



Department of Psychology

Date: October 3, 2005
To: Kathryn Seidel, CAS Dean
From: Robert L. Dipboye, Psychology Chair
Re: The annual review procedures and standards for the Psychology Department

The Collective Bargaining Agreement of 2005 between the BOT at UCF and UFF mandated that each department form a six person committee to revise the procedures and standards used in the chair's annual evaluation of faculty. In Psychology this committee consisted of Robert Dipboye (chair), Robert Pritchard, Stacey Dunn, Charles Negy, Barbara Fritzsche, and Valerie Sims. The present document describes the revisions in the Psychology Department annual review unanimously approved by this committee.

The committee concludes that for the most part the procedures and standards that are currently in place have served the department well. There is also a sense that there is little that Psychology is doing to warrant a dramatic change in the appraisal system that it has now used for almost a decade. The Psychology Department is among the most outstanding departments at UCF on research, teaching, and service. The faculty has striven to provide quality instruction in the classroom and evidence of the success of their efforts is the large growth in enrollments in Psychology courses and Psychology majors. There are now three Ph. D. and two masters programs, all of which are successful. The Ph. D. program in Human Factors has achieved national visibility as a top-ranked program and both the I/O psychology and Clinical programs are likely to achieve such recognition in the near future. The Clinical Program achieved APA accreditation in a much shorter period of time than usual, and the I/O program was identified as the single most productive I/O program at last year's meetings of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. In terms of publications in top tier journals, grants, teaching awards, and other outputs, Psychology faculty members are consistently among the highest performing faculty at UCF. Attempting to achieve even greater achievements through the imposition of a rigid annual review process is unlikely to stimulate greater efforts in a department that is already a high achieving department.

Nevertheless, we propose several revisions: 1) an updating of the 1999 merit standards list to better reflect performances associated with service, teaching and research and to conform to the annual review form, 2) the scaling each of these standards on a 5 point rating system to assist in evaluating quality within the merit standards performance

Formatted: Font: 16 pt

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Left

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Left, Indent: Left: 0 pt, Hanging: 72 pt

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Deleted: Department of Psychology¶

¶

¶

MERIT CRITERIA¶

¶

Revised June 2005¶

¶

[Approved by Department Vote- August, 15, 2005]

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0 pt

Formatted: Left, Indent: First line: 18 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0 pt

Formatted: Left, Indent: First line: 0 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

indicators; 3) the statement of rules for translating ratings on the three dimensions of service, research, and teaching into an overall rating, (4) changes in the process to allow for resolution of differences between the chair and the annual review committee, and (5) a statement of how the evaluations on service, research, and teaching are combined to determine the overall evaluation.

Formatted: Left

1. Changes in the merit criterion list. The 1999 merit criterion list provided for differential weighting or valuing among the target behaviors/accomplishments specified in each of the three primary evaluation areas: teaching/instruction, research/scholarly activity, and service/professional development. Specifically, the 1999 revised standards were labeled on a 2-point differential rating system as 1) Major or 2) Minor in evaluating teaching, research, and service. The 1999 merit criterion list was based on a committee decision. This 2005 revision has changed the merit criterion list in the following ways:

- a. The addition, deletion, and clarification of standards in this list,
- b. The performance/accomplishment list is scaled on the importance of each item to the research, service, or teaching mission of the department using a five point scale and based on a survey of all full-time faculty,
- c. The standards are organized to conform to the annual report form.

2. Change in the annual report process. Each faculty member now submits a narrative in which they describe their own accomplishments in teaching, research, and service. This is an opportunity for the faculty member to inform the annual evaluation committee and the chair of the accomplishments that they believe are particularly important and to justify the importance of these accomplishments.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 pt

Formatted: Underline

3. Changes in the process. The process by which annual appraisals are conducted remains substantially the same. An annual review committee is still elected and serves overlapping terms. This committee is still advisory to the chair who actually performs the evaluation that is submitted to the Dean. Three changes were made in the process:

a. A self-evaluation component is now provided by having each faculty person submit a narrative with the annual report in which they describe their accomplishments during the previous year on teaching, research, and service.

b. Rather than weighting teaching, research, and service equally as in the present system, research is clearly identified as the most important (but not the only) factor in the evaluation of tenured and tenure earning faculty and teaching will be the most important factor in the evaluation of non-tenure earning faculty. This is to comply with the research mission of the department. Differences among the faculty ranks are made explicit to reflect expectations for assistant, associate, and full professors.

Deleted: -

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

c. Each faculty member is now allowed to negotiate in special circumstances the relative weights attached to research, teaching, and service in the annual evaluation. Changes in the relative weights are expected to be infrequent and are to occur at the beginning of each calendar year. Any change is to be negotiated between the faculty member and the chair.

d. A mechanism is now provided for dealing with discrepancies between the department chair and the evaluation committee. In the event that there are differences of opinion, the department chair meets with the annual review committee chair and/or the entire committee to resolve the difference.

Department of Psychology

Formatted: Left

Annual Review Procedures and Standards

Philosophy Underlying the Annual Review System

The primary goals were to construct an annual review process that is fair and consistent in application, useful in providing guidance to faculty, equitable as a basis for determining monetary rewards, and helpful to achieving the research, teaching, and service missions of the department. Underlying the annual review system are several beliefs and assumptions. .

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 pt

The judgment of faculty performance is inherently subjective. Psychology takes the approach that evaluating complex outputs of faculty is a process that requires judgment rather than rule-based systems. This makes the process subjective. However, all evaluation systems are inherently subjective. No set of scales or procedures can be devised that will completely rid an annual review system of subjectivity. For example, in a rule-based system, what goes on the list of things that count and how these things are worded are subjective decisions. The subjectivity is simply in another part of the process. No matter how structured or seemingly objective an appraisal system might be, the final evaluation inevitably relies on judgments of the faculty person's service, teaching, and research. The accuracy of this judgment is influenced by the information available and the standards that each person applies to this judgment. We aspire to a system that provides the most accurate judgment possible, but realize that perfection in such a system is not possible and attempts to achieve total objectivity through such approaches as point systems are likely counterproductive.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 pt, First line: 0 pt, Tabs: Not at 36 pt

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Our annual review system is a principle-based system that provides general guidance and uniform procedures rather than a rule-based system. In the latter, lists of outputs are provided such as publication of an article in a refereed journal, teaching ratings above the college average, etc and the evaluation is based on how many of these outputs the faculty member has produced. Such lists have a number of problems that make them unsuitable for Psychology. The different outputs are not equally important and counting the number of outputs from the list does not take this into account. Even more importantly, the outputs vary on multiple, important dimensions. For example, the importance of a journal article in a person's evaluation depends on the quality of the work; the journal where it is published; the length of the article, e.g. one page note vs. full length article; the order of authorship; and the type of coauthors, e.g. the faculty member's students vs. more senior faculty. Moreover, rule-based systems can lead to an inordinate emphasis on the most visible and concrete accomplishments of the faculty (e.g., number of publications in evaluating research, student ratings for evaluating teaching, number of committees for evaluating service) and to a neglect of very important but not as easily

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

measured outputs (e.g., importance of contributions in evaluating research, success of mentorship in evaluations of teaching, and impact on committee work in evaluation of service). There are always outputs by some faculty that will not fit neatly into such lists. To account for all these factors, the output list would need to have some a point system where each dimension of each possible output was identified and an importance rating done on each. This would be very difficult to produce and even harder to implement.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Although the Psychology Department formally acknowledges that the annual review of faculty performance requires a subjective judgment, steps are taken to maximize the accuracy of the process. To this end, the evaluation committee is first provided with a list of what types of outputs are considered important, along with a quantitative indication of how important each is. It is hoped that these standards will be helpful not only in evaluating one's own annual performance and that of one's peers, but also in the planning of each faculty member's allocation of effort. This listing is not purported to be exhaustive, and the committee, the chair, and the faculty member who is evaluated are encouraged to consider outputs that are not on the list if they are deemed important. A key principle is to provide a merit criterion list that will aid all parties in thinking about the previous year's performance while retaining maximum flexibility.

Deleted: .

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: No underline

The Department recognizes the importance of research and teaching while honoring diverse patterns of activity and productivity. The relative emphasis placed on teaching, research, and service can vary as a function of faculty rank, where the faculty member is in his or her career, and unusual shifts in assignments. Not all faculty members have the same role. The Psychology department aspires to achieve prominence as a research department and for that reason research receives the greatest weight in the evaluation of tenured and tenure earning faculty. Tenure earning assistant professors are expected to engage in service less than tenured and non-tenure earning faculty. Instructors have more teaching responsibilities than tenure earning and tenured faculty. Consequently weights are attached to teaching, research, and service that differ according to rank and tenure status. These weights are not meant to reflect the persons time spent in each activity but rather the importance of each activity in one's evaluation. The overall rating shall include the weighting of these category ratings and shall be regarded as the final indicator of performance assessment.

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Font: Not Italic, Underline

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Font: Not Italic, Underline

Deleted: -

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

To allow for some diversity of achievement some discretion is allowed in the annual review system for the chair and the individual faculty member to negotiate the relative weights placed on teaching, research, and service. Such negotiations are not expected to be common and are limited to tenured and non-tenure earning faculty. Nevertheless, the opportunity is provided for revisions in the weights attached to research, teaching, and service for changes in assignments due to administrative assignments, buyouts, and the like. Such requests must be justified by the faculty member, approved by the chair, and negotiated at the beginning of the year. Only in exceptional circumstances can the weights for that year be revised once the chair and faculty member agree on the weight for that year (e.g., extraordinary administrative assignments, buyouts from grants).

Formatted: Normal, Left, Indent: First line: 0 pt, Tabs: 18 pt, Left + 36 pt, Left + 54 pt, Left + 72 pt, Left + 90 pt, Left + 108 pt, Left + 126 pt, Left + 144 pt, Left + 162 pt, Left + 180 pt, Left + 198 pt, Left + 216 pt, Left + 234 pt, Left + 252 pt, Left + 270 pt, Left + 288 pt, Left + 306 pt, Left + 324 pt, Left + 342 pt, Left + 360 pt, Left

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

The annual review process should be faculty driven. Faculty members are assumed to constitute the best sources of information on their own accomplishments. Each full time faculty member completes an annual report in which they summarize their activities and outputs over the last calendar year, and this report serves as the primary source of information for the annual evaluation committee and chair. Accompanying this annual report is a narrative in which each faculty member provides a self-evaluation of their own accomplishments. Consequently, the annual review system rests to a large extent on the completeness and accuracy of the information that faculty members provide about themselves. Although the chair has the final responsibility for assigning an evaluation, the entire process in Psychology is based on a belief in collegial self-governance. The annual review committee is a six person committee elected by the entire full-time faculty in the department. Membership on this committee rotates so that two members are elected each year. The elected committee and the chair are expected to resolve discrepancies in their respective evaluations rather than relying on one or the other as the sole judge of faculty performance. Finally, faculty members have the opportunity to discuss their evaluations with the chair and to appeal these evaluations if they believe they are incorrect.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Deleted:

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Caveats and Concerns.

In proposing any annual review process we must acknowledge the potential pitfalls of performance appraisals. The research and theory in the organizational and social sciences have documented the many problems that accompany overly strident attempts to impose seemingly objective appraisal systems. These include focusing the attention of employees on an overly narrow set of outputs (e.g., quantity of publication) to the detriment of other important outputs (e.g., quality and impact of research), reduced teamwork and cooperation, and the minimum standard becoming the maximum.

Formatted: Normal, Left, Indent:
First line: 0 pt, Tabs: 18 pt, Left + 36 pt, Left + 54 pt, Left + 72 pt, Left + 90 pt, Left + 108 pt, Left + 126 pt, Left + 144 pt, Left + 162 pt, Left + 180 pt, Left + 198 pt, Left + 216 pt, Left + 234 pt, Left + 252 pt, Left + 270 pt, Left + 288 pt, Left + 306 pt, Left + 324 pt, Left + 342 pt, Left + 360 pt, Left

Formatted: Left

Formatted: No underline

Formatted: No underline

The attempt to implement performance appraisal systems in academic settings is subject to these and other problems. It seems safe to conclude that none of the top tier research universities achieved their status through a performance appraisal system. Becoming a great research university is the result of a combination of factors that include (1) the attraction, selection, and retention of highly talented and motivated scholars, (2) an intellectually stimulating climate that encourages scholarly productivity, (3) the rewarding of these scholars for their productivity, (4) academic leadership that imposes high standards while creating a sense of trust. In the absence of these and other factors, an attempt to impose a performance appraisal system can do more harm than good.

Deleted: s

In light of these concerns, we wish to state three particularly important assumptions underlying this proposed annual review process:

1. The focus of the evaluation standards is on research, teaching, and service. The “other” category is a default category available in the event that there is a significant area of performance that cannot be captured in the domains of research, teaching, and service. However, the “other” category has been used very rarely in

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold, Underline

Formatted: Font: Bold

the department. The committee decided that virtually all specific examples of performance could be assigned to research, teaching, or service. It would be unproductive and potentially biasing to attempt to document behavioral examples for a category that is so rarely used, especially when the focus on the three categories has served us so well. This is NOT to say that other accomplishments and activities will not be considered in the event that they arise. By the very nature of their rarity, however, it is not possible to provide metrics for the relative weight of performances that might fall into this category.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 18 pt

Formatted: No underline

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Left

Deleted:

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

2. It is assumed that merit pay raises are based on the overall evaluation of performance, NOT the configuration of ratings on the three dimensions. Specifically, in proposing the revisions in the annual review procedures and standards, faculty should not have to achieve the highest possible rating on all three dimensions to qualify for major merit raises. There are rewards for performance on the separate dimension and in these cases evaluations on specific dimensions may be a major factor. For instance, TIP awards are based on the appraisals received on teaching and RIA awards on appraisals on research. However, in honoring diversity among faculty in their accomplishments, it is assumed that faculty with the same overall evaluation will be treated the same in the allocation of merit raises regardless of whether their overall evaluation is based mostly on research or on teaching. If this practice changes (e.g., if outstanding ratings on all three are required for a merit raise), then the appraisal system proposed here will need further revision. An outstanding performance on one or two dimensions usually requires some tradeoff on the other dimension(s). In proposing this revision we acknowledge such tradeoffs and believe that faculty should not be punished for making these necessary tradeoffs.

Formatted: Left, Indent: First line: 36 pt

Formatted: Left

Formatted: No underline

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline

3. It is further assumed that the annual review and evaluation procedures should not require faculty to expend inordinate time and effort in the documentation of their accomplishments or evaluation of these accomplishments. A performance appraisal system is self-defeating when it becomes so laden with forms and reports that it keeps faculty from performing their core tasks, i.e. teaching, research, and service. For that reason we have decided not to mandate visitation and observation of each full time faculty member each year and the submission of a portfolio of teaching materials. This will remain optional except where required by university policy. Several other changes were recommended to streamline the annual review process.

Deleted: ¶

¶

Page Break

NO CHANGE...THIS IS EXACTLY WHAT IS USED NOW...¶

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Faculty Evaluation Process: Psychology

MAJOR STEPS

1. Meeting of faculty member with chair to discuss assignment

The evaluation process begins each year when the chair and each faculty member meet to discuss the faculty member's activities for the year and the weights that will be used for combining teaching, research, and service into the overall evaluation. If any revisions in the weights that are standard to a rank are requested, the faculty member will propose this to the chair and provide a justification for why a revision is needed. Any revision in the standard weights for a rank must receive the approval of the chair. **On rare occasions a faculty member may have a major assignment for the year that does not constitute research, teaching, and service. In this event, a fourth category of "other" will be added to what is described below and the weight assigned to this category will be negotiated with the chair. Because this is likely to be infrequent, what follows includes only research, teaching, and service.**

Formatted: Font: Bold

2. Submission of annual report to the chair

In January of each year, faculty members submit their Annual Reports in which they summarize their accomplishments in the areas of research, teaching, and service during the last calendar year. The submission of an annual report is required of each full time faculty member. The reporting of accomplishments by a faculty member should take into consideration the specific accomplishments and performances in the merit criterion list and the relative importance of each to the research, teaching, or service mission of the department.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 pt, First line: 0 pt, Tabs: Not at 18 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

In the proposed annual review, faculty members also submit a narrative summary of the accomplishments and performances that they would consider most important to the evaluation of their research, teaching, and service. In this narrative the faculty person has an opportunity to provide a short justification for why a performance or accomplishment should be considered important to the evaluation on a dimension. The list of scaled merit standards provides guidance to the faculty member on the relative importance of various accomplishments and performances. In cases where the faculty member believes that the accomplishment is more important than stated in the criterion list, the narrative provides an opportunity to communicate this to the annual review committee and the chair. For instance, a publication in a journal that might not be considered a top tier journal might still be an important publication for various reasons. In the narrative the faculty member can communicate why the publication should be considered a more important publication than would appear to be the case. Lower than usual course evaluations might be the result of special circumstances such as a new preparation or unforeseen and unavoidable

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

problems. The faculty person can use the narrative to describe these mitigating circumstances.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

3. Meeting of the Faculty Evaluation Committee

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Italic

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

The actual evaluation starts with the Faculty Evaluation Committee, composed of six faculty members who are elected by the voting faculty. Each person serves a 2-year term, staggered so that three new people are elected each year. This committee reviews the Faculty Annual Reports, student teaching ratings, and any other information provided by the faculty member. In making the evaluation the committee will refer to the merit criterion list in deciding the importance of various accomplishments and assigning an evaluation to teaching, research, and service. The evaluation on each dimension is determined on the basis of a discussion of the committee. The merit criterion list is to provide general guidelines but not specific rules for translating accomplishments on the annual report into a rating on a specific dimension. This evaluation is done for all full-time members of the faculty.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

4. Ratings in each category.

Next, the category rating system (Outstanding, Above Satisfactory, etc.) is converted to a numeric rating from 1 (Unsatisfactory) to 5 (Outstanding). Committee members rate the faculty on Teaching, Research and Service. Each faculty member is rated by 3 committee members. The ratings of each committee member are then collated. Agreement across raters is determined by calculating the variability in the ratings, using the standard deviation (SD). If all three raters give exactly the same rating, the SD is 0, indicating perfect agreement. If two raters give the same rating and one rater is different by one category, e.g. two ratings of 4 and one rating of 5, the SD is .47. Any disagreement more than this produces a larger SD. The committee reviews each case where the SD of the ratings is .5 or larger. The logic is agreement where the SD is .47 or lower represents high agreement and does not need to be discussed. Where discussion is needed, the case is discussed until consensus is reached, defined as a final SD of less than .5.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

5. Combining ratings into the Overall Evaluation.

This produces a mean rating for each faculty member on teaching, research and service. These ratings are then combined to produce the overall rating, using the following process. A person's rating on each of the three categories is multiplied by the weights to be used for him/her that year and these products are summed. Table 1 gives examples. The committee ratings and weights are shown for each person. The Overall Evaluation is the teaching rating times the teaching weight plus the research rating times the research weight plus the service rating times the service weight. This process insures that the overall evaluation is reflective of each person's expected contribution in each of the three categories.

TABLE 1. EXAMPLES OF OVERALL EVALUATION CALCULATION

NAME	RANK	RATINGS			WEIGHTS			OVERALL EVALUATION
		Teach	Rsch	Serv	Teach	Rsch	Serv	
Smith	Associate	4.8	3.0	4.1	0.35	0.5	0.15	3.80
Jones	Professor	5.0	4.3	4.8	0.30	0.5	0.20	4.61
Roberts	Assistant	3.8	5.0	4.8	0.45	0.5	0.05	4.45
Jackson	Instructor	4.3	3.3	4.4	0.8	0.1	0.20	4.65

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

The quantitative evaluations for each of the four categories are then converted back to the nominal categories from Outstanding to Unsatisfactory based on these ranges:

- Outstanding = ratings of 4.6 - 5.0
- Above Satisfactory = ratings of 3.6 - 4.59
- Satisfactory = ratings of 2.6 - 3.59
- Conditional = ratings of 1.6 - 2.59
- Unsatisfactory = ratings less than 1.6

The ranges were selected so that if at least two of the three raters believed the work was at a given level and one saw it as different, the ratings of the two would determine the final category. For example, if two raters gave a teaching rating of 5 and the other a rating of four, the mean would be 4.66. Because two of the three raters saw teaching as Outstanding, the final rating is in the Outstanding range.

Relative weights of teaching, service, and research within each rank.

The relative weights attached to research, teaching, and service reflect the needs of the department and the importance of each to the evaluation of a faculty member at that rank. In rare and exceptional cases, tenured and non-tenure earning faculty can negotiate with the chair to change these weights. For instance, a faculty member who buys out of teaching might negotiate a much reduced weight on teaching and an increased weight on research. A faculty member who has exceptional administrative responsibilities might negotiate a reduction in the weight on research and teaching and increased weight on service. Any variations from the weights described below must have the chair's approval at the beginning of the calendar year for which the person is evaluated.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Bold

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Bold

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Bold, No underline

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, No underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, No underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 18 pt

***For tenured and tenure earning faculty:

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, No underline

At the rank of untenured assistant professor (faculty at this rank cannot negotiate different weights):

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

- 50 research
- 45 teaching
- 05 service

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, No underline

At the rank of tenured associate professor (faculty at this rank can negotiate different weights in exceptional circumstances)

50 research
35 teaching
15 service

At the rank of full professor (faculty at this rank can negotiate different weights for teaching and service in exceptional circumstances)

50 research
30 teaching
20 service

***For nontenure earning faculty

Instructors and other non-tenured faculty with an FTE > 0 in research

10 research
70 teaching
20 service

Instructors and other non-tenured faculty with an FTE = 0 in research

0 research
80 teaching
20 service

The differential weights for research, teaching, and service reflect the expectations for faculty at various ranks. The intention is to make the annual evaluation at each rank consistent with the progress toward tenure evaluations and promotion and tenure decisions while also allowing some flexibility for tenured and non-tenure earning faculty in how they allocate their time and effort.

1. At the assistant professor tenure earning rank, research and teaching are the most important factors in the awarding of tenure. The department aspires to achieving national prominence as a research department and consistent with this aspiration, tenure earning junior faculty members have been recruited because of their potential to establish a productive and visible research program. Promotion and tenure of these faculty members requires that they achieve an outstanding record of research and clear evidence they have the potential to develop a nationally visible research program. Past practice would suggest that promotion and tenure is possible, however, with an acceptable teaching record that is good but not outstanding. This is not to diminish the importance of teaching. Moreover, evidence that an instructor is not an effective teacher would in all

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, No underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, No underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, No underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, No underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, No underline

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 80 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 18 pt + Tab after: 37.5 pt + Indent at: 37.5 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 18 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted ... [1]

Formatted ... [2]

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted ... [3]

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted ... [4]

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted ... [5]

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted ... [6]

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted ... [7]

Deleted: j

Formatted ... [8]

Formatted ... [9]

Formatted ... [10]

Deleted:

Formatted ... [11]

Formatted ... [12]

likelihood lead to denial of promotion and tenure even if the candidate had an outstanding research record. The least important factor in the evaluation of tenure earning assistant professors is service. Although some service to the department is expected of assistant professors, they are not expected to devote as much time and energy to service activities as tenured faculty.

2. At the associate professor rank, the expectation is that the individual will do more than show promise of research productivity. According to the current standards for promotion and tenure, "To seek the rank of Professor, consistent and increasingly significant achievements must be evidenced. There is no specific time period specified for the establishment of a pattern of performance consistent with achievement of the rank of Professor. The hallmark suggesting readiness for the submission of a promotion file is a record of sustained excellence and nationally recognized contributions to the field." One might also expect that all of those who achieve the rank of tenured associate professor will have proven themselves to be at least acceptable and effective teachers. Thus, at the same time that research is most important factor in the annual evaluations, sustained evidence of teaching effectiveness must also be shown. Service is least important, but is a more important consideration for the associate professor than for the untenured assistant professor. A tenured associated professor is expected to become involved in substantial service to the department and the university.

3. At the professor rank, the expectation is that the individual will continue to have a productive research program and contribute to the teaching of the department. But in comparison to the assistant professor and associate professor ranks, full professors are expected to devote more of their time to department, university, and professional service. This could include active participation in committees, chairing of committees, and directing graduate programs.

4. At the instructor and other non-tenure earning ranks the expectation is that the individual's primary responsibility is teaching. Service is also a required part of the assignment in most cases. Research, on the other hand, may or may not be expected. If the faculty member requests part of his or assignment to be in research, it will be the least important of the three in determining the annual evaluation. If there is no assignment in research, no evaluation will be made for this dimension and the overall evaluation will be based solely on teaching and service.

Chair Review and Final Ratings

The final evaluations of the committee are then submitted to the chair. The committee is advisory to the chair and the evaluations are recommendations. The chair may change evaluations s/he submits to the Dean. The department chair will meet with the chair of the annual evaluation committee to discuss these evaluations and to attempt to resolve discrepancies that may exist in their respective evaluations of individual faculty.

Review by faculty member and submission to the Dean

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Left, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, No underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted ... [13]

Formatted: Left

Formatted ... [14]

Formatted ... [15]

Formatted ... [16]

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted ... [17]

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Underline

The faculty member will be given the chair's evaluation and will have an opportunity to discuss this evaluation with the chair and to submit a rebuttal. The chair will take into consideration the faculty member's rebuttal in deciding whether to revise the evaluation that is submitted to the Dean.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Deleted: ¶

¶
Faculty Annual Report Form (see Faculty Annual Report Form (2002).doc)¶
Summarizes faculty accomplishments for the last year¶
Done by each full time faculty member¶
Typically at the end of Spring semester¶
Includes information on teaching, research and service¶
Submitted with a narrative summary of activities in each area (see Narrative Example.doc)¶
¶
Student Teaching Ratings ¶
Done for all classes¶
¶
Faculty Evaluation Committee¶
Six people¶
Elected by the faculty¶
2-year term, staggered so three new slots each year¶
Review Faculty Annual Reports, narratives, and student teaching ratings¶
Done for all full-time faculty¶
Rate each faculty member on Research, Teaching, Service & Professional, Overall (Also have a category for Other University which we did not use.)¶
Ratings: 5=Outstanding, 4=Above Satisfactory, 3=Satisfactory, 2=Conditional, 1= Unsatisfactory ¶
Ratings based on departmental document (see Depart Merit Criteria & Raise Link Rev 04.doc)¶
What should be considered in each category, e.g. what is included in teaching, etc.¶
Relative weight of different factors ¶
Each faculty member is rated by at least 3 raters ¶
Ratings are summarized: mean and standard deviations are calculated¶
Committee meets to review ratings¶
Focuses primarily on faculty where variability across raters is high ¶
Finalizes ratings¶
Agrees on any other information that should be added to the faculty narratives¶
Gives chair the mean rating in each category, the mean rating for the overall, and narratives ¶
These ratings and narratives are advisory to the chair¶
¶
Faculty Evaluation Form (see Fac Eval Comm Form (04).doc)¶
Completed by the Department Chair¶
Based on committee recommendations, with any changes by chair¶
Uses narratives from faculty/Fac Eval Committee ¶
Additional information may be added by chair ¶

Formatted: Centered

The Merit Standards List

- The Merit Standards list consists of the major accomplishments and activities related to each of the three areas on which the faculty member is evaluated (i.e., teaching, service, research). Obviously quantity of activity (e.g., number of students supervised, number of publications, number of grant proposals submitted) plays a role in the evaluation but the quality and impact of the faculty member's endeavors in each category should also be given major consideration. For instance, a faculty member might serve on many committees but if there was little involvement or contribution to the work of these committees, the number of committees should count little.
- The revised standards are presented in a manner consistent with the annual report form to guide not only the faculty member's preparation of the annual report but also the evaluation of the file by the committee and chair. They are intended to provide guidance to the committee and chair on how to translate the record into the rating on teaching, service, and research and the overall evaluation for the year. However, the process is a subjective one and no attempt is made here to present a formula for this translation. Moreover, scaled values attached to each output reflect a very crude hierarchy of importance. As much importance should be attached to the standard deviations. The standard deviations reveal the differences among areas within the department on the relative importance of these outputs. The mean importance ratings are a useful guide, but the annual review committee and chair must take into account the possibility that any given output of a faculty member could be more important than indicated in these ratings. In these instances, much of the burden of proof is on the individual faculty member to show in the narrative summary of their accomplishments how their record deserves a higher evaluation than suggested by the mean ratings.
- The Department's Merit Standards specify those behaviors/accomplishments that are considered of primary professional significance in terms of faculty annual evaluation review as well as progress toward change of tenure and/or promotion status, and decisions regarding distribution of merit-based salary raise dollars. The faculty were surveyed and asked to evaluate each activity/accomplishment on the importance to fulfilling the research, teaching, and service missions of the department on a five point scale (5 = very important to mission, 4 = important to mission, 3 = moderately important, 2 = small importance to mission, 1 = minimal or no importance to mission). The mean rating from the recent survey and the standard deviation of the rating are in parentheses. The standard deviation is an index of how much variation existed among the sample in their ratings.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold, Underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold, Underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold, Underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 18 pt + Tab after: 36 pt + Indent at: 36 pt, Tabs: Not at 54 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 18 pt + Tab after: 36 pt + Indent at: 36 pt, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 18 pt, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers

Formatted: Left

Formatted: Normal, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 18 pt + Tab after: 36 pt + Indent at: 36 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

I. Teaching Activities:

All faculty members are expected to be competent instructors regardless of the extent to which their annual assignment involves research or service. This competency can be demonstrated in several ways, including course evaluations, teaching awards, peer ratings, and so on. The collective bargaining agreement states that student course evaluations must be taken into consideration, but that faculty may provide other material such as including course materials, informal and formal peer evaluations, and grade distributions. Progress toward tenure reports require a formal peer evaluation based on a class visit and observation and the submission of course materials. However, the provision of these and other materials is optional for all other faculty.

The department is required to consider student evaluations in annual reviews but we acknowledge the limitations of student evaluations as the sole means of evaluating teaching and providing feedback. It is the responsibility of faculty who wish to have sources of information considered in the annual review to include other materials in the annual report and to describe their importance in the narrative summary. For instance, a faculty member may wish the committee to take into account new preparations, challenging course material, a large class, and other factors in considering course evaluations. The faculty member also may choose to incorporate course materials, grade distributions, and other evidence in support of their teaching effectiveness.

Teaching at a major research university includes training and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students in addition to classroom instruction. These activities often occur outside the traditional classroom setting, but are nonetheless important to one of the overall missions of a research university – e.g., the development of a future generation of scholars. Teaching the necessary skills to be successful in this endeavor includes supervising undergraduate honors theses and encouraging undergraduates to participate in active faculty research programs. At the graduate level supervising master's theses and dissertations, supporting students' efforts to publish their research, and providing guidance on the importance of and strategies for obtaining pre-doctoral and post-doctoral extramural and intramural research support are all aspects of effective teaching. Excellence in these realms can be assessed, for example, by an undergraduate's entry into a desirable and competitive graduate training program, research publications of supervised students, and student success at obtaining research funding.

- a. Outstanding: clearly exceptional achievements in the instruction and mentoring of students including but not limited to successful supervision of student research, student advising, student ratings that are predominately in the top two categories of the rating scale, and timely passage of student supervisees through major hurdles such as the publication of research, presentation of conference papers, successful completion of comps, etc.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 18 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 pt, First line: 0 pt, Tabs: Not at 36 pt + 54 pt

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 18 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Indent: First line: 18 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 18 pt + Tab after: 36 pt + Indent at: 36 pt

- b. Above satisfactory: conscientious and dedicated performance as an instructor including but not limited to successful supervision of student research, student advising, and student ratings that are in the top two categories on some of the categories in the rating scale.
- c. Satisfactory: acceptable performance as an instructor including but not limited to student ratings that are predominately in the middle category of the rating scale.
- d. Conditional: substantial shortcomings in teaching performance requiring remedial action.
- e. Unsatisfactory: clear and sustained deficiencies in teaching performance which are sufficiently serious to warrant possible disciplinary action or termination.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 18 pt + Tab after: 36 pt + Indent at: 36 pt

Deleted:

The following list of teaching outputs are ranked and rated on their relative importance to the teaching mission. These rankings are meant as a rough guide to the committee and chair in evaluating the faculty record but should not be interpreted as precise measures of relative importance. For instance, a new course preparation has a value of 3.36 whereas the number of courses has a value of 4.00. This should not be interpreted to mean that number of classes taught is always more important than new class preparations. The standard deviations suggest considerable overlap in the ratings. Also, an individual faculty member's teaching record must be evaluated in the context of overall activity of that faculty member. For instance, in a given term a faculty member might teach fewer courses so that he or she can put more effort into the preparation of a course that makes a valuable contribution to the department. The faculty member would not be punished for a reduced load. The primary point here is that the annual review committee and the chair must avoid basing the evaluation on counts of outputs but should judge each output in the context of the overall record.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 18 pt

1. Quantity of teaching efforts

Formatted: Indent: First line: 18 pt

- a. Number of classes taught (4.00, .89)
- b. New Course Preparations:
 - Leadership in curriculum revision or development within or outside department (3.82, .87)
 - New course (3.36, 1.21)
- c. Contributions to teaching commitments;
 - Teaching large undergrad classes (>80): (3.82, .87)
 - Teaching honors college courses (2.91,1.14)
- d. Laboratory Development and authorship of pedagogic materials:
 - Design and/or fabrication of specific course and laboratory hardware (2.91, 1.14)
 - Textbooks (2.82, 1.47)
 - Workbooks, manuals (2.45, 1.29)
 - Software (2.45, 1.29)
 - Test banks (2.45, 1.29)

2 Quality of teaching efforts

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

- Quality of syllabi and course materials (4.00, 1.00)*
- Student evaluations of course (3.73, 1.34)
- Official peer evaluations (3.73, 1.35)*

Unofficial peer evaluations (3.00, 1.41)*

3. Supervision and mentoring of students

a. Research Reports Supervised:

Undergraduate Research (4.09, .94)

Nonthesis graduate research supervision (4.09, .83)

b. Theses Supervised:

Ph. D. thesis direction (4.64, .67)

MS thesis direction (4.55, .93)

Undergrad honors thesis direction (4.27, 1.19)

Thesis and dissertation committee membership (3.64, .92)

c. Other supervision

Supervision of Independent Study: (3.55, .93)

Intern Supervision: 3.18, .87)

d. Academic advising and mentoring

Faculty advisor to student professional groups (2.91, .70)

Postdoc supervision (2.91, 1.45)

Facilitating student admission into graduate/professional schools
(2.73, .79)

Number of students assigned for advisement (2.64, 1.43)

Facilitating career placement for students (2.55, 1.21)

Program of study consultation (2.54, 1.04)

4. Other

a. Grants and contracts to support instruction

Successful proposals (3.27, 1.42)

Proposals submitted to funding agencies (3.00, 1.18)

b. Review of pedagogic material

Manuscripts submitted to instructional journals (2.36, .67)

Review of books, workbooks, manuals (2.09, .94)

c. Conferences and workshops on teaching

Presentations, leading workshops (2.55, .93)

Attendance as a learner (2.18, .87)

d. Publications on teaching where focus is on specific assignments

(2.82, 1.25)

Formatted: No underline

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

*Under the collective bargaining agreement, it is optional whether faculty submit additional materials relevant to evaluating these factors.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 pt, First line: 0 pt, Tabs: Not at 54 pt

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic

II. Research and Creative Activities:

In evaluating faculty research the Department looks for evidence that the research program has or will have significant impact on the field. Although a certain frequency of publication is generally necessary for establishing a research reputation, sheer number of publications is neither the only nor the most important index of research productivity. Efforts to secure external research funding are expected of all faculty and

both the quality and the success of grant proposals will be used in merit evaluations. Documentation of research productivity will be provided minimally in the form of a list of publications, presentations, and grant proposals submitted during the year. Faculty are also encouraged to provide other documents that will allow the Annual Review Committee and the Chair to assess the quality as well as the quantity of work completed in this category. These might take the form of letters from editors or reviewers, published reviews of books, and a personal statement that places the year's work in the context of the individual's overall program of research.

A primary mission of the Department of Psychological Sciences is to achieve international and national visibility for excellence in research. Consequently, the department expects all tenured and tenure earning faculty to demonstrate a sustained record of scholarly achievement. The evaluation of research excellence involves an examination of a number of standards. Of course, there is the evaluation of the productivity of a candidate. However, evaluation of research excellence also involves examination of the quality of the research, its impact on the research activities of others in the field, the continuity of the candidate's research program, and the intellectual independence of the research program.

Quantity– In assessing productivity, faculty should be aware that primary emphasis will be given to publications in refereed journals. Book chapters will be considered positively in the context of a sustained record of refereed publications and where those chapters indicate evidence of national and international recognition. Textbooks can contribute to the scholarship of a field when they make a significant and demonstrable intellectual contribution. However, the contributions of book chapters and textbooks must be documented, and book chapters and textbooks are generally more useful for demonstrating scholarship at senior levels. Presentations at meetings are encouraged as a way of testing ideas in public forums but will not substitute for publications.

Impact and quality of research – The quality and impact of a candidate's research will be an important component of the assessment of scholarly contribution. Where the impact of the candidate's work may be unclear to the annual review committee and the chair, the individual faculty member has the responsibility of presenting journal reputation, impact and rejection rates, and other information that can be considered in judgments of quality. Citation analyses are required in the annual report and can be useful, but those analyses must be done in the context of the citation expectations for top scholars in the candidate's area of research. Again, it is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to provide a context for this information so that the annual review committee and the chair can properly evaluate this information.

- a. Outstanding: clear evidence of scholarly achievement that achieves national or international visibility. A recipient of an outstanding evaluation would have an active and visible research program and clear evidence of

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 18 pt

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

research accomplishments. Only publications appearing in print during the reporting period are used in the evaluation.

- b. Above satisfactory: clear scholarly achievement with the potential of achieving national or international visibility. A typical recipient of an above satisfactory evaluation would have a promising research program. Only publications appearing in print during the reporting period are used in the evaluation.
- c. Satisfactory: acceptable scholarly achievement but little evidence that there is a coherent research program that will achieve national or international visibility.
- d. Conditional: a deficient record of scholarship characterized by unacceptable quantity and/or quality of research
- e. Unsatisfactory: a sustained record of deficient scholarship that is unacceptable in quantity and quality.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 54 pt + Tab after: 72 pt + Indent at: 72 pt

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 54 pt

The scaled values in this list are to provide a general guide to the relative importance of various outputs. They should not be used to make fine distinctions among outputs. For instance, presentations at professional meetings have a mean importance rating of 3.40 whereas papers in refereed proceedings have a value of 3.07. The statistical significance of the difference in this case is not only nonsignificant, but the annual review committee and the chair should take into account differences among research areas in the importance attached to proceedings. For instance, in the Human Factors area the papers published in the Proceedings of the Human Factors Society are considered more important than papers in proceedings in other areas. The faculty member has the responsibility of showing in the narrative summary why an output might deserve more weight in the evaluation than indicated in the scaled list.

1. Sponsored Research/Awards:

Awards of external funds as PI (4.6, .74)

Award of external funds as co-PI (4.0, 1.07)

Award of internal funds as PI or co-PI (2.8, .86)

2. Proposal/Award Preparation: (3.4, .99)

3. Unsponsored Research: (3.4, .91)

4. Quantity of Publication of Professional Books or Papers:

Journal articles refereed (4.87, .35)

Authored scholarly books refereed (4.67, .62)

Edited scholarly books refereed (4.27, .80)

Scholarly chapters refereed (3.93, .96)

Authored scholarly book nonrefereed (3.47, .92)

Edited scholarly book nonrefereed (3.26, .96)

Papers in proceedings refereed (3.07, .96)

Journal articles nonrefereed (2.60, .99)

Technical reports (1.80, 1.01)

Computer programs (1.73, .88)

5. Impact of Publications

Status or prestige of journal or book series (3.73, 1.22)

Impact rating of journal (3.33, 1.35)

Citation count: (2.73, 1.28)

6. Presentation of Professional Papers/Posters

Keynote addresses (3.50, 1.18)

Meetings of professional organizations (3.40, .632)

Invited colloquia (3.00, 1.25)

Presentations to layperson groups (2.07, .88)

Briefings to research contracting agencies (1.87, .92)

7. Editorial board participation*

Editor of journal (4.13, .99)

Associate editor of a journal or book series (3.40, 1.29)

Editor of book series (3.27, 1.03)

Editorial board member (3.5)

Ad hoc reviewer (2.60, 1.05)

8. Other

Independence of research (3.33, 1.34)

Order of authorship on publications (3.07, 1.12)

Awards for research (e.g., RIA, 2.60, .99)

* Editorial activity does not fit neatly into the three scholarly categories described in this document. In reality, editorial responsibilities overlap both service and research. Becoming an editor, associate editor, or member of an editorial board is evidence of the individual's scholarly reputation. The activities of an editor involve the production of knowledge insofar as that individual serves as a gatekeeper for the field and shapes the content and quality of published work. An editor brings considerable prestige to the department and thereby furthers the research mission of the department. At the same time editing is clearly a vital service to the profession. In light of this ambiguity, faculty preparing narratives describing their professional accomplishments may need to pay special attention to the ways in which they describe the scholarly contributions of their editing. Faculty members are in the best position to explain the nature of such activities and the contributions they believe they make to research through their editing. To the extent that editorial activities make a substantial research contribution, the faculty member should list these activities under research as well as service to the profession. To the extent that the editorial activities are mostly administrative and do not represent a scholarly contribution, they should be listed only under professional service.

III. Service:

All faculty members are expected to provide service to the Department, the College, the University, and the Profession of Psychology. Faculty members are expected to share in the governance and necessary activities of the department through such things as committee assignments, teaching of service courses, and so on. However, the level of involvement in service activities will differ according to rank. Assistant Professors in their first term of appointment are expected only to provide institutional service at the

- Formatted: Font: 12 pt
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 18 pt
- Deleted:
- Deleted:
- Deleted:
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt
- Deleted: ,
- Deleted:
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt
- Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt
- Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 pt, First line: 0 pt, Tabs: Not at 54 pt
- Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt
- Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt
- Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt
- Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Department level. As a faculty member's career progresses, additional service is expected, both at the Department and at the College and University levels. Faculty at the rank of full professor should be involved in substantial leadership in service to the department and the profession. Full professors are more likely than the other ranks to be able to obtain high profile-positions as journal editors, editorial board members, executive board members of professional organizations. These activities bring recognition to UCF and should be encouraged.

Institutional service may include serving on committees or task forces, writing reports and other internal documents, mentoring junior faculty, and accepting major administrative assignments inside or outside the Department. Service to the profession may include reviewing manuscripts and grant proposals, serving in an official capacity within a professional organization, serving as an editor or member of an editorial board, and serving as an external reviewer for another institution. Faculty may also choose to provide professional service to the community, for example by serving on community boards or task forces, by consulting to public and private organizations, and by providing training or professional services to the members of the community. To be considered part of a faculty member's professional performance, community service should involve the application of professional expertise, not simply the contribution of time and effort. In general, service contributions may be documented by a list of activities undertaken during the year under review. Where a faculty member wishes service to be given special weight in merit evaluations, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to demonstrate the importance of this activity in the narrative summary that accompanies the annual report.

Service to professional organizations is a component of service excellence and can involve such activities as offices held in state, national or international societies. However, because service is not the primary responsibility of any faculty member in this department, and this department has only a limited outreach role, it is not expected that service will ever be the most important component of a faculty member's evaluation.

- a. Outstanding: exceptional service contributions to the university, college, department and profession including, as a minimum, work on important university committees as a member or chair, and service on committees in professional organization in the faculty member's discipline. An outstanding evaluation on service requires active participation that leads to clear contributions, not merely membership.
- b. Above satisfactory: above average contributions to the university, college, or department and/or discipline through participation in university committees and/or service on committees in professional organizations.
- c. Satisfactory: acceptable service including membership on university, college or department committees or participation in professional organizations.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Plain Text

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted ... [18]

Formatted ... [19]

Formatted ... [20]

Formatted ... [21]

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 pt

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

- d. Conditional: a deficient record of service including but not limited to a failure to participate in essential activities expected of faculty (e.g. failure to attend committee meetings)
- e. Unsatisfactory: a sustained record of clearly unacceptable service to the department.

- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, Not Bold
- Formatted: Plain Text, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 18 pt + Tab after: 36 pt + Indent at: 36 pt
- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, 12 pt
- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold
- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, 12 pt
- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold
- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, Not Bold

The scaled values associated with each output are meant to provide a rough guide to the annual review committee and the chair in evaluating each faculty member's service record. These values should not be used to make fine distinctions among outputs in this list. For instance, membership on a college/university committee would appear to be important (3.82) than membership on a departmental committee (3.63). Not only is the difference between these two statistically nonsignificant, but annual review committee and the chair will want to take into consideration the work, achievements, and significance of committees on a case-by-case basis. It may well be the case that a departmental committee is of such importance that it receives more weight than the university committees on which the faculty member served during the year. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to show in the narrative summary why this departmental committee should receive more weight than indicated in the scaled values.

- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold
- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, Not Bold
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt
- Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

1. Committee Service:

a. Service to Department

- Director of undergraduate/graduate program (4.82, .41)
- Chair of departmental committees (4.73, .47)
- Associate department chair (high importance, 4.55, .82)
- Membership on Departmental committees (3.63, .92)
- Mentorship of junior faculty (3.36, 1.29)

b. Service to the university

- Chair of college/university committees (4.64, .92)
- Membership on college/university committees (3.82, .98)
- Membership on SUS committees (3.63, .92)

.c. Public Service:

- Professional Service to the community that is relevant to the Profession (3.4, 1.07)
- Member of community group or advisory board (2.63, .92)
- Invited speaker (moderate importance (2.55, .69)

2. Public Relations Activities and entrepreneurial activities:

- Facilitating financial support for students (3.72, 1.09)
- Successful efforts to obtain major gifts (3.55, 1.21)
- Speeches and other community service which relate to the mission of the University (3.00, 1.15)
- Participation in efforts to obtain major gifts (3.00, 1.10)
- Compensated activities where fees are contributed to department or University (2.91, 1.04)

3. Service to the discipline

- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 36 pt + Tab after: 54 pt + Indent at: 54 pt, Tabs: 54 pt, Left
- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 36 pt + Tab after: 54 pt + Indent at: 54 pt, Tabs: 54 pt, Left

Participation and leadership in professional organizations

Officer of professional organization (4.00, .77)

Organizer of professional organization meetings (3.91, .94)

Professional organization committee membership (3.36, .67)

Awards for service (3.18, 1.40)

Attendance at meetings of professional organization (2.64, 1.12)

Professional Organization Memberships: (2.45, 1.13)

Editorial board participation*

Editor of journal (4.13, .99)

Associate editor of a journal or book series (3.40, 1.29)

Editorial board member (3.3, 1.00)

Editor of book series (3.27, 1.03)

Ad hoc reviewer (2.60, 1.05)

4. Other

Member of review panel for national organization or agency (4.00, .63)

Organizer of scholarly conferences (4.0, .89)

Program reviewer for another university (3.36, 1.12)

* Editorial activity does not fit neatly into the three scholarly categories described in this document. In reality, editorial responsibilities overlap both service and research. The activities of an editor involve the production of knowledge insofar as that individual serves as a gatekeeper for the field and shapes the content and quality of published work. Because of this, an editor brings considerable prestige to the department and thereby furthers the research mission of the department. At the same time editing is clearly a vital service to the profession. Faculty preparing narratives describing their professional accomplishments may need to pay special attention to the ways in which they describe the scholarly contributions of their editing. Faculty members are in the best position to explain the nature of such activities and the contributions they believe they make to research. To the extent that editorial activities make a substantial research contribution, the faculty member should list these activities under research as well as service to the profession. To the extent that the editorial activities are mostly administrative and do not represent a scholarly contribution, they should be listed only under professional service.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 36 pt, No bullets or numbering, Tabs: Not at 54 pt

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 36 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Deleted:

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Deleted:

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic

Deleted: Merit criteria... This is revised to be consistent with the annual report form.

I. Teaching Activities

1. Quantity of teaching efforts

a. Number and size of classes
List regularly scheduled courses taught this reporting period:

Semester	Course	Enrollment	Lecture	Laboratory	Contact Hours
					[22]

Formatted: ... [23]

Formatted: Indent: First line: 36 pt

Deleted: . a.

Deleted: Grants and contracts ... [24]

Deleted: . b.

Deleted: Review of pedagogic ... [25]

Deleted: . c.

Deleted: Conferences and work ... [26]

Deleted: III.

Deleted: Service ... [27]

Formatted: Font: Times New

Deleted: . . a.

Deleted: Professional Service ... [28]

Formatted: Font: 12 pt



~~Department of Psychology~~
~~Promotion & Tenure Criteria~~
~~Approved April 7, 2000~~

Formatted ... [29]

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Left, Indent: Left: 0 pt

~~Page Break~~

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 10 pt, Not Bold, Font color: Auto

~~PROMOTION & TENURE CRITERIA~~
~~Department of Psychology~~
~~[Approved April 2000]~~

PREFACE: The Department of Psychology endorses the BOR, UCF, and COAS criteria for promotion and tenure. In addition, the following statements are intended to further concretize the pattern of activities that will be used in evaluating members of the Department of Psychology as they go through the tenure and promotion process. One of the primary goals in completing such a detailed listing of activities normally expected for the achievement of tenure and promotion is to reduce the ambiguity that may attend the process. Therefore, the following guidelines are rather explicit with respect to activities in teaching, research, professional ... [30]

Formatted ... [31]

~~Page Break~~

~~Current merit criteria~~
Department of Psychology Merit Evaluation Criteria
(with Major & Minor areas of emphasis indicated).

... [32]

Page 11: [1] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: 12 pt, No underline		
Page 11: [2] Formatted	Robert Dipboye	9/21/2005 12:22:00 PM
Justified, Tabs: Not at 18 pt + 36 pt + 54 pt + 72 pt + 90 pt + 108 pt + 126 pt + 144 pt + 162 pt + 180 pt + 198 pt + 216 pt + 234 pt + 252 pt + 270 pt + 288 pt + 306 pt + 324 pt + 342 pt + 360 pt		
Page 11: [3] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: 12 pt, No underline		
Page 11: [4] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: 12 pt, No underline		
Page 11: [5] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: 12 pt, No underline		
Page 11: [6] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:37:00 PM
Font: 12 pt, No underline		
Page 11: [7] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 11: [8] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 11: [9] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 11: [10] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 11: [11] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 11: [12] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 12: [13] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 12: [14] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:38:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Underline		
Page 12: [15] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 12: [16] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 12: [17] Formatted	Robert Dipboye	9/21/2005 10:48:00 AM
No bullets or numbering		
Page 21: [18] Formatted	Robert Dipboye	9/28/2005 4:51:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold		
Page 21: [19] Formatted	Robert Dipboye	9/28/2005 4:51:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 21: [20] Formatted	Robert Dipboye	9/28/2005 4:51:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold		
Page 21: [21] Formatted	Robert Dipboye	9/28/2005 4:51:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 23: [22] Deleted	Robert Dipboye	9/17/2005 2:10:00 PM

Merit criteria... This is revised to be consistent with the annual report form..

I. Teaching Activities:

1. Quantity of teaching efforts

a. Number and size of classes

List regularly scheduled courses taught this reporting period:

<u>Semester</u>	<u>Course</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Lecture</u>	<u>Contact Hours</u> <u>Laboratory</u>
-----------------	---------------	-------------------	----------------	---

Note. Indicate by an asterisk those courses for which you conducted a formal student evaluation. Be sure your chair has a copy of the results of each evaluation.

b. New Course Preparations: (moderate, 2.83) List those courses in #1 above which you taught for the first time, in which you made substantial revisions, or which were new additions to the curriculum. Explain briefly your activities.

New course (moderate importance, 2.83)

Leadership in curriculum revision or development within or outside department (moderate importance, 2.83)

c. Contributions to teaching commitments; (important, 4.0)

Special Course Requirements: List those courses in #1 above which had special requirements such as Area Campus or off-campus presentations. Explain.

Teaching large undergrad classes (>80): (moderate, 3.0)

Teaching research methods (moderate, 3.3)

Teaching honors college courses (3.16, moderate)

Teaching statistics courses at grad and undergrad (moderate, 3.0)

d. Laboratory Development and authorship of pedagogic materials:

Design and/or fabrication of specific course and laboratory hardware

Textbooks (important, 4.33)

Workbooks, manuals (moderate importance, 2.83)

Software (moderate importance, 2.5)

Test banks (low importance, 1.83)

Quality of teaching efforts

Student evaluations of course (High importance 5.0)

Official peer evaluations (important, 3.88)

Quality of Syllabi and course materials (moderate importance, 3.5)
Unofficial peer evaluations (moderate, 2.88)

3. Supervision and mentoring of students

a. Research Reports Supervised: (High importance, 4.75)

Undergraduate Research (moderate importance, 3.12)

Nonthesis graduate research supervision (moderate importance,
3.17)

b. Theses Supervised: (Title, Candidate, Semester; and progress
made during the semester.)

Undergrad honors thesis direction (high importance, 4.67)

MS thesis direction (high importance, 4.83)

Ph. D. thesis direction (high importance, 5.0)

Thesis and dissertation committee membership (mod
importance,
3.17)

c. Independent Study: List independent study supervision

(Semester, Students) and explain briefly the nature of each project.
(moderate importance, 3.11)

d. Intern Supervision: Indicate number of students and semester supervised and describe your responsibilities.

e. Academic advising and mentoring

Average Number of Students Assigned for Advisement by semester

Program of study consultation (moderate importance, 2.67)

Faculty advisory to student professional groups (moderate
importance, 3.0)

Facilitating student admission into graduate/professional schools
(2.83, moderate importance)

Postdoc supervision (moderate importance, 2.66)

Facilitating career placement for students (2.33, low importance)

Other (Guest presentations in other classes and other unassigned teaching, innovative teaching techniques, etc.

Page 23: [24] Deleted	Robert Dipboye	9/17/2005 2:10:00 PM
<u>Grants and contracts to support instruction</u> (important, 3.8) Proposals submitted to funding agencies (low importance, 2.5) Successful proposals (high importance, 4.6)		
Page 23: [25] Deleted	Robert Dipboye	9/17/2005 2:10:00 PM
<u>Review of pedagogic material</u> (low importance, 2.5) Books (low importance, 2.5) Chapters (low importance, 2.0) Workbooks, manuals (low importance, 1.83) Manuscripts submitted to instructional journals (2.16, low importance)		
Page 23: [26] Deleted	Robert Dipboye	9/17/2005 2:10:00 PM
<u>Conferences and workshops on teaching</u> (low importance, 2.75) Attendance as a learner (low importance, 1.83) Presentations, leading workshops (moderate importance, 3.0) d. <u>Publications on teaching where focus is on specific assignments</u> (important, 3.6)		

II. Research and Creative Activities:

1. Sponsored Research/Awards: (Title, Principal Investigator(s), Sponsoring Agency, Grant Number, Date Begun, Expected Completion Date, Total Dollar Amount) High importance; 5.0

Awards of external funds as PI (High importance, 5.0)

Award of external funds as co-PI (Importance, 4.5)

Award of internal funds as PI or co-PI (Moderate Importance, 3.0)

2. Proposal/Award Preparation: (Title, Principal Investigator(s), Agency submitted to, Total Dollar Amount, Date Submitted, State either Funded, Pending, or Declined)

3. Un-sponsored Research: (Title, Principal Investigator, Date Begun, Completion Date)

4. Quantity of Publication of Professional Books or Papers: (Author(s), Title, Publisher, Conference, or Agency Published by, Location, Month and Year, refereed or nonrefereed, regional, national, or international, ISI indexed?)

Edited scholarly books (Important, 4.0)

Scholarly books (High importance, 4.66)

Scholarly chapters (Moderate importance, 3.33)

Journal articles (High importance, 5.00)
Papers in proceedings (Moderate importance, 2.83 with exception of Human Factors where proceedings in the annual meeting is Important)
Technical reports (Low importance, 1.83)
Computer programs (Low importance, 1.83)

5. Impact of Publications (Moderate importance, 3.0)

Citation count: (Moderate importance, 3.0)
Status or prestige of journal or book series (Moderate importance, 3.33)
Impact rating of journal (Moderate importance, 2.5)

6. Presentation of Professional Papers: (Author(s), Title, Conference or Agency where presented, Location, Month and Year, refereed or nonrefereed; regional, national, or international)

Meetings of professional organizations (moderate importance, 3.17)
Briefings to research contracting agencies (low importance, 1.83)
Invited colloquia (moderate importance, 3.17)
Keynote addresses (important, 3.83)
Presentations to layperson groups (low importance, 2.0)

7. Editor/reviewer for scholarly publications, conferences

Editor (Important, 4.0)
Editorial board member (moderate importance, 3.17)
Ad hoc reviewer (low importance, 2.17)

Service:

Committee Service: SUS, University, College, Department, Special Projects, by semester

- a. Service to Department (High importance, 4.5)
 - Chair of departmental committees (important, 4)
 - Director of undergraduate/graduate program (high importance, 5)
 - Associate department chair (high importance, 4.83)
 - Membership on Departmental committees (moderate importance, 2.83)
 - Mentorship of junior faculty (moderate importance, 2.83)

- b. Service to the university (Important, 4.25)

Chair of college/university committees
Membership on college/university committees
Membership on SUS committees

Public Service: Service on local, state, or national agencies, boards, etc. which relate to the mission of the University by semester

Page 23: [28] Deleted Robert Dipboye 9/17/2005 2:10:00 PM

Professional Service to the community (moderate importance, 3.25)
Invited speaker (moderate importance, 2.66)
Member of community group or advisory board (moderate importance, 2.83)

Public Relations Activities and entrepreneurial activities: moderate importance (3.25)

Speeches and other community service which relate to the mission of the University by semester

Participation in efforts to obtain major gifts (moderate importance, 2.67)
Successful efforts to obtain major gifts (Important, 3.67)
Facilitating financial support for students (Moderate importance, 3.33)
Compensated activities where fees are contributed to department or University (moderate importance, 3.5)

Service to the discipline (Important, 4.25)

Office of professional organization (Important, 4.33)
Professional organization committee membership (moderate importance, 3.17)
Organizer of professional organization meetings (Important, 4.0)
Organizer of scholarly conferences (Important, 4.0)
Program reviewer for another university (moderate importance,

3.5)

Attendance at meetings of professional organization (low importance, 2.33)

Professional Organization Memberships:

Page 24: [29] Formatted Psych Front Desk 9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM

Font: 12 pt

Page 24: [29] Formatted Psych Front Desk 9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM

Font: 12 pt

Page 24: [30] Deleted Robert Dipboye 8/28/2006 9:43:00 AM

PROMOTION & TENURE CRITERIA
Department of Psychology
[Approved April 2000]

PREFACE: The Department of Psychology endorses the BOR, UCF, and COAS criteria for promotion and tenure. In addition, the following statements are intended to further concretize the pattern of activities that will be used in evaluating members of the Department of Psychology as they go through the tenure and promotion process. One of the primary goals in completing such a detailed listing of activities normally expected for the achievement of tenure and promotion is to reduce the ambiguity that may attend the process. Therefore, the following guidelines are rather explicit with respect to activities in teaching, research, professional development, and service. However, the Department of Psychology is also committed to honoring diverse patterns of activity and productivity. Thus, the activities outlined are offered as *guidelines* that will normally apply in the typical case, but they should not be taken as precise, inflexible rules.

TENURE: Although it is typically the case that a faculty member will be considered for tenure at the time of consideration for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the present BOR and UCF guidelines outline separate procedures for tenure and promotion. In light of this distinction, the Department of Psychology considers the decision to award tenure among the most significant judgments that can be made regarding a faculty member. Therefore, the criteria for tenure may be viewed as even more stringent than those utilized in awarding an individual the rank of Associate Professor. Concretely, this means that the Department would not grant tenure to anyone who does not qualify for the rank of Associate Professor; however, it might be possible to hire someone at the Associate Professor rank and yet not award tenure at the time of hiring.

Tenure is awarded to those faculty who are judged to be likely to make continuing significant professional contributions to the University and the academic community as a whole. A strong record of successful teaching, research, professional development, and service shall be taken as evidence of the likelihood of making continued significant professional contributions. Evidence of academic performance shall be consistent with an individual's years of experience and opportunities. Substantial achievement in both teaching and research, and indications of future excellence in these categories, are necessary for the granting of tenure. An appropriate amount of activity in professional development and service is also required. However, outstanding performance in the professional development and service category alone is insufficient for tenure. To achieve tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate the potential for making a significant, positive contribution to the discipline, Department, College, and University.

The Chair, in accordance with University requirements, will review all tenure earning but untenured faculty members in the Department of psychology annually. In addition, the departmental Tenure and Promotion committee will provide a written evaluation to each candidate concerning progress toward tenure. This evaluation will be based on material submitted to the committee by the Chair and the faculty member and will normally include, but not be limited to: (a) prior tenure progress evaluations; (b) faculty member annual report; (c) teaching evaluations for the given evaluation year; (d)

course syllabi and other selected teaching materials; (e) examples of recent manuscripts and funding proposals. Additionally, for the 3rd year Tenure Progress Review, the faculty member will submit: (f) a current curriculum vitae; (g) all previous Tenure Progress review reports; (h) all previous Annual Evaluation Chair Summary Reports; (i) selected published manuscripts, funded grant proposals, etc.

PROMOTION: As is the case with the Tenure criteria, the criteria for promotion outlined below are intended as guidelines that will normally apply as candidates are considered for promotion. However, the intention is not to provide inflexible standards that must be met in every case. Each faculty member will be evaluated on an individual, case-by-case basis. Although the types of activities that form the basis of promotion evaluations are founded on the Department's Merit Criteria in Teaching, Research, and Professional Development/Service, and thus overlap across ranks, the level of performance expectations are intended to be progressive in nature from promotion from (a) Instructor to Assistant Professor, (b) Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, and (c) Associate Professor to Professor. Thus, for example, the criteria for promotion to Professor require that a candidate must demonstrate evidence of sustained excellence that leads to peer recognition of one's achievements in the discipline at the national or international level.

ADDITIONAL INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS: The following additional guidelines are offered in response to evolving standards of performance expectations, particularly for the attainment of tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, and in response to requests by the faculty to provide increased clarity and concretization to the Department's Promotion and Tenure criteria. This evolution has particularly impacted expectations in the Research area as the Department's mission has increasingly emphasized graduate study and research. As noted earlier, however, it should be acknowledged that evaluation for tenure and/or promotion is accomplished on an individual basis. All guidelines are intended to reflect expectations in the typical instance but may vary considerably depending upon the individual faculty member's specific specialty area of professional work. It is imperative that the faculty member, the Department Promotion & Tenure Committee, and the Chair state explicitly and agree in writing upon exceptions to these general criteria/guidelines.

In the normal instance, the primary way of establishing the groundwork for a national scholarly reputation is through the publication of research-based papers in recognized peer reviewed scientific journals or other comparable peer reviewed publications (e.g., book chapters). The writing and receipt of External and/or In-House contracts or grants also represents highly valued scholarly activity and indicator of scholarship excellence, but would generally be considered secondary to peer reviewed publications for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

In general, a minimum expectation of 7 peer reviewed journal publications, book chapters, or other creative work [including "in press" status] will have occurred within the 5-7 year period prior to the submission of tenure and promotion materials.

Recognition and determination of the relevant publication outlets within discipline subspecialty areas will be the responsibility of the Department Promotion & Tenure

Committee and the Chair in consultation with the faculty member and appropriate area faculty.

It is recognized that multiple/joint authorship is a normal and valued pattern of publication credit in Psychology. Ethical practice generally suggests that the order of authorship will reflect the relative professional contributions of the authors to the research product. Additionally, while a faculty director may have made substantial contributions to the publication manuscript, APA ethical practice dictates that 1st authorship of a publication based on a student's thesis or dissertation would normally go to the student. The faculty candidate for tenure and promotion would normally be expected to be the senior author of at least 3 of the publications presented at the time of tenure and promotion consideration. Alternately, the candidate can provide evidence of significant intellectual leadership in their research effort.

PROMOTION TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR.

Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor is based on the individual meeting the following criteria:

Training: it will normally be required that Assistant Professors will have earned the terminal degree in Psychology [Ph.D., or Psy.D.], or in a closely related field.

Teaching Experience: It is normally expected that Assistant Professors will provide evidence of successful teaching at the college/university level, and potential for continuing growth in this area. Evidence of successful teaching might include materials as presented in the Department Merit Criteria-Teaching Subcategory with "Major-Minor" emphasis areas that are presented at the end of this document.

Research: All candidates will also be expected to demonstrate successful completion of research as evidenced by scholarly publications and potential for continued growth in this area. Evidence of successful research might include materials as presented in the Department Merit Criteria-Research Subcategory with "Major-Minor" emphasis areas as presented at the end of this document.

Service & Professional Development: This area will typically be considerably less important for promotion to Assistant Professor than to higher ranks. Where the candidate's academic experience is appropriate, he or she will be expected to demonstrate growth in this area. Examples of Service activities with areas of Major-Minor emphasis from the Department's Merit Criteria are presented at the end of this document.

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR.

All criteria for the rank of Assistant Professor must have been met. In addition, evidence of established and sustained excellence in teaching, research, and professional development/service must be present.

Excellence in “Teaching” will normally be evidenced by active and productive involvement with either undergraduate or graduate students [For example, faculty whose primary assignment is on an Area Campus may not have the opportunity to meet this criteria]. Excellence will normally be assessed in both classroom teaching as well as through mentorship or supervision of individual students. Excellence in teaching will also normally be evaluated in terms of Peer evaluations, Student evaluations, and other outcome indicators of productivity in this area. Evidence of excellence in Teaching would normally include items from the “Teaching” category of the Department Merit Criteria that appears at the end of this document.

Normally, excellence in Research productivity includes successful evaluation by a peer review process [e.g., successful peer reviewed evaluation of manuscripts; grant/contract proposals; refereed process in paper selection for presentation at professional meetings, etc.]. However, grant proposals and funded research alone are insufficient bases for promotion to Associate Professor. Development of an ongoing program of research, productivity in research, as well as evidence of the beginning of national recognition in scholarship are hallmarks for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. This is frequently accomplished through the development of a focal area of research expertise, presentation and publication of work in national forums, etc. The establishment of excellence in research/scholarship would normally involve evaluation of materials as outlined in the “Research” category of the Department Merit criteria which appears at the end of this document. Although submissions are an indication of research effort, it is understood that “in press” and published products are necessary. Also note the material previously presented under “Additional Introductory Comments.”

The achievement of excellence in “Professional Development/Service” includes evidence of a sustained, ongoing involvement in professional service to one’s community. “Community” may be defined in a variety of ways including and perhaps most importantly, the University Community [Department, College, University at-large], the SUS, regional, national, or international communities of scholars, the local community, the State, regional, national, or international public communities. Normally, attainment of the rank of Associate Professor of Psychology signifies evidence of productive involvement at a variety of levels of the university community, as well as professionally related involvement at some level of the extra-university community. The establishment of excellence in professional development/service would normally involve evaluation of materials as outlined in the “Service” category of the Department Merit criteria which appears at the end of this document.

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR.

All criteria for the rank of Associate Professor and for tenure must have been met. To seek the rank of Professor, consistent and increasingly significant achievements must be evidenced. There is no specific time period specified for the establishment of a pattern of performance consistent with achievement of the rank of Professor. The hallmark suggesting readiness for the submission of a promotion file is a record of sustained excellence and nationally recognized contributions to the field.

The establishment of excellence in Teaching, Research, and Service is again typically documented and evaluated in terms of the “Merit” categories summarized at the end of this document. Additionally, promotion to the rank of Professor typically requires that the faculty member not only has demonstrated a sustained pattern of excellence across the primary teaching, research, and service areas, but that she/he has specifically demonstrated leadership both within the Department and university community as well as by being recognized by professional peers as a nationally recognized leader/contributor to one’s field. Such leadership is often evidenced through demonstration of one or more of the following types of specific behaviors/contributions in teaching, research, and service:

Teaching

- Sustained success in undergraduate & graduate teaching
- Development of innovative courses and/or seminars
- Development of creative teaching strategies or materials including texts, software, presentational methods
- Chairing honors theses, graduate theses and/or dissertations
- Direction/supervision of independent studies and/or research leading to scientific presentations or publications by students.
- Acquisition of funding to develop or evaluate instructional methods
- Recognition for teaching excellence by the College, university, or discipline
- Mentorship of junior faculty

Research

- Sustained success in producing refereed, scientific journal publications
- Publication of book chapters, books, monographs, representing ongoing significant contributions to particular areas of psychology
- Success in the acquisition of external research funding
- Service in an editorial capacity for scientific journals, conference proceedings, or other scholarly publications
- Sustained service as a referee for grant/contract proposals to federal, State, or private funding agencies
- Development, sponsorship, and other leadership in support of scientific conferences, symposia, and/or workshops related to psychological research
- Presentation of invited or competitively selected research addresses to significant scientific societies
- Demonstration of a significant “citation” index of scholarly productivity

Service

Service as an officer in State, regional, national or international scientific or professional societies

Service as a Chair and/or sustained membership of college-, university-, or SUS-wide committees

Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 10 pt, Not Bold, Font color: Auto		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:52:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:53:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:53:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:53:00 PM
Font: Not Bold, No underline		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:53:00 PM
Font: Not Bold		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:53:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:53:00 PM
Font: Not Bold, No underline		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:53:00 PM
Font: Not Bold		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:53:00 PM
Font: Not Bold		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:53:00 PM

No underline

Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:53:00 PM
Font: Not Bold		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:53:00 PM
Font: 12 pt, Not Bold		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: 12 pt		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:53:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:54:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:31:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:54:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Italic		
Page 24: [31] Formatted	Psych Front Desk	9/28/2005 3:54:00 PM
Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt		
Page 24: [32] Deleted	Robert Dipboye	9/28/2005 8:52:00 AM

Current merit criteria

Department of Psychology Merit Evaluation Criteria

(with Major & Minor areas of emphasis indicated).

TEACHING

Classroom Instruction MAJOR
 syllabi & course materials
 student evaluations
 peer evaluations

Authorship of Pedagogic Materials MAJOR

textbooks
workbooks, manuals
software

Student Research Direction MAJOR
undergraduate research/independent study
undergraduate honors thesis direction
MS thesis direction
PhD thesis direction
Thesis & dissertation committee membership

Academic Advising & Mentoring¹ MINOR
program of study consultation
faculty advisor to student professional groups
facilitating student entry into graduate/professional schools
facilitating career placements for students
¹ The Department recognizes & acknowledges in its evaluation of this category, the exceptional volume of student advising related activities of faculty on Area Campuses and of the unique assignment of the Director of Undergraduate Advising/Instructor position

Grants/Contracts to Support Instruction
proposals submitted to funding agencies MINOR
reviews from funding agencies MINOR
successful proposals MAJOR

Review of Pedagogic Material MINOR
books
chapters
workbooks
manuscripts submitted to instructional journals

Program and Course Development MINOR
new course
substantial revision of existing course
leadership in curriculum revision or development

Conferences & Workshops of Teaching MINOR
attendance as a learner
presentations; leading workshop

Publications on Teaching Methods **where the focus is on particular activities or assignments**
related to specific content areas MAJOR

RESEARCH

Publications MAJOR
scholarly books or chapters
journal articles
proceedings

technical reports
computer programs

Presentations	MINOR
meetings of professional organizations	
briefings to research contracting agencies	
invited colloquia	
Research Grants/Contracts	
awards of external funds as PI	MAJOR
externally funded release time	MAJOR
award of external funds as co-PI	MAJOR
d) award of internal funds as PI or co-PI	MINOR
Submissions	MINOR
book/chapter manuscripts	
journal article manuscripts	
research grant/contract proposals	
5. Editorial/Reviewer for Scholarly Publication, Conference	
a) editor or editorial board of scholarly publication	MAJOR
b) ad hoc reviewer for scholarly publication, conference	MINOR

SERVICE

Service to the department	
chair of departmental committees	MAJOR
director of undergraduate/graduate program	MAJOR
associate department chair	MAJOR
membership on departmental committees	MINOR
mentorship of junior faculty	MINOR
Service to the university	
chair of college/university committees	MAJOR
membership on college/university committees	MINOR
Service to the discipline	
officer of professional organizations	MAJOR
professional organization committee membership	MINOR
organizer of professional organization meetings	MINOR
organizer of scholarly conferences	MINOR
program reviewer for another university	MINOR
attendance at meetings of professional organizations	MINOR
Professionally-related service to the community	
invited speaker	MINOR
member of community group or advisory board	MINOR

