

Department of Psychology Criteria for Post Tenure Review

Submitted: September 2023

Approved by the Dean's Office and Office of the Provost: September 8, 2023

All tenured faculty members in the Department of Psychology are subject to Post Tenure Review (PTR) every five years. PTR is a holistic evaluation of a faculty member's contributions to our department community over the preceding five years. The review packet, which comprises the material to be reviewed, will consist of (1) an optional narrative record of accomplishments over the previous five years prepared by the faculty member under review (and not to exceed 12,000 characters in length), (2) the previous five years' worth of annual performance reviews, (3) the faculty member's CV, and (4) the faculty member's disciplinary record (if any).

Psychology Department guidelines for PTR are based on quantifiable department criteria for annual evaluation, adjusted to account for a five-year evaluation period. Our department values the contributions of our faculty in the areas of Research, Teaching, and Service, and we consider these areas to be of equal significance. Therefore, performance in all three areas will be considered during the PTR process, taking into account the faculty member's annual assignments across the five-year period of review.

Rating categories for PTR shall include the following:

1. Exceeds expectations: A clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performance of faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit.
2. Meets expectations: Expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit.
3. Does not meet expectations: Performance falls below the normal range of annual variation in performance compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit, but is capable of improvement.
4. Unsatisfactory: Failure to meet expectations that reflect disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulations and policies.

As per College of Arts and Sciences PTR requirements, please note that a faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation during one (or more) of the previous five years, or has received unsatisfactory performance in any single area of assignment over multiple years, or has demonstrated a pattern of non-compliance with university regulations or policies or with efforts to correct performance, may be deemed as not meeting expectations (a score of 3) or as unsatisfactory (a score of 4).

PTR of each area (Research, Teaching, and Service) will be based on the previous five years of annual reviews and assignments. Ratings will be made separately for each area (Research,

Teaching, Service), and then holistically weighed by assignment to yield a final PTR score. The PTR evaluation will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period. The criteria for PTR in the Psychology Department are drawn from university approved criteria for annual evaluations as follows:

| | Research | Teaching | Service |
|---------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Exceeds Expectations (1) | <p>Evidence of demonstrably high research activity for the rank, which exceeds the norm in our department.</p> <p><i>Examples include (but are not limited to):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequently publishes in impactful journals appropriate for their discipline • Produces scholarly work of unusually strong merit • Gives prestigious invited addresses / keynote talks • Regularly presents research at conferences | <p>Evidence of demonstrably high-quality teaching and mentorship for the rank, which exceeds the norm in our department.</p> <p><i>Examples include (but are not limited to):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regularly teaches curriculum-critical courses • Teaches courses that challenge students intellectually and develop their relevant skills • Consistently receives teaching evaluations above the department / college means • Absence of patterns of student criticism or complaints; improves courses based on feedback • Chairs and sits on multiple thesis committees (depending on campus) • Mentors multiple students in research (depending on campus) • Successfully mentors Honor Thesis students (depending on campus) | <p>Evidence of demonstrably high-quality department, college, university, and/or professional service, which exceeds the norm in our department.</p> <p><i>Examples include (but are not limited to):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holds office in prominent professional society • Serves on numerous “heavy load” department / college / university committees • Regularly disseminates research to the community • Serves as Editor / Associate Editor at top-quality journals |
| Meets Expectations (2) | <p>Research activity meets expectations for the rank in our department.</p> | <p>Teaching activity meets expectations for the rank in our department.</p> | <p>Service activity meets expectations for the rank in our department.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p><i>Examples include (but are not limited to):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publishes in impactful journals appropriate for their discipline • Publishes rigorous scholarly work • Presents research or gives talks at professional conferences | <p><i>Examples include (but are not limited to):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaches courses that meet university quality guidelines • Receives teaching evaluations that meet College averages • No discernible patterns of student criticism or complaints • Sits on multiple thesis committees (depending on campus) • Mentors students in research (depending on campus) | <p><i>Examples include (but are not limited to):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serves on department / college / university committees • Serves on professional committees • Does regular ad hoc journal reviewing |
| <p>Does Not Meet Expectations (3)</p> | <p>Research activity is less than expected for the rank in our department.</p> <p><i>Examples include (but are not limited to):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few / no articles or chapters published in quality outlets • Little / no scholarly work published in quality outlets • Few / no research presentations at professional conferences | <p>No clear evidence of adequate teaching at the level expected for the rank in our department.</p> <p><i>Examples include (but are not limited to):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course syllabi contain some major lapses in university guidelines or course design • Consistently receives teaching evaluations below college means • Some evidence of patterns of student criticism or complaints • Sits on few or no thesis committees (depending on campus) • Does not supervise students in research (depending on campus) | <p>No clear evidence of adequate service at the level expected for the rank in our department.</p> <p><i>Examples include (but are not limited to):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little to no service to the department / college / university / and/or profession • Little to no evidence of participation in internal committees • Little to no evidence of participation in professional committees • Little to no ad hoc reviewing for journals |
| <p>Unsatisfactory (4)</p> | <p>Research activity is less than expected for the rank in our department. The pattern continues more than one year.</p> | <p>No clear evidence of adequate teaching at the level expected for the rank in our department. The pattern continues</p> | <p>No clear evidence of adequate service at the level expected for the rank in our department. The pattern continues</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | <p><i>Examples include (but are not limited to):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not actively engaged in self-directed research projects for a sustained period of time (more than one year) as evidenced by a lack of journal submissions and a lack of participation in professional conference presentations • Not actively involved in collaborative research for a sustained period of time (more than one year) as evidenced by a lack of journal submissions and a lack of participation in professional conference presentations • No publications for a sustained period of time (more than one year) | <p>more than one year.</p> <p><i>Examples include (but are not limited to):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course syllabi consistently lack required elements • Consistently receives teaching evaluations below college means and shows little or no efforts to improve teaching • Significant patterns of student criticism or complaints • No active participation in graduate student recruitment, teaching, or training (depending on campus) | <p>more than one year.</p> <p><i>Examples include (but are not limited to):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No service to the department / university / profession for a sustained period of time (more than one year) • No evidence of participation in internal committees for a sustained period of time (more than one year) • No evidence of participation in professional committees for a sustained period of time (more than one year) • No ad hoc reviewing for journals for a sustained period of time (more than one year) |
|--|--|---|---|

The Process

The faculty member completes a university-designated dossier highlighting accomplishments and demonstrating performance and submits it to the Chair. The Chair reviews the dossier, the faculty member’s personnel file, and other records related to professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance. Upon reviewing the relevant data, the Chair assigns the faculty member a single rating using the rating scale described above (and based on the criteria outlined in the table above). The PTR evaluation will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period.

The Chair also writes a letter assessing the faculty member’s level of achievement and noting (if applicable) any concerns regarding professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance during the period under review. The Chair forwards the faculty member’s dossier, including all records and the Chair’s letter, to the college dean for review.

Appeals

Any faculty member may appeal the PTR score awarded by the Chair, without prejudice. Appeals will be conducted by the Psychology Department Evaluation Committee, using the same criteria. The outcome of the appeal will determine the PTR score reported by the Chair.

Approved by vote of the tenure-track faculty on 9/15/23