded from the list of possible external reviewers. Outside reviewers should be selected because of their expertise in the area of the candidate's research and must clearly be at "arms' length" to assure an impartial review. As such, former advisors, recent and frequent collaborators, and individuals who have served in a structured mentoring relationship (i.e. research mentor through a professional society or on a mentored grant of some type) shall be excluded as external reviewers. The list of recommended reviewers will be submitted to the LAS Dean for approval prior to the PUC Chair contacting potential reviewers.

The outside reviewers' letters will not be made available to the candidate. The candidate shall not know the external reviewers' identities. A redacted summary of the external reviewers' comments will be provided in the PUC letter.

The candidate will submit a dossier for review by the deadline communicated by the LAS Dean's Office. If a dossier is not submitted by the deadline (or within the agreed-upon timeframe) the candidate will not be considered for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. In this case, unless a tenure clock extension has been granted by the campus, a pre-tenure candidate will receive a one-year terminal contract for use in transitioning away from the University.

The dossier will include evidence to show that the candidate has met the standards set forth in the primary unit criteria. Examples of appropriate materials that may be submitted for evaluation to determine if department criteria have been met are included in the Appendix. At each review, the PUC will use multiple means of evaluating teaching. This will include FCQ ratings along with a minimum of two additional methods of evaluating teaching.

The dossier shall include the following information as well as other evidence that the candidate opts to submit: (1) an updated curriculum vitae following the format required in the campus policy; (2) a self-evaluation statement of the candidate 's entire record; (3) a teaching portfolio which will include a teaching philosophy, FCQ summaries, and at least two other means of assessing teaching effectiveness; (4) a research portfolio demonstrating scholarship activity; and (5) evidence demonstrating service and/or leadership activity.

The PUC will perform the evaluation of the candidate's progress and qualifications. Depending on the level of the review, the PUC will vote on the progress the candidate is making towards tenure (initial or comprehensive review) or the qualifications of the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. They will vote on whether the candidate meets qualifications and present the results of their vote to the Psychology tenured faculty (i.e., how many voted for and how many voted against). Individuals' votes are to remain confidential and only a summary report of the number of votes for and against each component of the vote (detailed below for different levels of review) will be made public.

The chair of the PUC will write a letter to the Dean that details: the composition of the committee, the committee's votes, and the committee's shared rationale for the vote. The letter will explain how the committee believes the candidate meets the criteria for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. All committee members will be given an opportunity to sign the letter summarizing their deliberations and decision prior to submission to the Dean. The letter will be placed in the electronic file. The chair of the PUC will meet with the candidate and provide a copy of the letter and a summary of the committee's decision as soon as possible.

A copy of the PUC's letter will be given to the chair of the department who will write a separate letter of evaluation to the dean which will be placed in the electronic file. The department chair will meet with the candidate as soon as possible to discuss the evaluation and to provide a copy of the letter to the candidate.

In the case of tenure decisions, the PUC chair will bring to the full tenured psychology faculty the results of the committee discussion and decision, and solicit a vote from the entire tenured psychology faculty on whether the candidate has earned tenure or not. The vote of the tenured faculty will be provided in the PUC's letter. If the full faculty and PUC disagree, the outcome of the full faculty vote will be detailed in the PUC's letter to the Dean that describes the rationale for the positive as well as the negative votes. The full tenured faculty vote in the case of tenure decisions; all other decisions are based on the vote of the PUC. In the case of promotion to Full, an additional vote of all Full Professors in the department will be conducted.

Votes rendered as part of the RPT process will be as follows:

For comprehensive (and initial) reviews there will be separate votes in each area as "on track for tenure", "not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections" or "not on track for tenure". There will be a separate vote for reappointment. This vote is separate to account for cases in which, for example, an individual might be on track for tenure in two areas and need work in one and the PUC could therefore recommend reappointment with guidance for improvement.

For reviews regarding tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, votes will occur separately for teaching, research, service and/or leadership (and any other areas) as "not meritorious", "meritorious", or "excellent". A recommendation regarding tenure and promotion will be based on the outcome of those votes.

In all cases, a simple majority of those voting will determine the outcome. If desired, those voting against the majority may include a minority opinion statement along with the letter associated with the vote in question.

If the Dean disagrees with the primary unit's recommendation, the Dean will initiate a discussion with the department chair and the PUC chair to identify the point(s) of disagreement. In the event that the Dean does not initiate this discussion, the department chair will do so to assure that it occurs. The department chair will then call a meeting of the appropriate faculty (as listed below) to reconsider the decision. The department chair will write a letter summarizing the results of the faculty's reconsideration.

> For tenure and promotion to associate reviews, all tenured psychology faculty will be convened to reconsider the decision.
>
> For promotion to full professor, the psychology full professors will be convened to reconsider the decision.
>
> For other reappointment decisions, the PUC will be reconvened along with the department chair to reconsider the decision.
>
> If faculty outside of the psychology department served on the department PUC, they will be asked to convene with the appropriate psychology faculty for decision reconsiderations.

If campus or department criteria are revised during one's pre-tenure period, pre-tenured faculty may elect to be evaluated under the criteria established at their time of hire or the new criteria.

Faculty being reviewed for promotion to full professor will be reviewed under the most current criteria.

Any processes not directly addressed in this document will use the campus and university processes and guidelines as outlined in the appropriate UCCS policies, Regents Laws and policies, and CU Administrative Policy statements.

Criteria

General Considerations
The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work which integrates existing knowledge, and applied research. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research, although candidates must decide to document such activities either in the "teaching" category or in the "research" category when constructing a dossier. The department recognizes both classroom teaching and individualized teaching activities. The department recognizes service and/or leadership to the university, community, and to our profession.

The department will consider the following criteria when reviewing candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. Examples of evidence that may be submitted for evaluation of meeting criteria are given in the Appendix.

In the assessment of research and scholarly work, the department places greater weight on items which have undergone some form of peer review, especially refereed journal articles, and scholarly books from high-quality publishers) than those that have not. Non-peer reviewed work (for instance, reports, or articles in the popular press) will also be considered as part of the candidate's record but will be weighted less than peer reviewed work. Such material may also be submitted to outside readers for evaluation and such review may then allow the material to be weighted at a higher level.

Our department encourages collaborative research and co-authored papers will be considered as equivalent to sole•authored papers if the first author is a student collaborator. Additionally, work with other collaborators (at UCCS or at other institutions) will be considered equivalent to sole-authored papers if the candidate provides clear evidence of a significant contribution by the candidate to the paper; otherwise, the collaborative work will still be counted as part of the candidate's overall record but will be weighted less. All candidates for promotion should demonstrate that they have an independent research program by having some first-authored work.

In the assessment of teaching effectiveness and accomplishment at any level of the RPT process, the department requires the use of multiple means of documenting teaching activities in and outside of the classroom. Regarding the tenure and promotion review, and consistent with Regent Policy, we note that "A recommendation for tenure based on excellence in teaching shall include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one's immediate instructional setting." The department defines "immediate instructional setting" as one's assigned teaching load and other classroom/online teaching activities (i.e., guest lectures, participating in the Professions of Psychology class) that are directly connected to existing courses offered by the Psychology department. There are many acceptable means of demonstrating teaching achievement and effectiveness, and although this document provides examples of several of these, candidates are urged to consult campus resources for additional support and ideas for assessing the broader impact of teaching activities ("beyond [the] immediate instructional setting") as options for achieving this are constantly evolving and improving.

Faculty Responsibility Statements: Generally, faculty will have a work distribution of 40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% service. No written documentation is needed for this work distribution.

In general, pre-tenure faculty members will not have the option to differentiate their workloads in order to assure that they are provided with adequate opportunity to develop both their teaching and research prior to the tenure point. In unusual circumstances, however (i.e. an employment contract which stipulates an alternative workload distribution or receipt of a grant award requiring additional time spent in research) may have a differentiated workload which will be delineated in a faculty responsibility statement. Such a statement will explicate the workload distribution and stipulate changes in how tenure criteria will be weighted for such a differentiated load. Differentiated workloads may impact quantity of work in a given area but are not expected to change quality criteria. It is expected that pre-tenure faculty will only have a differentiated workload for a small proportion of the pre-tenure period (e.g., a first year with professional practice activity, or during a period where a major research grant award is received).

Post-tenure faculty may have a differentiated workload to reflect a differential focus on one or more areas of work that may occur as their opportunities and interests evolve after the tenure point. These changes are reflected in altered percentages of time (and associated performance evaluation) devoted to research, teaching, and/or faculty service/administrative duties. It is expected that all faculty will have research, teaching and service and/or leadership as part of their workload distribution but the percentages in each area can change to meet the needs of the faculty member and the department. It is generally expected that no one would go below a minimum of 10% in any given category, except professional practice may be zero; however, exceptions may be made in extraordinary circumstances (e.g., a career research award).

Professional Practice: In unusual circumstances, a candidate may include clinical and counseling activities as part of their workload. This will be considered on a case by case basis and will only be considered when it serves the needs of the department. For example , this may be used for a brief period during the pre-tenure period to allow a candidate to get required clinical hours so that they can fulfill licensure requirements which would be needed so that the candidate can provide clinical supervision as part of the teaching load required for the doctoral training program. Similar to service, faculty should demonstrate meritorious performance in this area for promotion and reappointment decisions.

Criteria for the Initial Reappointment Review
The candidate's total record, including teaching, scholarship, service, and professional practice (if appropriate), shall be evaluated. No specific rating in each area is required, but the record must show sufficient potential of future success to justify reappointment. At this level of review, candidates should provide evidence of the initiation of systematic efforts to establish a strong program of teaching and research, and demonstrate departmental citizenship, including working collaboratively with the department Chair and other faculty to meet the service, student advising, and teaching needs of the department as they arise, within the confines of their prescribed workload and in a manner which does not impede their progress toward tenure and/or promotion.

Teaching: The candidate is expected to provide evidence that his or her courses are coherently organized, thoughtfully presented, and that they deal with significant areas of psychology. The candidate is expected to demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which may be constructive interactions with students, concern with departmental goals and curriculum, satisfactory development of skill in presenting materials, and/or improvement and innovations in teaching methods and in curriculum development. All these skills, which are constantly evolving, should be reflected in the items provided as evidence of teaching effectiveness that the candidate chooses to include in their dossier (see Appendix). At the initial review, the department looks for evidence of the emergence and/or development of these skills.

Evidence of growing skill in the desired characteristics could include: syllabi, lecture notes or other classroom instruction materials; involvement in student advising; mentorship of students' MA theses, PhD dissertations, or honors theses; willingness to contribute to meeting and developing courses which are responsive to the department's curricular needs within the scope of the candidate's training and workload, involvement in teaching workshops, conferences, or other learning activities; and/or establishment of a teaching mentor relationship. At all levels of review, evaluation of teaching performance shall include data obtained from FCQ's (both numerical ratings and written comments) as required by Regent policy, but the preponderance of evidence considered regarding teaching skill development, accomplishment, engagement, and effectiveness will be drawn from other sources of data regarding the candidate's teaching activities and impact (see Appendix).

Scholarship and Research: The candidate is expected to demonstrate a well-designed research plan and the potential for continued development as a researcher and progress toward publication. Evidence might include drafts of work in progress, presentations at professional meetings, articles submitted for publication, and/or grant proposals in preparation or submitted.

Service and Leadership : The candidate is expected to have participated fully in the department, including attendance at faculty meetings, sharing in the departmental decision-making process, and participating in activities that contribute to the department's functioning (e.g., participation on committees). The candidate should also have begun to identify appropriate places to contribute to the college, university, profession, and/or wider community.

Professional Practice: The candidate who includes professional practice would be expected to demonstrate standards of ethical and professional practice, document the time spent in professional practice activities, demonstrate openness and responsiveness to clinical supervision, and follow policies and procedures of the clinical/counseling setting.

Criteria for Comprehensive Reappointment Review
The candidate's record in teaching, scholarship/research, and service, and professional practice (if appropriate) will each be evaluated separately as on track for tenure, not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections, or not on track for tenure. The candidate must demonstrate sufficient progress toward tenure to justify reappointment, which means that based on the criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor, the candidate has already achieved a level of success in teaching, research, and service, which, if that individual continues along their current trajectory, will meet the established criteria by the time they submit their dossier for the tenure review, recognizing that at that review, at the criteria for "excellent" in either teaching or research must be obtained to be successful.

Teaching: In order to receive a rating of "on track for tenure" the candidate is expected to demonstrate effective teaching through submission of student evaluations and at least two other forms of evaluation. The teaching portfolio should demonstrate evidence of improvement in teaching since the first review. This evaluation includes contributions to meeting the breadth, depth, and needs of the department regarding teaching within the scope of the expertise and prescribed workload of the candidate, and up-dating curriculum and course materials. Candidates taking on a course due to an unexpected departmental need will be held harmless from any unintended consequences (e.g., low FCQ scores) that may arise as a result of stepping in to help the department in this manner. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities will be considered. In evaluating teaching, course content, level, and size as well as format (i.e., in person versus online) will be considered in interpreting student evaluations. Assessment of teaching

performance shall include data obtained from FCQ's (both numerical ratings and written comments), but the preponderance of evidence considered regarding teaching skill development, accomplishment, engagement, and effectiveness will be drawn from other sources of data regarding the candidate's teaching activities, development, progress, and impact. A rating of "on track for tenure" is demonstrated by a portfolio of teaching evidence demonstrating that, if the candidate continues along their current trajectory, will meet the criterial for tenure (excellent or meritorious).

Scholarship and Research: There should be clear evidence that a focused research program has been established that is producing or will produce rigorous, publishable research that makes a meaningful contribution to the discipline. The candidate must demonstrate reasonable progress toward tenure as demonstrated by the research portfolio and by the letters of evaluation of his/her work. Exceptional quality of scholarly work will be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where there is a lower quantity of work. Reappointment would not occur if there was little or no realistic evidence that publications will be forthcoming or that research funding proposals will be submitted in the immediate future. The research portfolio should include examples of published work, with emphasis placed on refereed journal articles, book chapters, books, and grant proposals. A rating of "on track for tenure" is demonstrated by publications, submitted or funded research proposals, or professional presentations, and by positive external letters of evaluation of the candidate's scholarly activity that, if the candidate continues along their current trajectory, will meet the criterial for tenure (excellent or meritorious).

Service and Leadership: The candidate should demonstrate continuing departmental service and should show evidence of college, campus, community, or national professional service. In evaluating service and/or leadership both the quality and quantity of service and/or leadership contributions will be considered. A rating of "on track for tenure" requires meeting service and/or leadership responsibilities within the department and some service and/or leadership to the college, campus, community, or profession.

Professional Practice: The candidate who includes professional practice would be rated as meritorious if the candidate demonstrates standards of ethical and professional practice, documents the time spent in professional practice activities, demonstrates openness and responsiveness to clinical supervision, and follows policies and procedures of the clinical/counseling setting.

Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and/or Awarding of Tenure
The candidate's record in teaching, research, service, and professional practice (if appropriate) will each be evaluated separately as below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. The candidate must receive a rating of excellent in either teaching or research and be rated as meritorious (or higher) in the remaining areas.

Teaching: The candidate will submit a teaching portfolio which will include a teaching statement, student evaluations (FCQs) and at least two other forms of evaluation. In order to receive a rating of meritorious, the candidate is expected to demonstrate strong evidence of effective classroom teaching. Examples of materials that may be submitted for demonstrating effectiveness are provided in the appendix. Additionally, this evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and up-dating curriculum and course materials. Maturation and improvement in teaching should be evident. The candidate must also demonstrate merit as a teacher outside the classroom, in particular by mentoring graduate students and/or undergraduate students in the department honors program, as research assistants, or as mentees through the Undergraduate Research Academy. In addition to classroom teaching and research mentoring, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities will be considered. Assessment of classroom teaching will encompass course content, level, and size, as well as format (i.e., in person versus online) in interpreting student evaluations. At all levels of review,

evaluation of teaching performance shall include data obtained from FCQ's (both numerical ratings and written comments), but the preponderance of evidence considered regarding teaching skill development, accomplishment, engagement, and effectiveness will be drawn from other sources of data regarding the candidate's teaching activities and impact.

A rating of excellence in teaching for tenure will be **based on clear high performance regarding direct student instruction and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one's immediate instructional setting based on multiple means of evaluating the impact of the candidate's activities. This** requires that the candidate meet the standards for a meritorious rating as well as submit evidence of participation in activities that reflect dedication to student learning and impact of teaching and/or mentorship activities that extend beyond the UCCS Psychology department (the candidate's "immediate instructional setting" as defined by the department). This evidence could take many forms, some of which are suggested in the appendix, but candidates **are urged to consult campus resources for additional support and ideas for assessing the broader impact of teaching as options for achieving this are constantly evolving and improving.**

Scholarship and Research: The candidate must demonstrate a body of work which makes an original scholarly contribution. A variety of completed work may be submitted as evidence of a productive research program; however, articles in published or accepted in final form in peer-reviewed journals are most important. Non-peer-reviewed works (e.g., article-length contributions to edited books, edited research works, published books, collaborative work, textbooks, and other publications) will be considered on their scholarly merit. Other indicators of scholarly accomplishment include presentations at national meetings and external research funding. It is expected that faculty will seek external research funding. Internal research funding is also valued, but not at the level of external proposal submissions and funded awards. In all scholarship, the scholarly quality and contribution to the theoretical and applied fields of psychology are of utmost importance, with quantity being necessary but not sufficient to demonstrate research merit. Although quality is of greater importance than quantity, the department expects evidence of continuous productivity over a period of years.

A rating of meritorious requires a steady level of productivity in a focused area which demonstrates original scholarly contribution in the specialty area as demonstrated by peer-reviewed publications, submitted or funded external research proposals, and by positive letters of evaluation of their work. Internal research funding is also valued, but not at the level of external proposals submitted and/or funded. A "steady level of productivity" is defined as averaging 1-2 peer-reviewed journal articles per year, with the candidate, ideally, appearing as the primary or senior author on at least one of these publications. Variation in publication rate is expected based on the type of work undertaken by the candidate, understanding that papers requiring, for example, longitudinal data collection, assessment of populations which may be challenging to access, or laboratory-based studies with repeated measures may take longer than some other types of studies.

A rating of excellent requires meeting the criteria for meritorious and demonstrates a more substantial level of impact on the field. Evidence supporting a rating of excellent in research may include achievements such as receipt of substantial external funding, high numbers of peer-reviewed publications in well-respected journals, indices demonstrating high rates of citations of scholarly work, receipt of a research/scholarship award from at the campus level, receipt of a research/scholarship award from a professional society, authorship of a scholarly book, and invited research keynotes at major conferences or other scholarly events. A rating of "excellent" typically requires more than one of these types of achievement.

Service and Leadership: In addition to meeting his or her service and/or leadership obligation to the department, college, campus, and university, the candidate should also demonstrate service and/or leadership

within the discipline and/or to the community. Service and/or leadership in the discipline may include reviewing for journals, granting agencies or professional conferences, or participation and leadership within professional associations. Service and/or leadership to the community may include pro bono consultation with community service agencies, membership on boards of organizations or agencies, responsible presentation of psychological literature through the media, or provision of education to children, the lay public, or professionals. In evaluating service and leadership, both the quality and quantity of the contributions will be considered.

A rating of meritorious requires meeting service and/or leadership responsibilities within the department and service and/or leadership at the college, campus, community, or professional level(s).

A rating of excellent requires meeting service and/or leadership responsibilities within the department and college, including some level of leadership, and increased service and/or leadership contributions to the college, campus, university system, community, and/or profession.

Professional Practice: The candidate who includes professional practice would be rated as meritorious if the candidate demonstrates standards of ethical and professional practice, documents the time spent in professional practice activities, demonstrates openness and responsiveness to clinical supervision, and follows policies and procedures of the clinical/counseling setting.

Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor
The candidate's record in teaching, research, and will be evaluated. Promotion requires " a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances require a stronger emphasis or singular focus on one or the other; and a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching and working with students, research, scholarship or creative work, and service."

Teaching: The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching with evidence of growth and development in this arena. This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and up-dating curriculum and course materials. Candidates taking on a course due to an unexpected departmental need will be held harmless from any unintended consequences (e.g., low FCQ scores) that may arise as a result of stepping in to help the department in this manner. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered here. In evaluating teaching, course content, level, and size as well as format (i.e., in person vs. online) will be considered in interpreting student evaluations. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a teacher since tenure must be demonstrated through development of new and revised curriculum, new pedagogical techniques, participation in professional development focused on teaching, work with students outside the classroom and other areas of teaching such as those in the appendix. The candidate's maturity and stature as a scholar should be reflected in his or her teaching.

Scholarship and Research: Substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a researcher since tenure must be demonstrated. A steady rate of publication in rigorous, peer-reviewed journals is expected. Other indicators of scholarly maturity may include publications of a scholarly book, major grant funding, invitations to provide a keynote address at a national conference or another university, or invitations to contribute to handbooks in the specialty field. Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity is less. Presentations at professional meetings and non-refereed publications may be considered as secondary evidence of ongoing research activity. In addition,

there must be evidence of national or international esteem for his or her publications as important and authoritative works in the candidate's specialty field.

Service and Leadership: The department recognizes service and/or leadership to the campus, community and to our profession, but for promotion to full professor a substantial level of leadership in one or more of these venues should be evident. In evaluating service and/or leadership both the quality and quantity of the contributions will be considered. The candidate must have maintained a record of departmental service, in most cases including some degree of leadership (e.g., of committees). The candidate must provide evidence of a major contribution or substantial leadership in at least one area of professional, university, or public service. We recognize that different faculty at this level will fulfill this requirement very differently.

Professional Practice: The candidate who includes professional practice would be rated as meritorious if the candidate demonstrates standards of ethical and professional practice, documents the time spent in professional practice activities, demonstrates openness and responsiveness to clinical supervision, and follows policies and procedures of the clinical/counseling setting.

Appendix
Examples of Appropriate Evidence to Submit for Evaluation

The lists below are examples of the types of evidence that the department finds acceptable for a candidate to submit as support for meeting departmental criteria. Items are grouped (A, B and C) as a guide for candidates and their mentors to represent the relative value the department places on certain activities within the broader categories of teaching, research and service. Within the groupings, items are in no particular order. In general, candidates should seek to include more activities from groups A and B in their dossiers, although there is no specific combination of activities required (in other words, concentrating one's efforts on group C activities to the exclusion of any group A activities is discouraged). This is not an exhaustive list but intended to provide guidance; other types of evidence may be considered. In all cases, the candidate is recommended to seek the advice of mentors, the chair of the department, and/or the chair of the PUC when deciding on which activities to participate in and what evidence to submit in a dossier.

TEACHING

GROUP A ACTIVITIES AND DOCUMENTATION

- Publishing a peer-reviewed article on teaching pedagogy
- Delivery of teaching workshop on campus or at a conference
- Teaching award or other outstanding accomplishments in instruction
- Teaching contribution to other departments, programs, or institutions, in addition to UCCS Psychology Department (i.e., working with other academic units on or beyond the campus to develop new programs, curricula, or pedagogical approaches)
- Peer evaluation of teaching
- Teaching outside of the classroom through supervision of students' thesis or dissertation projects or as member on thesis or dissertation committees

GROUP B ACTIVITIES AND DOCUMENTATION

- Preparation of course materials (e.g., syllabi, lecture notes, instructional materials)
- Evidence of student learning or accomplishment
- Teaching improvement activities (e.g., seeking mentorship)
- New course development
- Contributions of teaching to diversity. This may include, but is not limited to, modifications of curriculum to integrate issues related to diversity as appropriate for the course content, efforts to advance equitable access to education, changes in pedagogies which may enhance learning for students with diverse backgrounds, inclusion of adaptive technologies for students with disabilities.
- Evidence of taking risks in teaching activities. This may include, but is not limited to, integration of materials in courses which deal with controversial or sensitive topics, using alternative classroom pedagogies.
- Evidence which demonstrates effectiveness of students in succeeding courses and/or in the pursuit of graduate education and/or in careers

- Student supervision in professional experience activities, internships, and/or independent studies
- Evaluating classroom processes or student learning through ongoing assessment activities
- Student evaluations (FCQs; may not be more than 25% of portfolio)
- Publishing a textbook
- Publishing a peer-reviewed book chapter on teaching pedagogy
- Providing role modeling and mentoring based on a teaching experience at any educational level (e.g., new faculty, graduate students)

GROUP C ACTIVITIES AND DOCUMENTATION

- Course organization
- Participation in teaching workshops or conferences
- Student advising activities
- Guest lecturing in a class in the department
- Guest lecturing in a class outside the department
- Teaching activities in a community setting to lay audiences including schools
- Unsolicited letters from current and former students documenting the impact of teaching and mentoring
- Student evaluations of mentoring
- Quality of doctoral dissertation, master's thesis or honor's thesis supervision
- Evaluation of student performance in departmental examinations and assessments
- Uncompensated service on dissertation, honors, or thesis committees

RESEARCH

GROUP A ACTIVITIES AND DOCUMENTATION
- Peer-reviewed journal articles
- Invited journal article in a journal issue
- Peer-reviewed book chapters in scholarly books
- Research award or other outstanding accomplishments in research
- Authored or co-authored scholarly book
- Edited or co-edited scholarly book or volume
- External grant proposals submitted as PI, co-PI, investigator, or co-investigator
- External grant proposals funded as PI, co-PI, investigator, or co-investigator

GROUP B ACTIVITIES AND DOCUMENTATION
- Papers presented at professional conferences or workshops
- Posters presented at professional conferences or workshops
- Invited commentary

- Non-refereed book chapters, technical reports, monographs
- Recognition by other scholars of research and publications
- Participation in research/scholarship development workshops (e.g., statistical workshop, pre-conference workshop in one's specialty area)
- Providing role modeling and mentoring of research at any educational level
- Objective evidence of cultural and societal impact of research
- Contribution to diversity
- Internal grant proposal funded (campus level proposal)

GROUP C ACTIVITIES AND DOCUMENTATION
- Participation in career development activity (e.g., workshops, conference, summer schools, seeking and using a research mentor)
- Encyclopedia entries
- Book reviews
- Commentaries
- Expert and technical consultation on research projects
- Participation in grant-funding training workshops
- Unsponsored research activities such as data collection activities, development of measures
- Evidence of capacity for future research achievements

SERVICE/LEADERSHIP

GROUP A ACTIVITIES
- Administrative leadership (e.g., program director (UG, DCT, MA, Honors), department chair, center director)
- Editorial activities for professional journals (e.g., editor, guest editor of special edition, associate editor)
- Participation in faculty governance
- Participation in professional activities (e.g., officer, committee member, organizing conferences or workshops, site visits, in-service training)
- Service award or other outstanding accomplishments in service

GROUP B ACTIVITIES
- Willingness to meet departmental needs for faculty effort (i.e. classes, committees, other service) as they arise
- Reviewing manuscripts for journals, research proposals, books, or book chapters.
- Review of tenure/promotion cases from other institutions
- Serving as a grant reviewer for NIH, NSF, or other federal body
- Contribution to diversity
- Pro bono consultation and public service

GROUP C ACTIVITIES

- Board member on local, state, regional, or national organization
- Providing role modeling and mentoring at any educational level relating to service or leadership activities
- Writing a popular press article
- Providing a media interview

Note. Departmental, college, campus or university committee work and service to the profession/discipline (local, state, national, international level) may be regarded as Group A, B, or C depending on the role and level of involvement.

PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT
Post-tenure Review Criteria and Processes

Introduction

Standards and processes for post-tenure review of faculty are governed by Article V of the Laws of the Regents. These are further delineated in a series of CU Administrative Policy Statements. Campus guidance is supplied in UCCS Policy # 200-016.

The criteria are to be considered guidelines for evaluation of candidates for post-tenure review in the Department of Psychology at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in our discipline. Each candidate's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. The department is committed to quality teaching and scholarship, and effective service to the university, the profession, and the community. The evaluation process assumes: conduct which reflects the professional and academic standards for generating, validating, disputing, and transmitting knowledge; and an appreciation of and respect for the rights, duties, and privileges associated with academic freedom and collegial responsibilities.

Processes

1. As the Primary Unit, the Psychology Department faculty will be responsible for the primary review of all faculty at post-tenure review.

2. The chair of the Psychology Department will inform each faculty who is required to have a post-tenure review of the review procedures and timeline for review.

3. The chair of the Psychology department will be empowered by the faculty to make a recommendation to the Dean for members of the Evaluation Committee that is appropriate to perform the post-tenure review of all candidates who are to be reviewed in a given year. Reviewed faculty will be consulted on potential committee members. Post-tenure review committees will consist of tenured faculty. If there are many faculty undergoing post-tenure review in a given year, multiple committees may be constituted. An evaluation committee for post-tenure review will have at least 3 members. The evaluation committee will have the majority of its members from the Psychology department; however, members from other academic units may be selected when their area of expertise allows for sound judgment of the candidate's record. Evaluation committee members cannot review faculty who have provided a post-tenure review for the committee member in the same year. The chair of the Psychology Department will typically not serve on an evaluation committee.

4. The chair of the evaluation committee for the post-tenure review is responsible for conducting the review, writing the report, and providing feedback to the reviewed faculty member. A copy of the written performance evaluation will be made available in a timely manner to the candidate.

5. The following materials, submitted in one binder, will be examined by the primary unit committee for the post-tenure review:
   o Annual performance evaluations for the previous 5 years
   o Current curriculum vita
   o Professional plan(s) from the current post-tenure review cycle
   o A new, updated professional plan
   o A copy of any differentiated workload agreements for the five-year period as appropriate.
   o FCQ summary sheets
   o Additional materials selected by the faculty member which are appropriate evidence for demonstrating meeting the departmental criteria

6. The post-tenure review evaluation committee will review submitted materials and provide an overall evaluation of the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, research and scholarship, and service. The evaluation committee will provide an evaluation of the faculty as outstanding, exceeding expectations, meeting expectations or below expectations. The report will summarize the committee's findings regarding the faculty member's adherence to the previous professional plan(s); meeting the department's standards; conclusions about the faculty member's productivity and contributions to the university in teaching, research/scholarship, and service; and will remark on the feasibility of the new professional plan for allowing the faculty member to meet the departmental standards at the next review. All committee members will be given an opportunity to see the report summarizing their deliberations and decision prior to submission to the reviewed faculty member and the department chair.

7. If the reviewed faculty member disagrees with the evaluation committee's rating, the faculty member will file a grievance with the department chair. The faculty member will explain in writing the areas of disagreement. The department chair will constitute a faculty committee with three tenured psychology faculty to review the grievance. The committee will review the grievance and the candidate's materials. If the committee agrees with the grievant and rules that the original review was not conducted properly, the committee will conduct a new review and will write a new evaluation letter. If the committee disagrees with the grievant and rules that the original review was conducted properly, the evaluation from the original committee will be submitted to the department chair.

8. A copy of the report will be given to the department chair who will review the materials and will approve the new professional plan. The chair will submit the post-tenure review report to the dean. If the department chair or the evaluation committee does not approve of the new professional plan, the faculty member will be asked to revise the plan before submission to the dean. Typically, the department chair would not write an additional letter for the post-tenure review.

9. In the event that the first level review of the primary unit's procedure leads either a committee or the Dean to disagree with the decision of the primary unit, the Dean will initiate a discussion about the disagreement with the department chair. The chair will then call a meeting of the evaluation committee to reconsider the decision. The chair will write a letter summarizing the results of the faculty's reconsideration.

10. Following Regents' policy there are three types of post-tenure review:

- A ***regular five-year review*** occurs if the candidate has received annual review ratings of *meeting expectations* or better since the last post-tenure review (or since receiving tenure if this is their first post-tenure review).

- A ***triggered review*** occurs when a faculty member receives an annual summary review of *below expectations* or when a primary unit committee has given a *below expectations* rating at a regular five-year post-tenure review.

- An ***extensive review*** occurs when a faculty member has received two *below expectations* ratings within the previous five years or when a faculty member who has undertaken a Performance Improvement Agreement did not achieve an evaluation of *meeting expectations* or better by the end of the agreement.

11. If the faculty member is found to be below expectations on a post-tenure review, the faculty member must undertake a Performance Improvement Agreement. The faculty member and the department chair will work together with input from the post-tenure review evaluation committee to develop a Performance Improvement Agreement following procedures outlined in the post-tenure review policies (Regents, UCCS, and LAS).

12. If a triggered review follows a below expectations rating, attempts will be made to include the same members on the post-tenure review committee who made the initial rating and who will evaluate whether the faculty member has meet the conditions of the Performance Improvement Agreement.

13. A department post-tenure review evaluation committee will complete a triggered review or an extensive review following procedures outlined in system and campus policies and consistent with the procedures for doing a regular review.

14. If criteria are revised, faculty will be evaluated under the criteria in place when they submitted their most recent professional plan. A faculty member may elect to be evaluated under new criteria.

15. Any processes not directly addressed will use the campus and university processes and guidelines as outlined in the appropriate Regents Laws and Policies, and CU Administrative Policy statements.

Criteria

A faculty member will be evaluated on teaching, scholarship and research, and service as part of the 5-year plan with a differentiated work load taken into consideration as appropriate. Under a differentiated workload, evaluation of the quantity of work completed in a given area should change based on the differentiated workload but quality of work should be given same consideration under all work load allocations.

The Psychology department recognizes that there are many different ways in which post-tenure faculty contributed to the university. The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work which integrates existing knowledge, and applied research. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research. The department recognizes both classroom teaching and individualized teaching activities as important teaching activities. The department recognizes service to the university, community and to our profession.

In order to be rated as *meeting expectations* for the post-tenure review period, a faculty member must demonstrate the minimal requirements stated for each evaluation area. Ratings of *exceeding expectations* and *outstanding* will be determined by the post-tenure review evaluation committee based on the materials submitted by the faculty member that demonstrate performance beyond the expected minimum.

Teaching

All faculty members are expected to be engaged in teaching activities. To demonstrate *meeting expectations* in teaching, the following must occur.

- Faculty will provide evidence of purposeful attempts to attain the teaching goals stated in the previous professional plan(s).

- Faculty will demonstrate evidence of effective teaching through multiple means of evaluation. Such evaluations will include

    o Student evaluations (FCQs)
    o At least two other ways to demonstrate teaching effectiveness or engagement as provided in the appendix.

- Faculty will provide evidence that they are involved in mentoring and/or advising of students.

- Faculty will not have a consistent pattern of substantiated negative behavior regarding teaching. Such behavior may include, but is not limited to, consistent disrespectful behavior towards students (e.g., inaccessibility, excessive missing of classes, mistreatment of students, harassment of students) or poor teaching (e.g., lack of substance in teaching, reading textbook/notes to students, excessive rambling, capricious standards for classroom performance, ill-defined curriculum or course planning).

Research/Creative Works

All faculty members are expected to be engaged in research/creative work. To demonstrate *meeting expectations* in research, the following must occur.

- Faculty will provide evidence of purposeful attempts to attain the research goals stated in the previous professional plan(s).

- Faculty will provide evidence that he or she has an active and systematic program of research that has regular output of quality research and scholarly work. Examples of such evidence are provided in the appendix.

- Faculty will not have substantiated negative behavior regarding research. Such behavior may include, but is not limited to, plagiarism, falsification of data or results, unethical treatment of research participants, or mismanagement of research funds.

Service

All faculty members are expected to be engaged in service activities. To demonstrate *meeting expectations* in service, the following must occur.

- Faculty will provide evidence of purposeful attempts to attain the service goals stated in the previous professional plan(s).

- Faculty will provide evidence of service activities to the department.

- Faculty will demonstrate that he or she is actively involved in service activities beyond the department. Examples of such service are listed in the appendix.

- Faculty will not have substantiated negative behavior regarding service. Such behavior may include, but is not limited to, disrespect towards or harassment of other faculty and staff; flagrant disregard for department, campus, or system policies; disengagement from service activities (e.g., not attending faculty meetings or other committee meetings), misrepresentation of self in the community, misuse of university resources.

Appendix
Examples of Appropriate Evidence to Submit for Evaluation

The lists below are types of evidence that the department would find acceptable for a candidate to submit for review as evidence for meeting the departmental criteria. These are lists of suggestions and are neither all-inclusive nor a list of requirements. Items are not ranked or grouped in any order of importance.

Teaching Evidence

Effectiveness and Engagement
- Student evaluation of teaching (FCQs are mandatory at each review but other student evaluation may also be used)
- Teaching awards and other outstanding accomplishments in instruction
- Peer evaluation of teaching
- Alumni evaluation of teaching and mentoring
- Evaluation of student performance in departmental examinations and assessments
- Preparation of course materials (e.g., syllabi, lecture notes, instructional materials)
- Course organization
- New course development
- Demonstration of student learning including effectiveness in succeeding courses
- Demonstration of innovation or creativity in teaching
- Participation in teaching-related activities (e.g., workshops or conferences)
- Teaching improvement activities (e.g., workshops, conferences, seeking mentorship)
- Teaching contribution to other departments, programs, or institutions, in addition to UCCS Psychology Department
- Evaluating classroom processes or student learning through ongoing assessment activities
- Evidence of taking risks in teaching activities. This may include, but is not limited to, integration of materials in courses which deal with controversial or sensitive topics, using alternative classroom pedagogies.
- Contributions of teaching to diversity. This may include, but is not limited to, modifications of curriculum to integrate issues related to diversity as appropriate for the course content, efforts to advance equitable access to education, changes in pedagogies which may enhance learning for students with diverse backgrounds, inclusion of adaptive technologies for students with disabilities

Mentoring and advising activities

- Student advising activities
- Teaching outside of the classroom through supervision of students' thesis or dissertation projects or as member on thesis and dissertation committees
- Student supervision in professional experience activities, internships, and/or independent studies
- Evidence demonstrating student development and encouragement
- Providing role modeling and mentoring based on a teaching experience at any educational level (e.g., new faculty, graduate students)
- Student evaluation of mentoring
- Quality of doctoral dissertation, master's thesis or honor's thesis supervision
- Evidence which demonstrates effectiveness of students in the pursuit of graduate education and/or in careers

Scholarship and Research Evidence

- Peer judged publications (journal articles, book chapters, books)
- Papers presented at professional conferences, workshops,
- Recognition by other scholars of research and publications
- Non-referred monographs (edited book chapters, books, technical reports)
- Sponsored research activity: proposal submissions and/or funded grants and contracts
- Professional reputation (both inside and outside the university)
- Evidence of capacity for future research achievements
- Participation in research/scholarship development workshops
- Participation in career development activity (e.g., workshops, conference, summer schools, seeking and using a research mentor)
- Long-term research projects
- Expert and technical consultation on research projects
- Providing role modeling and mentoring of research on any educational level
- Unsponsored research activities such as data collection activities, development of measures
- Evidence demonstrating impact of research activities (e.g., recognition, external letters, quantitative measures—number of citations, impact ratings)
- Risk factor involved in the research venture
- Cultural and societal impact of research
- Contribution to diversity

Service Evidence

- Departmental, college, campus and university committees
- Administrative service (e.g., program director, department chair, center director)
- Participation in faculty governance
- Service to the profession and discipline (Local, State, National, International Level)
- Pro bono consultation and public service
- Providing role modeling and mentoring at any educational level relating to service or leadership activities
- Reviewing manuscripts for journals, research proposals, books, or book chapters.
- Editorial activities for professional journals (e.g., editor, guest editor of special edition, associate editor)
- Participation in professional activities (e.g., officer, committee member, organizing conferences or workshops; committees, site visits, in-service training)
- Board member on local, state, regional, or national organization
- Community presentations
- Service contribution to education or psychology at any level and at any institution in addition to the University of Colorado
- Contribution to diversity

College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences
Department of Psychology RPT Criteria
Version History

Version 1:
Approved by Psychology faculty, 4/15/2020
Approved by the Interim Dean Rex Welshon, 4/25/2020
Approved by Provost Tom Christensen, 6/26/2020
Effective date, 7/1/2020