

**Department of Psychology
Eastern Kentucky University
Criteria for Promotion and Tenure
Approved: 2/1/2017**

CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

Tenure: Meets Expectations in Teaching and Service and has one publication that meets Departmental criteria for promotion.

Promotion to Associate Professor: Meets Expectations in Teaching, Service, and Scholarship.

Promotion without Tenure: University guidelines permit individuals hired as assistant professors to apply for promotion to associate professor after three years of full-time service.

Please Note: Candidates for tenure who have previously earned promotion have, in practice, satisfied the department's criteria for simultaneous promotion and tenure. Therefore, the dept. does not require a minimum level of additional scholarly production for these candidates during the period between promotion and the application for tenure, but requires them to demonstrate continued scholarly activity. However, candidates for tenure after promotion shall continue to satisfy the teaching and service criteria for simultaneous promotion and tenure.

Promotion to Professor: Exceeds Expectations in Teaching, Service, or Scholarship and Meets Expectations in the other two areas for activities since promotion to associate professor.

PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOR POLICY

Consistent with University Policy 4.6.5, candidates should be aware that interpersonal behaviors that interfere with the mission of the university can be used as grounds to deny reappointment and/or tenure. The RAPT committee has the authority to make this judgment based upon evidence gathered via the annual review process.

TEACHING

Three independent categories make up teaching: Classroom Instruction, Individual Teaching Activities, and Professional Development related to teaching.

This document lists criteria for each level in each category.

- Candidates may request that activities not listed be considered for inclusion in Individual Teaching and Professional Development.
- Supporting documents must be included with evaluation materials.
- Unless noted below, activities used in Scholarship and Service may not be used in Teaching.

A. CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION

Review of Self-Evaluation

- Candidates will complete the self-evaluation materials as outlined in the Promotion and Tenure guidelines. See Self-Evaluation and Teaching Material Review Appendix for information on items to include and evaluation guidelines for the Self-Evaluation of Teaching.
- Please begin Part B: Teaching Narrative with a description of your Teaching Philosophy.
- The candidate will receive feedback on his/her Self-Evaluation of Teaching in the RAPT report.
- The candidate should address previous feedback on his/her self-evaluation in his/her current self-evaluation.

Quantitative Student Evaluation Scores

- To meet departmental expectations for Quantitative Student Evaluations, an overall median average rating of at least a 3.0 for all courses is needed (e.g., the grand median).
- All sections of all courses taught during the Fall and Spring semesters of the probationary period or since last promotion should be included in the calculation.
- Calculate a median 5 point scale for Progress on Relevant Objectives, Excellent Course, or Excellent Instructor. Candidates may choose among these three outcomes for each individual course.
- Faculty should allow class time for students to complete course evaluations. Please note: If course response rate is frequently <50%, course evaluations may not be counted.
- The candidate should address quantitative student evaluations and previous feedback related to quantitative student evaluations in his/her self-evaluation.

Review of Student Comments

- Candidates should provide copies of the students' comments to the open-ended items on the evaluations, for all courses and all sections taught during the Fall and Spring semesters of the probationary period or since last promotion.
- The candidate should address student comments and previous feedback related to student comments in his/her self-evaluation.

Review of Classroom/Online Teaching

- Each candidate will be observed teaching by two members of the RAPT committee and the department chair (each year for pre-tenured faculty, and in the application year for tenured faculty) using the pre- and post-observation forms for face-to-face classes and the review form for online courses (See Appendix).
- Feedback from the three teaching observations will be combined and presented to the candidate in the RAPT report.
- The candidate should address previous feedback from class observations in his/her self-evaluation.

Review of Teaching Materials

- Candidates should provide copies of teaching materials, which include course syllabi, course assignments, tests, grading rubrics, and other course documents. See Appendix for information on items to include and evaluations guidelines for Teaching Materials.
- Review of teaching materials in combination with the peer evaluation of teaching constitutes the “second systematic method of teaching evaluation,” as referred to in University Policy 4.1.7. Feedback from this review will be included and noted as the second systematic method of teaching evaluation in the committee report.
- The candidate should address previous feedback related to the review of teaching materials in his/her self-evaluation.

EVALUATION OF CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION

Level of Performance	Category
Exceeds Department Expectations	A grand median of average ratings of at least 3.0, AND “exceeds expectations” in Review of Teaching Materials in each course and in Classroom Teaching and Self-Evaluation
Meets Department Expectations	A grand median of average ratings of at least 3.0, AND “meets expectations” in Review of Teaching Materials in each course and in Classroom Teaching and Self-Evaluation
Does Not Meet Department Expectations	Does not meet criteria for Meets Expectations.

B. INDIVIDUAL TEACHING ACTIVITIES

- Faculty are expected to engage in one-on-one instructional activities with students. These activities have the potential to be extremely valuable to student outcomes, and are highly valued by the department.
- We consider some of these to be of such a high demand and potential student impact, that the candidate can also receive service credit for the activity (see Service areas for more information). Individual teaching activities include those listed below.
- Additional activities will also be accepted. The burden is on the candidate to demonstrate that the activity consists of one-on-one instructional activities. Please assign a value to the activity by comparing to other known activities.

Individual Teaching Activities and Values

Advising (2) per 15 advisees

Master's Thesis Committee member (1)

Chair of a Thesis Committee (2)

Publication in a journal (2)

Presentation at a conference (1)

Independent study supervision (1)

Course teaching assistant mentoring (1)

McNair mentoring (2)

Honors thesis mentoring (2)

Supervising/Mentoring students for no teaching credit (1)

Clinical Consultation with students outside of an official Supervision Role (1)

Clinical Modeling and Direct Support not covered by course credit (1)

EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL TEACHING ACTIVITIES

Level of Performance	Average Number of Individual Activities Per Year
Exceeds Department Expectations	6 or more
Meets Department Expectations	4
Does Not Meet Department Expectations	Less than 4

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- Faculty are expected to continuously improve their teaching skills, develop new instructional techniques, and update their knowledge base. As such, professional development related to teaching is both expected and highly valued by the department.
- Professional development activities with point values include those listed below. Additional activities will also be accepted. The burden is on the candidate to demonstrate that the activity constitutes professional development. Please assign a value to the activity by comparing to other known activities.

Professional Development Activities and Values

Participation in a Professional Learning Community (3)

Attending a teaching conference (3)

Attending a professional conference (3)

Attending a full-day workshop (including activities such as CATs scoring, continuing education) (3)

Prepping a new course (3)

Substantial Revision to an existing course (2)

(e.g., new text book, transition to online, transition to writing intensive, transition to service learning, etc. Provide documentation to verify the revision.)

Attending a half-day workshop (2)

Attending a TLC workshop, webinar, or other continuing education (1)

EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Level of Performance	Average Number of Professional Development Points Per Year
Exceeds Department Expectations	4 or more
Meets Department Expectations	3 points
Does Not Meet Department Expectations	Less than 3 Points

OVERALL TEACHING EVALUATION

Level of Performance	Criteria
Exceeds Department Expectations	“Exceeds Expectations” in Classroom Instruction, and “exceeds expectations” in either Individual Teaching or Professional Development, and “meets expectations” in the third area.
Meets Department Expectations	“Meets Expectations” in all three categories
Does Not Meet Department Expectations	Does not meet expectations in one or more area

SERVICE

- Service activities include professional service to the department, college, university, profession, and the community.
- Non-professionally related service activities do not count in this category.
- Applicants should list their service activities and the level of demand for each service activity since last reviewed or since last promotion.
- Service activities with point values included are listed below. Additional activities will also be accepted. The burden is on the candidate to demonstrate that the activity constitutes professional development. Please assign a value to the activity by comparing to other known activities.
- Those service activities that are compensated at a fair market rate should not be assigned points for promotion and tenure.
- Service activities which receive less than fair market compensation should be assigned points based upon comparison of known activities. Applicants should make this determination and present the justification for the decision in their narrative about service.
- Chair of a Committee: Add an additional 50% of that Committee's associated points.

OVERALL SERVICE EVALUATION

For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

Level of Performance	Average number of points per year*
Exceeds Department Expectations	> 15
Meets Department Expectations	12-15
Does Not Meet Department Expectations	< 12

*Because faculty are not expected to engage in service their first year, untenured faculty should compute an average by dividing the total number of points by (Years – 1).

For Promotion to Full Professor:

Level of Performance	Average number of points per year
Exceeds Department Expectations	> 30
Meets Department Expectations	25-30
Does Not Meet Department Expectations	< 25

SERVICE APPENDIX

Documentation about level of demand is not required for (most of) these service activities.

Exceptional Demand (6 points) *(Average: 50—60 hours per year)*

Department

RAPT
Interim Chair for Dept.
Psych Bowl Leader
Psi Chi Advisor
Chair of Graduate Admissions Committee
Clinic supervision (over 25 cases)

College

College P&T

University

University IRB
Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee
University Assessment Committee
Pre-Med Committee

Profession

Officer in professional society
Editor of professional journal

High Demand (4 points) *(Average: 30—40 hours per year)*

Department

Comps grading (if essay)
Departmental Ethics Committee
Faculty/ Staff Search Committees (in-dept)
Member Graduate Admissions Committee
Communications Coordinator (Dept.)
Faculty Retreat Organizer
Clinic Supervision
Graduate thesis committee member
Chair of graduate theses (this is in Teaching category as well)

College

College Curriculum Committee
Faculty/ Staff Search Committees (outside-dept)

University

Foundation Professor Committee
Faculty sponsor of student organization
Faculty Senate
Faculty P& T Appeals Committee

<p>Profession --</p>
<p>Standard Demand (2 points) <i>(Average 10—20 hours per year)</i></p> <p>Department Awards Committee Merit Pay Committee Faculty Research and Development Committee Graduate Student Comps Committees (1 point per committee) Dept. Curriculum Committee Academic Practices Committee (Dept level) Colloquium Committee New faculty mentoring (1 point per mentee) Comps committee member NAMI Advisor</p> <p>College College Discipline Committee Academic Practices Committee (College level)</p> <p>University University Discipline Committee</p> <p>Profession --</p>
<p>Points per activity Ad hoc advising (e.g., summer sessions for Chair) (2 points per session) Spotlight days (2 points per session) Major Expo (1 point per session) Reviewer of manuscripts or conference submissions (1 - 3 points per review, including 1 - 3 points per revision; applicant should make a case for each review's point allocation, final decision is the RAPT Committee's)</p>
<p>Case-by-case (use established activity as metric to assign points) Writing grants to support departmental activities Developing funds for departmental support Leading workshop or organizational training Other College Committee (specify in application) Other University Committee (specify in application) Community service Writing for Popular Press CAAP Activities Science Fair Judge</p>

*

SCHOLARSHIP

Three independent categories make up the domain of Scholarship: Publications, Presentations, and Funding Activities.

- The applicant is responsible for presenting documentation and justification for any exceptions.
- The burden is on the applicant to demonstrate her/his role in the publication is that of a major contributor.

A. PUBLICATIONS

- The main criteria for this category are the number and nature of published works in which the applicant is first or second author and that are substantive, require peer review, and are in recognized outlets for information in the discipline
- Publication outlets include but not limited to: journal articles, scholarly books, and chapters in scholarly books.
- Federal Grants: 1 funded federal grant can also count as 1 publication.
- Manuscripts that are in-press or have been accepted for publication constitute valid publications.
- Articles that have been submitted but not yet accepted for publication will not be considered as publications.

Please Note: Please let the committee know ASAP if the status of a publication changes at any time during the review process.

- All publications must indicate EKU as the author's current institutional affiliation.
- The following publications can be used toward the "Exceed Expectations" category, but not the "Meets Expectations" category:
 - Submission of a Federal grant as first or second primary investigator (PI);
 - Publications in which the candidate is third or more author;
 - Special-case non-peer reviewed papers, e.g., major state or federal commission reports. These special-case non-peer reviewed papers must be clearly scholarly in nature, lengthy, and high in quality.
- For all non-journal article publications, the applicant must supply to the RAPT Committee the book/document and detailed information, so that the acceptability of the publication can be determined. For example, a scholarly book may count as one or two publications, depending on the nature of the book and the candidate's authorship role. The candidate should provide an opinion and explanation regarding the weight to be given to the book, but the RAPT Committee makes the final decision.
- Regarding publications with student co-authors:
 - For publications in recognized outlets for faculty, e.g., not undergraduate journals, order of authorship will be determined by counting the non-student authors only;
 - Publications in undergraduate journals do not contribute to the Scholarship area, but do contribute to the Teaching area.

CRITERIA for PUBLICATIONS:

Level of Performance	Number of publications since hired or last promotion*
Exceeds Department Expectations	At least 4 publications and 1 st author on at least 2
Meets Department Expectations	At least 2 publications, 1 st author on at least 1, and 1 st or 2 nd author on second.
Does Not Meet Department Expectations	Does not meet the criteria for Meets Expectations

**date of Departmental recommendation for promotion*

B. PRESENTATIONS

- The main criteria for this category are the number and nature of presented works in which the applicant is first or second author and that are substantive, require peer review, and are in recognized outlets for information in the discipline including: presentations at state, regional, national, or international meetings.
- The RAPT committee will consider special situations or exceptions to these guidelines. The burden is on the applicant to demonstrate her/his role in the presentation is that of a major contributor.
- Panel/Session presentations count as 2 presentations.
- Poster presentations count as 1 presentation.
- National or International presentations count double.
- Regarding presentations with student co-authors:
 - For presentations at recognized outlets for faculty, e.g., not undergraduate conferences or undergraduate portions of a conference, order of authorship will be determined by counting the non-student authors only, and the faculty member must have attended the conference and participated in the research presentation;
 - Presentations at an undergraduate conference or an undergraduate portion of a conference do not contribute to the Scholarship area, but do contribute to the Teaching area.

CRITERIA for PRESENTATIONS:

Level of Performance	Number of presentations since hired or last promotion*
Exceeds Department Expectations	2 or more Points Per Year
Meets Department Expectations	A total of 4 points during the past 5 years
Does Not Meet Department Expectations	Does not meet the criteria for Meets Expectations

**date of Departmental recommendation for promotion*

C. FUNDING ACTIVITIES

- The main criterion for this category is the extent of one's involvement in actively seeking or obtaining funding. In cases of collaborative projects, the burden is on the applicant to demonstrate that her/his role in the project is that of a major contributor.
- Please note: Faculty Development Grants for travel or continuing education are not considered internal grants.

CRITERIA FOR FUNDING ACTIVITIES:

Level of Performance	Criteria
Exceeds Department Expectations	Obtained 1 external grant as 1 st or 2 nd PI -or- Obtained 2 internal grants as 1 st or 2 nd PI
Meets Department Expectations	Has played a substantial role in the preparation and submission of 1 proposal for external funding -or- Has played a substantial role in the preparation and submission of 2 proposals for internal funding -or- Has obtained internal funding
Does Not Meet Department Expectations	Does not meet the criteria for Meets Expectations

OVERALL SCHOLARSHIP EVALUATION

Level of Performance	Criteria
Exceeds Department Expectations	Exceeds Expectations in Publications and Exceeds Expectations in at least 1 of the other 2 categories (all categories must at least Meet Expectations).
Meets Department Expectations	Meets Expectations in all 3 categories -or- Publications must at least Meet Expectations. Exceeds Expectations in Presentations or Funding, but Does Not Meet Expectations in final category.
Does Not Meet Department Expectations	Does not meet the criteria for Meets Expectations

TEACHING OBSERVATION APPENDIX

Eastern Kentucky University/Department of Psychology Pre-Observation Conference Form

This form is to be completed by the class instructor in advance of the scheduled class and returned to the observer. When presenting this form to the observer, please provide the observer a copy of any material that will help the observer understand the content and objectives of the session.

Instructor's name: _____ Observation (session) date: _____

Location (building and room): _____

Time: _____ Course number: _____ Number Enrolled: _____

1. Condition of the room. What temperature, environmental conditions, configuration, etc. might affect the outcome of the session?
2. Student learning objectives. What are the major objectives for this class session?
3. Teaching strategies. What strategies/methods/activities will you use to help students meet these objectives?
4. Preparation. What have students been asked to do in preparation for this session?
5. Assessment. How will the students demonstrate that they have met the objectives?
6. Teaching style. Will this class be typical of your teaching style? If not, why?
7. Instructor concerns/focus. What would you like to get from this specific observation?
8. Logistics. What are the logistics of this class (where the observer should sit, is the observer expected to interact or not, how long the observer will stay)?

TEACHING OBSERVATION APPENDIX

Eastern Kentucky University/Department of Psychology
Post Observation Form

Instructor's name: _____ Date: _____

Location (building and room number): _____ Time: _____

Instructor Organization. Comments on the extent to which the instructor made the class plan explicit, followed the plan, has the materials needed for class, showed evidence of having prepared the content, and the like.

Prompts in specific areas of instruction.

Variety and pacing of instruction. Comments on the extent to which the instructor employed a variety of instructional teaching styles and engaged the class for student interest and accomplishment of goals.

Presentation skills. Comments on the instructor's voice, tone, fluency, eye contact, rate of speech, gestures, and use of space.

Teacher-student rapport. Comments on the verbal interaction present in the class, the extent to which the instructor welcomed and appreciated student discussion, the instructor's openness to class suggestions, and his/her interpersonal skills.

Clarity. Comments on the extent to which the instructor used examples, was clear with explanations or answers to student questions, and defined new terms or concepts.

General prompts.

What things went well for the instructor and/or class? What things did not go so well during this particular class? What specific suggestions for improvement can be made?

TEACHING OBSERVATION APPENDIX

Eastern Kentucky University/Department of Psychology Peer Evaluation of Online Instruction

Instructions to Candidate: Please enroll the evaluator in your course for an agreed upon 2 week period.

1.1 Instructions make clear how to get started and where to find various course components.

2.1 The course learning objectives describe outcomes that are measurable.

2.4 Instructions to students on how to meet the learning objectives are adequate and stated clearly.

3.1 The types of assessments selected measure the stated learning objectives and are consistent with course activities and resources.

3.2 The course grading policy is stated clearly.

3.3 Specific and descriptive criteria are provided for the evaluation of students' work and participation.

4.1 The instructional materials contribute to the achievement of the stated course and module/unit learning objectives.

5.1 The learning activities promote the achievement of the stated learning objectives.

5.2 Learning activities foster instructor-student, content-student, and if appropriate to the course, student-student interaction.

6.1 The tools and media support the learning objectives and are appropriately chosen to deliver the content of the course.

6.3 Navigation throughout the course is logical, consistent, and efficient.

7.1 The course instructions articulate or link to a clear description of the technical support offered.

SELF-EVALUATION AND TEACHING MATERIAL REVIEW APPENDIX

Eastern Kentucky University/Department of Psychology

Teaching Philosophy

- Reader has a clear sense of teaching philosophy.
- Teaching philosophy demonstrates an understanding of the characteristics of students at EKU.
- Teaching philosophy demonstrates an understanding of the core teaching goals of the department and the university.

Teaching Activities

- Individual teaching activities are described.
- Pedagogical innovations and new course developments are noted.

Syllabi

- Syllabus follows University syllabus policy.
- Syllabus follows Departmental syllabus policy.
- Common departmental SLOs are included for each course.
- Course SLOs are clear, measureable, and assessments are explicitly linked to SLOs on syllabus.
- Teaching strategies described and outlined on syllabi are effective mechanisms for accomplishing goals outlined in teaching philosophy.
- Sequence of topics is clear and logical.
- Content coverage is up to date.

Course Design

- Critical thinking instruction and assessments are clearly articulated.
- Difficulty level is appropriate to enrolled students.
- Course is an adequate prerequisite for other courses-if applicable (as demonstrated by course content and assessments).
- Pacing of course coverage and assignments is appropriate to level of course.
- Technology use is appropriate to course.

Course Assessment

- Exam/Evaluation content is representative of course content and SLOs.
- Exam/Evaluation items are clear and well written, and address multiple levels of learning outcomes.
- Standards used for grading are appropriate to the level of the course and clearly communicated to the students.

Self-Reflection

- The Candidate's effectiveness and areas of weakness in meeting teaching goals is clearly explained.
- Strategies for remediating areas of weakness are realistically addressed.
- Candidate acknowledges and responds to previous evaluation feedback.
- Candidate acknowledge and responds to student feedback.

RAPT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS APPENDIX

Eastern Kentucky University/Department of Psychology

1. Have you reviewed the self-evaluation materials provided by the candidate?
2. In what way(s) have you worked with this candidate? (e.g., teaching collaboration, research collaboration, service collaboration, committee work, informal discussions, clinic work, peer evaluation of teaching, etc.)
3. Evaluate your experience working with this candidate?
4. Evaluate this individual's reliability, professionalism, department citizenship, and ability to work as a member of a team.
5. Do you have any additional firsthand knowledge of relevant professional behaviors (e.g., availability to students, continuing education, participation in the profession, course development, etc.)
6. Do you have firsthand knowledge of any past problems with this person's performance? If yes, of what past problems do you have firsthand knowledge?
7. If the answer to question 6 is yes, has this person's performance improved? Explain your answer.
8. Is this candidate an asset or a liability to the department? Explain your answer.
9. If tenure or promotion is being sought: Would you recommend this person for tenure? Promotion?