

This document was revised by the Psychology Department during the 2012-2013 academic year and approved by the psychology faculty by departmental vote. It was approved by the Provost on Feb 25, 2014.

Revised 12/31/12

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA

I. PROCEDURES

A. Candidate's responsibilities

1. Faculty members have the right and responsibility to know all relevant Departmental, College, and University promotion criteria, policies, and practices. They should exercise this right at the earliest possible time.

2. A faculty member has the right to apply for promotion at any time (subject to provisions pertaining to promotion and tenure described in section III-L of the Faculty Handbook) and has the sole right to advance or withdraw the dossier from the promotion process.

3. Candidates' dossiers must be submitted to the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) no later than August 15th. The FEC will make the dossier available to the P&T Committee no later than September 1. (See Department Bylaws for a description of the composition and function of the FEC).

A candidate has the responsibility to consult the Faculty Handbook and also the Department Chairperson, the FEC, the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee, and other appropriate persons regarding the content and preparation of the dossier. It is the responsibility of each faculty member who desires to be considered for promotion or tenure in a given year to initiate the process by notifying the Chairperson by March 15.

a. The UD Faculty Handbook indicates that "Unless otherwise noted in the faculty appointment letter, all work in rank, even if conducted at other institutions of higher education, shall be considered for promotion and tenure. It shall be the faculty's responsibility to include evidence of this work in his/her dossier and to clearly identify when and where this work was performed." Work conducted at other institutions should be documented and evaluated in the context of the Department and institutional standards of excellence at the University of Delaware.

b. Tenure-track candidates to the rank of Associate Professor will be required to include the 2- and 4-year peer reviews (i.e., reviews conducted by the corresponding Department committee and reviews conducted by the Department chair). Continuing non-tenure-track candidates to the rank of Associate Professor will be required to include all available peer reviews. Dossiers that do not include these reviews will be considered incomplete.

B. Department responsibilities

1. For promotion to associate professor

a. Constitution of the Promotion and Tenure Committee

The P&T Committee will consist of all associate and full professors in the Psychology Department excluding the Chair. When considering tenure, only tenured associate and

full professors will constitute the P&T committee. The chairperson of this committee will be the Associate Department Chair if a full professor or if not the Associate Chair, a full professor who also serves on the Department's FEC. The P&T Committee will consult with the Department Chairperson, who will offer his/her counsel but neither participate in the final deliberation nor participate in the vote on the committee's recommendation.

b. Use of outside evaluators

The Department will use outside evaluators for the purpose of advising the Department concerning the scholarly or other relevant academic achievements of the candidate. A minimum of six "outside" evaluation letters will be obtained from senior and distinguished scholars in the field of the candidate. The FEC will develop a list of at least twelve outside evaluators, soliciting suggestions from the candidate and other Department members including the Chair. From that list the FEC shall select at least six with the expectation that there will be at least two representatives from each list on the final roster.

In the candidate's dossier, the FEC will specify the number of potential reviewers who were presented to the candidate and the number of these potential reviewers to whom the candidate objected, including the bases for these objections. The candidate will be shown this description and will be allowed to attach additional comments. If a reviewer (or reviewers) is selected despite a candidate's objections, the FEC will specify, in the dossier, the rationale for the selection.

In the case of a candidate being reviewed for the second time, it is desirable to select some reviewers who were not contacted the first time. Some of the original reviewers might receive requests for a second review. For the second review, only the second set of letters will be included in the candidate's dossier.

Other evaluations may be included in the promotion dossier but cannot be substituted for the requested outside evaluations. It shall be the responsibility of the FEC chairperson to contact the appropriate outside evaluators in sufficient time to obtain their evaluations. The letters of evaluation, assessing the candidate's productivity and accomplishments relative to standards in the field, will be confidential, and each such letter in the dossier will be accompanied by the letter requesting the evaluation (see Appendix A) as well as a curriculum vitae or biographical statement describing the reviewer's credentials and relationship to the candidate. Insofar as is reasonable and possible, only reviewers without personal ties to the candidates will be selected. Also, potential reviewers who previously wrote employment letters of recommendation will be avoided whenever possible.

For Continuing non-tenure-track (CNTT) faculty, the external reviewers shall be experts in areas directly relevant to the candidate's assigned workload (e.g., the teaching of psychology, clinical supervision, or administration).

c. Reporting of recommendation

The P&T Committee will provide a written statement of its evaluations and recommendations by October 1. This statement will indicate the numerical vote, describe the committee's composition, and explain the reasons for the decision

based on the candidate's performance relative to the Department requirements and weighted for workload during the period under review. It will be transmitted in writing to the candidate and to the Department chair and placed in the candidate's dossier. The copy to the candidate will not include mention of the identity of the outside reviewers. Signed minority opinions will be forwarded as appendices to the committee's recommendations. A simple majority vote is required for a positive recommendation.

The recommendations of the P&T Committee shall be forwarded to the Department Chair, who will review the evidence submitted by the candidate, the report of the committee, and the stated criteria and will make a recommendation supporting or failing to support the candidacy. The Chairperson will explain, in writing, her or his recommendation to the candidate and to the Department committee by October 15th. The chair's letter will be placed in the candidate's dossier.

d. Forwarding procedures

If the Department P&T Committee and Chairperson agree in recommending promotion, or if either or both recommend against promotion but the candidate chooses not to withdraw it, the application will go forward to the College committee and the Dean, together with the committee's and the Chairperson's recommendations.

e. Appeal procedures

If the candidate wishes to appeal either the P&T Committee or the Chairperson recommendation, the candidate may request a reconsideration meeting -- with the P&T Committee and/or with the Chairperson, depending on which recommendation(s) are appealed. A request for a reconsideration meeting must be made within five working days after receiving notification of the committee or chairperson recommendation. At the meeting(s) the candidate may present additional material, orally and in written form. At the conclusion of the meeting, a final vote will be taken, or a final recommendation made.

The P&T Committee Chairperson and/or the Department Chair (depending on the audience of the appeal) should document in writing that a reconsideration meeting occurred and the nature of the information reviewed. The candidate is also free to include in the dossier a letter documenting the grounds for a reconsideration meeting. If the P&T Committee or Chairperson decides to change its/his or her evaluation after such a reconsideration meeting, then both the original and the revised letter will be included in the dossier. If the P&T Committee or Chairperson decides to maintain its/his or her evaluation after the reconsideration meeting, then the committee or chairperson should document in writing the reason for the maintenance of the original recommendation.

2. For promotion to full professor

a. Constitution of the Promotion and Tenure Committee

The P&T Committee will consist of all Department full professors

excluding the Chair. When considering promotion of tenured faculty, only tenured full professors will constitute the P&T Committee. The Associate Chair or a tenured full professor who also serves on the Department's FEC will serve as chairperson.

b. Use of outside evaluators

Same as for promotion to associate professor. Whenever possible, reviewers who evaluated a candidate for promotion to associate professor should not be used to evaluate that candidate for promotion to full professor. However, it is acknowledged that in some research areas, reselection of reviewers is unavoidable and occasionally desirable.

c. Internal peer reviews conducted during the candidate's tenure as Associate Professor should be included in the promotion dossier.

d. Reporting of recommendation, forwarding procedures, and appeal procedures are the same as for promotion to associate professor.

3. Recommendation for tenure without promotion

Whenever a person has been hired at the rank of associate professor or full professor without tenure, the procedures for evaluating that individual for tenured status will be identical with the procedures used when an assistant professor is being considered for associate professor or when an associate professor is being considered for full professor depending upon the rank of the person applying for tenure.

4. CNTT appointments

CNTT faculty are eligible for promotion in rank. The same criteria and procedures apply to promotion of CNTT faculty that apply to tenure-track faculty. While the administered workload agreement is relevant and must be considered in the promotion in rank of all full-time faculty, it is particularly relevant to the promotion of CNTT faculty given the idiosyncratic workload agreements that may pertain to these individuals. Excellence in the area that constitutes the majority of the administered workload is required for promotion. When the P&T Committee undertakes evaluation of a CNTT promotion candidate, the committee will consult with the Department chair prior to its deliberations to insure that all parties understand the nature of each CNTT workload agreement.

C. Time schedule

March 15 - Faculty member should notify the Chairperson of her or his intention to be considered for promotion and/or tenure.

April 1 - FEC notified by Chair. FEC chooses a relevant P&T Committee Chair.

May 15 - Requests for letters of evaluation sent to potential reviewers.

August 15 - Dossier to the FEC.

September 1 - Dossier to P&T Committee and Chairperson.

October 1 - P&T Committee's recommendation sent to Department Chair

October 15 - Department's and Chair's recommendations to the College.

II. CRITERIA

When a faculty member is considered for promotion, his or her contributions in three major areas are considered:

- a. The contribution to Scholarship in the candidate's area, to include recognition in, and impact upon, the field.
- b. The contribution to Teaching.
- c. The contribution to Service.

A favorable decision for the promotion of tenure-track faculty requires excellence in scholarship, evidence that the candidate is developing a national reputation in the field, evidence of high-quality teaching, and a service contribution consistent with good Department citizenship. For CNTT faculty, excellence is required in the primary area (50% or more) of the workload assigned by contract.

A. For promotion to and tenuring of associate professor

1. Scholarship

Excellence in research and scholarship will be judged on the basis of the quality and number of published books and papers, the conduct of sponsored research, the number of papers delivered at professional meetings, and the amount of responsibility for evaluation of papers and grant applications assumed by the candidate. Within these four classes of scholarly activity, some qualitative distinctions will be made.

Publications are considered in two distinct categories; those that provide strong evidence of an individual's research competence and those of lesser importance. Refereed journal articles, research reviews, books, and book chapters are considered substantive evidence of research competence, with refereed work receiving the highest weighting. Strictly editorial work, technical reports, and non-refereed papers will be given less weight. The expectation is that papers will appear in high-quality venues and will result in citations from other scholars in the same or related research area.

Evidence of there being a programmatic quality to the research is of primary importance. Given two dossiers with the same number of papers, even if each individual paper is of high quality, the dossier in which the work is clearly striving towards some unified goal, and evidences the conduct of a program of related research projects, is the more preferred.

It is expected that the published work will provide evidence that the candidate is already becoming a highly visible scholar in the area of specialization, with the expectation that he or she will indeed become a leading scholar in the field in future years. What is important is not so much the volume of published work as its excellence, both in terms of its scientific soundness and its imaginativeness and contribution to the field.

The research grants submitted and grants awarded to a candidate are very important additional factors in consideration for promotion and tenure. Faculty are expected to pursue external funding for their research. Although receiving significant external funding is not itself a requirement for promotion, it is strong evidence of favorable performance and promise as judged by an independent source and thus is often a significant enhancement to the case for promotion and tenure. Furthermore, it is evidence that the candidate is able to secure the resources needed to advance their research program. For awarded grants, the candidate should clearly state what percentage of the award or money they are receiving and their specific role in the project.

The number of papers presented at professional meetings and invited addresses at other institutions provide a third basis for faculty evaluation.

A fourth and somewhat less important basis for evaluation of scholarship is the candidate's work as a referee for scholarly journals and grant applications. The quality of the journal for which the candidate evaluates will be considered in the judgment of this aspect of professional work as will the level of responsibility.

When making determinations of excellence in scholarship, consideration must be given to the candidate's negotiated workload agreements for the years being evaluated.

2. Teaching and Training

Teaching and other training take many forms in the life of the Department. Faculty may be involved in teaching both undergraduate and graduate students. As well, teaching takes place not only in formal classroom settings, but also in online courses and in the contexts of research mentorship, career and graduate school advisement, thesis (both undergraduate and graduate) and dissertation supervision, and clinical supervision. Such activities might also take place outside of the Department if such activities are part of the negotiated workload.

Evidence for Teaching Effectiveness

Evidence for teaching effectiveness should be compiled in a teaching portfolio.

Required Items for the Teaching Portfolio. The teaching portfolio should include both quantitative and qualitative evidence of effectiveness in teaching. At minimum, the teaching portfolios of all candidates should include the following items:

A narrative statement that contains a description of his or her primary teaching activities and primary teaching and learning goals.

Recent syllabi, examinations, and/or other teaching materials (group activities, paper assignments, slide presentations) that demonstrate the rigor and appropriateness of his or her teaching.

Student reactions to his or her teaching or training obtained from all evaluations. Quantitative student course evaluations (optionally framed in comparison to Departmental norms for courses in that group) should be presented. Faculty are encouraged to explain lower than average course evaluations in terms of course difficulty, teaching style, or other contextual factors. Qualitative student comments from course evaluations should also be presented. When these come from courses of size 50 or less they can be presented in full (unedited) for all courses taught by the candidate in all years leading up to the present review. When these come from courses of larger size, the candidate along with the FEC may select a representative sample of the qualitative comments with a statement that describes the method of selection (e.g., systematic random sampling).

Evidence of Excellence in Teaching. In addition to the evidence described above, faculty who wish to document excellence in teaching must submit additional materials. Such materials must include:

Evaluations from faculty peers who visit their classrooms and prepare letters describing their teaching. The candidate should arrange for such evaluations at multiple stages of the evaluation period.

Quantitative or qualitative evidence that their courses are designed to meet and assess significant stated learning goals. These might include evidence of significant student learning, such as completed exams, final projects, or presentations. In addition, tests and rubrics for scoring performance-based assessments of students' achievement of learning goals should be supplied. The candidate should annotate these materials, indicating the learning goals they were designed to develop or assess.

Final grade distributions of courses taught.

Evidence of attendance at teaching development conferences or workshops relevant to the candidate's assigned or anticipated teaching and training responsibilities.

The following additional forms of evidence may include but are not limited to:

Letters solicited by the FEC from undergraduate and graduate research advisees, clinical supervisees, students with independent studies, etc., providing feedback regarding their mentoring experiences with the candidate. Such letters may be considered by the P&T Committee and will be treated as confidential in the promotion dossier.

Examples of successful undergraduate/graduate advisement and mentorship, such as career or internship placement, placement into graduate programs or jobs. They may describe examples of successful undergraduate research supervision, such as undergraduate thesis supervision, publication with undergraduates, conference presentations with undergraduate co-authors, or supervision of undergraduate independent study. Faculty who train graduate students may present evidence of successful graduate research or clinical supervision, including dissertation committee chairship or membership, and publications or conference presentations with graduate students.

Evidence of participation in other aspects of the teaching mission of the Department, such as undergraduate informational panels or Psi Chi advisement.

Additional Evidence of Teaching and Training Leadership.

In addition to demonstrating their effectiveness inside the classroom, candidates for promotion whose primary workload (50% or more) is teaching or training may demonstrate their commitment by providing evidence of their leadership in teaching and training. This leadership might be local; for example, by developing innovative courses that are central to the Department's learning goals of critical thinking and quantitative literacy, teaching second-writing courses or including add-on honors sections to regular Department offerings, or local in terms of the university's strategic teaching goals such as the development of classroom technology or problem based learning courses. Such leadership might be regional or national, such as conference presentations that are teaching-related, or publishing scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL) in teaching-oriented journals. It may involve taking a leadership role in teaching- or training-related organizations on or beyond campus. It may involve publication of original teaching materials such as study guides, problem sets, textbooks, or training manuals.

3. Service

Service includes service to the Department and to the programs within it, service to the University, service to the scientific and professional community of psychologists, and service to the public more generally.

For purposes of faculty evaluation, service to the scientific and professional community is considered most important, since this reflects on an individual's professional reputation and scholarship, but regardless of its demanding nature, service is not a substitute for scholarship and teaching and generally does not weigh heavily on promotion and tenure decisions at the Associate Professor level unless such service is a significant part of the negotiated workload.

B. Promotion to full professor

In addition to evidence of continued excellence in scholarship (See II. A. 1), a tenure-track individual desiring to be promoted to full professor must be recognized by scientific colleagues outside the University as a leading scholar in his or her area of specialization. A continuing non-tenure-track individual desiring to be promoted to full professor must be recognized by colleagues outside the university as demonstrating significant leadership in his or her primary area of workload (e.g., teaching, clinical supervision, or administration) by enacting original or creative practices, meeting or setting standards in the field, or establishing a regional or national reputation in the area. Evidence of such a reputation will be obtained from the following:

1. Solicited peer evaluations

Every dossier will include at least six outside peer reviews obtained as described in the Procedures section. These reviews will be written by individuals with established reputations in the candidate's field. These statements will analyze and evaluate critically the candidate's work and accomplishments and may

compare them to others in the field who are at a comparable level. Peer reviews will be solicited from individuals qualified to review the candidate's primary workload area (see I.B.1.b.).

2. Unsolicited peer evaluations

Examples of unsolicited peer evaluations would be: a) articles citing the individual's work and the reasons for its importance; b) prestigious extramural grants; c) reviews of books, particularly when the reviews are in depth; d) reprinting of articles or parts of books in collections of distinguished contributions to a subject; e) invitations to speak at prestigious scholarly meetings and conferences, both national and international in scope; f) invitations to contribute chapters to books edited by established scholars in one's field ; g) data (such as h-index) from the Science and the Social Science Citation Index relevant to the impact of an individual's work; h) leadership positions in scientific societies; i) significant editorial responsibilities (e.g., Editorships) for respected scholarly publications; j) substantial involvement in national grant review processes (e.g., permanent member of review panels); k) invitations to participate in other peer-review processes such as program or Departmental evaluations; invitations to participate in promotion and tenure proceedings from peer Departments and universities. These activities each provide testimony to a person's competence and reputation and bring valued visibility to the candidate, to the Department, and to the University of Delaware.

In the area of teaching and training, such unsolicited evaluations could include awards for teaching, publications or invitations to talk about teaching and training methods, leadership positions in teaching and training communities, or other evidence of a significant reputation in these communities.

3. Teaching and Training

Tenure-track candidates for full professor must demonstrate continued evidence of high-quality teaching. CNTT candidates for full professor whose primary workload involves teaching and training are required to show continued evidence of excellence in these areas. In either case, evidence of achievement should be documented by portfolio (see Section II.A.2).

For candidates whose workload is primarily teaching and training, promotion to full professor requires more than just excellence in the classroom. Instead, candidates should demonstrate significant engagement with and leadership in relevant communities outside of the classroom—even regionally or nationally. Such engagement may be demonstrated through original publications on the scholarship of teaching, training and learning, receipt of relevant contracts and grants, development and dissemination of original pedagogies and training materials (e.g., textbooks, training manuals), involvement in the training of other educators or trainers, and other activities that establish the candidate's national or international reputation in their particular field of excellence.

Similarly, candidates whose primary workload is in a clinical-services or administrative area should demonstrate significant leadership in this area of their workload. Leadership might take the form of presentations, publications,

elected positions, or other accomplishments that reflect that the candidate has made significant contributions and earned a regional or national reputation in his or her area of workload.

4. Service

As described above, service includes service to the Department and to the programs within it, service to the University, service to the scientific and professional community of psychologists and service to the community.

For purposes of faculty evaluation, service to the scientific and professional community is considered most important, since this reflects on an individual's professional reputation and scholarship. Examples of this would include journal and grant reviews and committee assignments associated with membership in professional societies.

Similarly, extraordinary service of a demanding nature to the Department, College, or University will enter into the evaluation of faculty. Examples of this are election as College or University Faculty Senate president, chairing important Department, College, or University committees, etc.

Regardless of its demanding nature, service is not a substitute for teaching and research unless specified in the negotiated workload. Nevertheless, habitual avoidance of service commitments may be cause for not being recommended for promotion and tenure.

Community service is commendable, but except as it reflects on an individual's professional competence or is a significant part of the negotiated workload, it will not be considered as supportive of promotion or tenure decisions

III. FINAL STATEMENT

The Department will act in such a way in matters of promotion and tenure as not to violate the written policies of the University and University Senate, to which such actions are subject.

APPENDIX

Structure and Function of the Faculty Evaluation Committee of the Psychology Department

I. Structure of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)

The Faculty Evaluation Committee, chaired by the Associate Chair, consists of all members of the Advisory Committee, or their designees, and shall work with all candidates for promotion as they prepare their dossiers for submission to the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee. One member of the committee is designated as the primary liaison between the candidate and the Department P&T Committee.

II. Function of the FEC

The FEC's functions include: (a) coordination and implementation of tenure and promotion reviews of faculty; (b) coordination and implementation of all internal peer reviews of faculty; and (c) occasional review of the procedures and criteria for all activities involving evaluation of faculty.

For (a) above: The FEC coordinates the selection and solicitation of external reviewers, examines the candidate's dossier, and makes recommendations to the candidate concerning items that should be included or deleted. When the dossier is completed by the candidate, the FEC inserts the letters from the external reviewers and then presents (at a meeting) the dossier to the appropriate Department Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee (see I-B-1-a; I-B-2-a). Usually, the member of the FEC who is from the same program within the Department as the candidate will lead the P & T Committee meeting discussion and produce the initial draft of the letter that reports the vote of the P & T Committee and includes a summary of the rationale for that vote. This draft will be circulated among members of the P & T Committee for its approval; it is expected that the FEC will make some revisions to the draft based on comments from P & T Committee members. The final letter will be inserted in the candidate's dossier and will be forwarded to the candidate and the Department Chair.