

Department of Psychology
College of Letters, Arts and Sciences

May 31, 2009

Psychology Department
Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Processes
Approved December 2, 2008
Approved by the Provost: May 27, 2009

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 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: 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

1. As the Primary Unit, the Psychology Department faculty will be responsible for the primary review of all faculty for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.
2. The chair of the Psychology department will meet with each candidate for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to inform him or her of the procedures, how to construct a dossier, and to solicit recommendations for possible external reviewers (when appropriate) and evaluation committee members.
3. The candidate must provide the department chair with a list of possible outside reviewers (including addresses, telephone, fax, email information, a brief biography of each, and a statement of past interactions with the potential reviewer). The department chair or evaluation committee chair can select from that list and may add to it. The candidate has the right to request that specific people not be asked to be external reviewers. Outside reviewers should be selected because of their expertise in the area of the candidate's research. Former advisers, collaborators, and mentors should be excluded from the list to ensure a true "external" review. The list of recommended reviewers will be submitted to the LAS Dean for approval.
The outside reviewers' letters will not be made available to the candidate under any circumstances. The candidate shall not know the external reviewers' identities. A redacted summary of the external reviewers' comments will be provided to the candidate by the chair of the Evaluation Committee.
4. 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 review of the qualifications of the candidate for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. A committee for reappointment, tenure or promotion must contain no fewer than 5 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. The chair of the Psychology Department will not typically serve on an evaluation committee.

5. The candidate will submit a dossier for review. If a dossier is not submitted then the candidate will not be considered for reappointment or promotion.

The dossier will include evidence to show that the candidate has met the criteria for the review. 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 evaluation committee 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 should include the following information as well as other evidence that the candidate wants to submit: (1) an updated curriculum vita following the format required in the campus policy; (2) a self-evaluation statement of the candidate's entire record and plans for the next 3-5 years covering each area of teaching, scholarship, and service; (3) a teaching portfolio which will include a teaching philosophy, FCQ summaries, FCQ individual sheets for 3 most recent years (in a separate binder), and at least two other means of evaluation; (4) a research portfolio demonstrating scholarship activity; and (5) evidence demonstrating service activity.
6. Evaluation Committees for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to associate professor reviews will typically include only tenured faculty. Review for promotion to full professor requires inclusion of only full professors on the evaluation committee. People may only serve on one evaluation committee for a review; if a faculty member serves on a higher level review committee, they will not serve on the primary unit evaluation committee.
7. The Evaluation Committee will perform the evaluation of the candidate's qualifications. 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 the decision will be made public.

The chair of the Evaluation Committee will write a letter to the Dean that details: the composition of the committee, the committee's vote, 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, 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 document folder.

The chair of the Evaluation Committee will meet with the candidate and provide a copy of the letter and a summary of the committee's decision as soon as possible.
8. A copy of the evaluation committee's letter will be given to the chair of the department who will write a separate letter of evaluation to the dean and which will be placed in the document folder. The department chair will not write a separate letter if he or she serves on the Evaluation Committee. 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.
9. In the case of tenure decisions, the Evaluation Committee 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. The vote of the tenured faculty will be provided in the evaluation committee's letter. If the full faculty and evaluation committee disagree, the outcome of the full faculty vote will be detailed in the evaluation committee's letter to the Dean that describes the rationale for the positive as well as the negative votes. The full tenured faculty vote only in the case of tenure decisions; all other decisions are based on the vote of the Evaluation Committee.
10. 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 and the evaluation committee chair. 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 evaluation committee will be reconvened along with the department chair to reconsider the decision; the evaluation committee chair may request that all tenured faculty be convened to reconsider the decision if the situation warrants such.

- If faculty outside of the psychology department served on the department evaluation committee, they will be asked to convene with the appropriate psychology faculty for decision reconsiderations.
11. If criteria are revised, pre-tenured faculty may elect to be evaluated under the previous criteria or the new criteria. Faculty being reviewed for promotion to full professor will typically be reviewed under the most current criteria; however, faculty may request to use previous criteria if those criteria were revised within 3 years of the review for promotion to full.
 12. Any processes not directly addressed 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. The department recognizes both classroom teaching and individualized teaching activities. The department recognizes service 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. At initial and comprehensive reviews the department may also take into account issues of material bearing such as strategic goals of the department, college and campus when deciding on reappointment.

In the assessment of research and scholarly work, the department places greater weight on items which have undergone some form of peer review 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.

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 unusual circumstances, a pre-tenured faculty member may have a differentiated workload which will be delineated in a faculty responsibility statement. Such a statement will explicate the workload distribution and provide guidance on changes in how the 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-tenured 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 work load to reflect a variety of workloads or to account for administrative duties. It is expected that all faculty will have research, teaching and service 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 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.

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 good interaction 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.

Evidence of growing skill in the desired characteristics could include: Performance on FCQ's (both numerical ratings and written comments); syllabi, lecture notes or other classroom instruction materials; involvement in student advising and mentorship of students' MA theses, PhD dissertations, or honors theses; willingness to contribute to the department's curriculum; involvement in teaching workshops, conferences, or other learning activities; and/or establishment of a teaching mentor relationship.

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.

Service: 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 well-being. The candidate should also have begun to identify appropriate places to contribute to the university and 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 Review

The candidate's record in teaching, scholarship/ research, and service, and professional practice (if appropriate) will each be evaluated separately as below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. The candidate must demonstrate sufficient progress toward tenure to justify reappointment. At this level, the candidate should receive at the minimum a rating of meritorious in both teaching and research, and have established himself or herself as a contributor to the department, and limitedly, to the campus or wider community.

Teaching: In order to receive a rating of meritorious 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 the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and up-dating curriculum and course materials. 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 will be considered in interpreting student evaluations. Both qualitative comments and quantitative ratings on the FCQs will be considered when determining effectiveness along with the other forms of evaluations.

A rating of excellent will require the candidate to meet the standards for a meritorious rating as well as submit evidence of participation in activities that reflect dedication to student learning (the appendix gives examples of such activities). Such activities should demonstrate that the candidate is enhancing the learning experiences of students.

Scholarship and Research: There should be clear evidence that a focused research program has been established that 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 prospect that publications will be forthcoming or that research funding proposals will be submitted within the next two years. The research portfolio should include examples of published work, with emphasis placed on refereed journal articles, book chapters, books, or grant proposals.

A rating of meritorious requires reasonable progress toward tenure as demonstrated by publications, submitted or funded research proposals, or professional presentations, and by external letters of evaluation of the candidate's scholarly activity.

A rating of excellent requires evidence of growing impact in the specialty field both with regards to quantity and quality of research as demonstrated by publications which may include refereed journal articles, refereed book chapters, article-length reports, books, or funded research and external letters of evaluation of the candidate's scholarly activity.

Service: The candidate should demonstrate continuing departmental service and should show evidence of university, community, or national professional service. In evaluating service both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered.

A rating of meritorious requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and some service to the college, campus, community or profession.

A rating of excellent requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and leadership roles or multiple service contributions 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 Awarding of Tenure

The candidate's record in teaching, research, service, and professional practice 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. 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. . In evaluating classroom teaching, course content, level and size will be considered in interpreting student evaluations. Both qualitative comments and quantitative ratings on the FCQs will be considered when determining effectiveness along with the other forms of evaluations.

A rating of excellent will require the candidate to meet the standards for a meritorious rating as well as submit evidence of participation in activities that reflect dedication to student learning (the appendix gives examples of such activities). Such activities should demonstrate that the candidate is enhancing the learning experiences of students. Continuous efforts at improvement and creative instructional development should be evident in the teaching portfolio and will be considered as evidence for dedication to student learning.

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 be seeking external research funding. In all cases, 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 publications, submitted or funded research proposals, and by letters of evaluation of their work.

A rating of excellent requires meeting the criteria for meritorious and demonstrates exceptional impact on the field through either quantity or quality of research publications and/or extraordinary research funding.

Service: In addition to meeting his or her obligation to the department and university service, the candidate should also demonstrate service within the discipline and/or to the community. Service to the discipline may include reviewing for journals, granting agencies or professional conferences, or participation and leadership within professional associations. Service 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 the lay public or professionals. In evaluating service both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered.

A rating of meritorious requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and service to the college, campus, community or profession.

A rating of excellent requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and increased service contributions 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 Full Professor

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service 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. This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and up-dating curriculum and course materials. 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 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, 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 would be expected. Other indicators of scholarly maturity may include publications of scholarly book, major grant funding, invitations to provide keynote addresses at major national conventions, 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: The department recognizes service to the campus, community and to our profession. In evaluating service both the quality and quantity of service 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 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 types of evidence that the department would find acceptable for a candidate to submit for review as evidence for meeting 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. Other evidence may also be considered however the candidate is recommended to seek the advice of the chair of the department or Evaluation Committee when deciding on which activities to participate in and submit in a dossier.

Teaching Evidence

Effectiveness

- Student evaluation of teaching and mentoring (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
- Quality of doctoral dissertation, master's thesis or honor's thesis supervision
- Teaching outside of the classroom through supervision of students' thesis or dissertation projects or as member on thesis and dissertation committees
- 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
- Evidence of student learning or accomplishment
- Evidence which demonstrates effectiveness of students in succeeding courses and/or in the pursuit of graduate education and/or in careers

Student Dedication

- Student advising activities
- Evidence which demonstrates innovation or creativity in teaching
- Participation in teaching-related activities (e.g., workshops or conferences)
- Student supervision in professional experience activities, internships, and/or independent studies
- Evidence demonstrating student development and encouragement
- Teaching improvement activities (e.g., workshops, conferences, seeking mentorship)
- Providing role modeling and mentoring based on a teaching experience at any educational level (e.g., new faculty, graduate students)
- Teaching contribution to other departments, programs, or institutions, in addition to UCCS Psychology Department
- Evidence which demonstrates effectiveness of students in succeeding courses and/or in the pursuit of graduate education and/or in careers
- Evidence of student learning or accomplishment
- 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

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
- Un-sponsored 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