

Department of Psychology
College of Letters, Arts and Sciences

May 31, 2009

PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT
Post-tenure Review Criteria and Processes
Approved December 2, 2008
Approved by the Provost: May 27, 2009

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:
 - Annual performance evaluations for the previous 5 years
 - Current curriculum vita
 - Professional plan(s) from the current post-tenure review cycle
 - A new, updated professional plan
 - A copy of any differentiated workload agreements for the five year period as appropriate.
 - FCQ summary sheets
 - 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
 - Student evaluations (FCQs)
 - 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