

Standards and Criteria for Retention, Tenure and Promotion
Department of Psychology
Humboldt State University

The members of the Department of Psychology approved the following teaching, scholarly/creative, and service activities as applicable to the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) process pursuant to Appendix J of the Faculty Handbook (Effective AY 2015-2016).

NOTE: This version of Appendix J is available on the UFPC web site:
<http://www.humboldt.edu/senate/UFPC/ufpcindex.htm>

Each candidate should meet with both the chair and IUPC to review scoring of the file in the Scholarship and Service areas. Candidates should score their file and place justification for scoring in the PDS. The IUPC and Chair should also detail their scoring of the candidate's file in their letters (see Appendix A of this document for suggested format).

I. Teaching

We are satisfied with the evaluation process for teaching noted in Appendix J. Faculty are directed to Appendix J, Section IX.B.1.a-c for information on the areas of evaluation. We do recognize the instructional contribution that faculty make to the development of student scholarship outside of traditional course instruction. To acknowledge this important function we add the following section:

d. Active instruction of students in scholarship

Engagement and mentoring of students in the development of scholarship is highly desirable. Faculty who instruct students in research therefore are rewarded over and above that received in the previous sections. Such activities might include those that result in student authorship (either independently or as a co-author) on peer-reviewed presentations or publications as well as other forms of active engagement in projects that are not disseminated (or are disseminated without student authorship credit).

Faculty should detail a) student contributions and experiences (e.g., student involvement in research tasks), b) student outcomes resulting from these experiences (e.g., admissions to Ph.D. program in related fields, student authorships on presentations and publications), and c) student evaluations of these experiences (e.g., student letters addressing the value of the experience). For activities that do not involved peer-reviewed dissemination, faculty must document in detail student involvement and faculty mentoring/instruction so that faculty letter writers can evaluate the contribution.

Faculty must provide clear evidence of their contributions that exceed expectations of research and thesis supervision (e.g., working with a student to publish their thesis) as these contributions are recognized in the service section or are given WTU credit elsewhere in the teaching section.

II. Scholarship

We employ a system wherein accomplishments are awarded points, with the table and additional

criteria appearing in Section II.C determining evaluations of “excellent,” “good,” “minimum essential,” and “not acceptable.” For each category, we note points earned by each accomplishment and limits to the number of total points earned in the category. In addition to points, we establish additional criteria for achieving “Good” or “Excellent” category rankings.

For each scholarship accomplishment there must be some form of evaluation of the work. Evaluation may be comprised of peer review, editorial review, collegial review, and/or comments from students or others involved in the scholarship.

Information Provided by the Candidate

Candidates should address the quality of each scholarship contribution in the PDS. In particular, candidates should provide a brief summary of the activity or product, discuss the impact and significance of the work, and, where appropriate, describe where their work appears (e.g., outlet, conference), and outline student involvement in the research. For scholarship contributions that do not receive peer or editorial review, we encourage candidates to discuss with the IUPC appropriate means for assessment of these contributions.

Information Provided by Letter Writers

Letters from departmental and other faculty should address the quality of scholarship contributions. This information will carry more weight when letter writer’s expertise overlaps that of the candidate. For candidates applying for tenure and/or promotion, external letters evaluating scholarship are strongly recommended. It is very difficult for CoPs and UFPC committees to evaluate scholarship outside of their areas of expertise. Supportive letters by scholars within the candidate's field help review committees understand the importance and impact of the scholarship within a disciplinary context. The quality of files without external letters are often judged as suspect. It is the duty of the Chair and/or the IUPC to solicit these outside letters in a timely manner in support of each candidate.

A. Activities to be assessed

1. Peer-reviewed publications
2. Published/edited books/book chapters
3. Published critical review articles
4. Submitted and/or awarded grants and evidence of subsequent work pertaining to the grant
5. Other published work
6. Professional presentations
7. Active involvement of students in scholarship
8. Other contributions not included above but addressed in Appendix J, Section IX.B.2.a-f

B. Level of accomplishment necessary to meet departmental criteria

Faculty earn rating points based on the criteria below. Section C describes standards for different levels of review.

1. Peer-reviewed publications
 - a. Publications for this section include journal articles, monographs, and other contributions submitted for peer review.

- b. Candidates should address the significance and importance of their publications in their PDS. For work with multiple authors, the candidate should detail their specific contributions to the paper.
 - c. Peer-reviewed publications are vetted by relevant experts, so quality of publication outlets is meaningful for scholarship evaluation. We request that candidates rate outlets as Excellent, Good, or Passable using the guidelines in Appendix A of this document. We encourage candidates to discuss outlet quality ratings with the IUPC and faculty with similar research emphases (if possible) to establish consensus on ratings.
 - d. The IUPC will assign an A, B, or C rating to each publication based on the quality of the work and the candidate's level of contribution. In most cases, a publication in an Excellent outlet will earn an A rank for the publication. Publication evaluation will, however, not focus exclusively on outlet quality. For example, excellent work may appear in Good outlets. Evidence from letter writers' evaluations may move the classification of the work from C to B or B to A ratings. Similarly, work appearing in an Excellent outlet may receive a B or C rating if the publication is less rigorous (e.g., letters, brief commentary) or the candidate made a lesser contribution to the work. See Appendix B of this document for more information.
 - e. Faculty receive four rating points for each publication evaluated an A, two points for publications given B ratings, and one-half point (0.5) for each C publication.
 - f. There is no cap on the total points earned in this category.
2. Published/edited books/book chapters/workbooks
- a. Published/edited books will earn up to six points per book, depending on the quality and significance of the contribution.
 - b. Book chapters earn up to four points, depending on the quality and significance of the contribution.
 - c. Study guides and workbooks to accompany other texts earn up to two points per contribution.
 - d. Evaluations of quality and significance are based on factors including, but not limited to, the reputation of the publishing house, the scope of the work, and the audience.
 - e. There is no cap on the total points earned in this category.
3. Published critical review articles
- a. Published reviews may earn one-half point (0.5) per review.
 - b. Critical reviews (e.g., book reviews) are usually subject to editorial review rather than peer review so we do not include reviews in the publication category.
 - c. Review articles that do require peer review comparable to regular journal submission (e.g., review was subjected to a rigorous review process wherein acceptance rates are low) will be considered regular publications and evaluated in that category.
 - d. There is a cap of two points for this category.
4. Awarded grants and evidence of subsequent work
- a. Extramural funding
 - i. Extramurally funded grants may earn one to four points each, depending on the extent of involvement with the grant (e.g., PI, co-PI, junior investigator,

consultant), the impact of the funding, and the successful completion of the project. For example, a grant on which the candidate was the PI that supports a multi-year project and includes funding for student assistants would earn four points whereas a small grant that supported purchase of a computer and software for the PI's laboratory would earn only one point.

- ii. To encourage grant submissions, faculty may be awarded up to one point total for each unfunded proposal on which they are PI or co-PI, provided that the proposal was to a major granting agency, foundation, or similar organization and the reviewers' comments were mostly positive.
 - iii. Other activities that involve substantial effort such as competitive extensions or grant supplements may earn an additional one point.
 - iv. There is no cap on total points earned by external funding.
- b. Internal (campus-based) funding
- i. Internal grants may earn up to one point total.
 - ii. We do not include funding exclusively for travel or dissemination as part of this category.
 - iii. Internal funding is capped at one point total.
5. Other published work
- a. Published work that is not peer reviewed (e.g., newsletter articles, informational pamphlets) may earn one-half point for each unique contribution.
 - b. The candidate must provide a detailed explanation of these contributions with a particular focus on the impact and relevance to their scholarship and arrange for letter writers to critically evaluate the work.
 - c. There is a cap of two points earned in this category.
6. Professional presentations
- a. Faculty may earn up to two points for presentation at national conferences and one point presentations at regional conferences.
 - b. An additional point may be awarded for presenting invited addresses.
 - c. We make no distinctions based on order of authorship or whether the presentation was poster or paper format; however, if the candidate gives the same presentation more than once, it may only be counted once.
 - d. There is a cap of three points for this category.
7. Other Contributions
- a. There are a number of other categories for productivity listed in Appendix J. Contributions in these categories will be evaluated on an individual basis.
 - b. It is imperative that the candidate provide a detailed explanation of the contribution of these materials and that letter writers critically evaluate contributions.
 - c. There is a cap of two points earned in this category.

C. Scholarship Evaluations

1. We base scholarship evaluations on total points earned over the course of the evaluation period in the categories above with the following restrictions.
 - a. To earn a rank of good or excellent, regardless of points accumulated,

faculty must have one of any of the following: a) a peer-reviewed publication rated A or B, b) a book or book chapter, c) a significant extramurally funded grant (i.e., multi-year funding for a project on which the faculty member is a PI), or d) unfunded extramural grant proposals where reviewers' comments were mostly positive.

2. For promotion to Full Professor, the evaluation reflects contributions made after submission of materials for promotion to Associate (if applicable).

Scholarship Evaluation Table

	Reappointment 3 rd / 4 th year	Reappointment 5 th / 6 th year	Tenure/Promotion To Associate	Promotion to Full
Evaluation				
Excellent	6 or more points	8 or more points	10 or more points	15 or more points
Good	4 to 5.5 points	6 to 7.5 points	7 to 9.5 points	11 to 14.5 points
Minimum Essential	2 to 3.5 points	3 to 5.5 points	4 to 6.5 points	6 to 10.5 points
Not Acceptable	0 to 1.5 points	0 to 2.5 points	0 to 3.5 points	0 to 5.5 points

III. Service

The criteria below speak to service contributions for psychology faculty. We employ a system wherein accomplishments are awarded points, with the table and additional criteria appearing in Section II.C determining evaluations of “excellent,” “good,” “minimum essential” and “not acceptable.” For each category, we note points earned by each accomplishment and limits to the number of total points earned in the category.

In reviewing service, we pay special attention to the unique circumstances of Psychology faculty. Basing our analysis on 10-year university and college averages, it is clear that our faculty have greater workloads than many faculty at HSU. Psychology is one of the largest majors on campus (over 500 majors and with steady increases seen every year since 2009). Data from AY 2013- 2014 show we have one of the highest yearly FTES (24.4% of the college and 5.74% of the university) and a student to faculty ratio (28.6) exceeds both the college (23.0) and university (21.8) averages for that period. This combination of factors means that Psychology faculty teach larger classes and accommodate more advisees than faculty in most departments. Because our workloads are higher than those found in most departments, we place greater weight on departmental service than other activities during reviews for retention and tenure.

The primary criteria for judging service are time commitment, quality of participation, level of participation, and letter writers' evaluations of the work.

Information Provided by the Candidate

Candidates should address the quality and significance of each service contribution in the PDS.

Faculty should provide a summary of their work, the time involved, and, where appropriate, describe the outcomes of the service. As most service activities do not receive peer or editorial review, it is important for candidates to document their contributions in detail.

Information Provided by Letter Writers

We encourage letters to address the quality of service contributions. These letters are particularly valuable when they document and evaluate the extent of the candidate's contributions with a particular focus on quality and value of service to the department.

A. Activities to be assessed

1. Departmental Service
 - a. Standing Committees
 - b. Ad hoc Committees
 - c. Chairing Committees
 - d. Other Activities
 - e. Unit Overloads
2. College/University Service
3. Professional Service Activities
4. Community Service Activities
5. Other contributions not included above but addressed in Appendix J, Section IX.C.3

B. Level of accomplishment necessary to meet departmental criteria

1. Departmental Service
 - a. Standing Committees
 - i. Service on standing committees may earn up to two points per committee.
 - ii. The primary criteria for evaluation of standing committee service are time commitment, length of service on the committee, and quality of service as evaluated by colleagues.
 - iii. Committee service may include but is not limited to graduate program committees, the coordinating committee, the undergraduate committee, and the initiating unit personnel committee.
 - iv. For each activity faculty should document a) time commitment and b) their contributions to committee products.
 - v. There is a cap of four points in this category.
 - b. Ad Hoc Committees
 - i. Service on ad hoc committees may earn up to one point per committee membership.
 - ii. The primary criteria for evaluation of ad hoc committee service (e.g., space committee, search committees, assessment committees) are time commitment required for each activity and quality of service as evaluated by colleagues.

- iii. For each activity faculty should document a) time commitment and b) their contributions to committee products.
 - iv. There is a cap of four points in this category.
 - c. Chairing Committees
 - i. Faculty may earn an additional point for each unique committee chaired.
 - ii. There is a cap of two points in this category.
 - d. Other Activities
 - i. Other departmental service areas include, but are not limited to: mentoring colleagues, involvement in student activities such as sponsoring a student organization, coordinating the research participation pool, and overseeing lab fee requests.
 - ii. Service will earn points, consistent with the time required for each activity (e.g., repeated over several years is more valuable than a one-time activity) and quality of service as evaluated by colleagues.
 - iii. For each activity faculty should document a) time commitment and b) their contributions to the service activity.
 - iv. There is a maximum of three points for each activity.
 - v. The total cap for service in this category is six points.
 - e. Unit Overloads
 - i. C-factor overloads will earn up to two points depending on the number of semesters.
 - ii. S-factor overloads will earn one point regardless of the number of semesters.
 - iii. Faculty should document both C and S-factor overload clearly in their PDS.
 - iv. The total cap for service in this category is two points.
 - f. The total cap for the departmental service category is ten points.
- 2. College/University Service
 - a. College and university committee memberships will earn up to three points per committee, depending on the time commitment and contribution to the committee as evaluated by colleagues.
 - b. For each activity faculty should document a) time commitment, b) their contributions to committee products, and c) seek letters from committee members speaking to the extent and quality of their service.
 - c. The total cap for this category is ten points.
- 3. Professional Service Activities
 - a. Professional service activities may earn up to two points per activity, depending on the time commitment and contribution.
 - b. These activities may include serving in leadership positions in professional organizations, editorial duties, substantial ad hoc reviewing (e.g., several reviews per year), editorial board membership, and organizing professional activities.
 - c. Simple membership in professional organizations will not earn credit unless that membership involves service to the organization.
 - d. For each activity faculty should document a) time commitment, b) their contributions to committee products, and c) seek letters from relevant sources speaking to the extent and quality of their service.
 - e. The total cap for this category is four points.

4. Service to the Community
 - a. Community service activities may earn up to two points per activity, depending on the time commitment, contribution, and relevance to faculty expertise. Community service should clearly relate to one's teaching and/or research foci; thus, unrelated volunteer activities will not be considered as contributing to one's RTP portfolio.
 - b. For each activity faculty should document a) time commitment, b) their contributions to products, and c) seek letters from relevant sources speaking to the extent and quality of their service.
 - c. The total cap for this category is six points.

5. Unique course-based contributions to service
 - a. Faculty may earn up to two points for each significant and unique service learning project connected to specific courses.
 - b. For each activity, faculty should a) document time commitment, b) develop and provide an assessment of the effectiveness of their activities (e.g., evaluation by individuals served), and c) arrange for regular collegial observation and evaluation of activities.
 - c. Points will only be awarded for clear evidence of contributions that exceed expectations for teaching and supervision.
 - d. The total cap for this category is four points.

6. Other contributions not included above but addressed in Appendix J, Section IX.C.3
 - a. Other contributions may earn up to two points per activity, depending on the time commitment, contribution, and relevance to faculty expertise.
 - b. Criteria not explicitly addressed in this document but included in Appendix J will be evaluated on an individual basis.
 - c. The total cap for this category is four points.

C. Service Evaluations

1. We base scholarship evaluations on total points earned over the course of the evaluation period in the 5 categories above with the following restriction.
 - a. Faculty who earn four points or fewer in the departmental service category are not eligible for a ranking above “minimum essential” for service.
2. For promotion to Full Professor, the evaluation period reflects contributions made after submission of materials for promotion to Associate (if applicable).

Service Evaluation Table

	Reappointment 3 rd / 4 th year	Reappointment 5 th / 6 th year	Tenure/Promotion To Associate	Promotion to Full
Evaluation				
Excellent	6 or more points	8 or more points	10 or more points	15 or more points
Good	4 to 5.5 points	6 to 7.5 points	7 to 9.5 points	11 to 14.5 points
Minimum Essential	2 to 3.5 points	3 to 5.5 points	4 to 6.5 points	6 to 10.5 points
Not Acceptable	0 to 1.5 points	0 to 2.5 points	0 to 3.5 points	0 to 5.5 points

Appendix A

Sample Tables for Scoring File

The table below provides a format for detailing scoring of a candidate's file. The candidate, IUPC, and Chair should use this format. Please list each item in a separate row. Sum points and place them in the final row. In the PDS, place these tables at the end of the relevant section.

Scholarship Category	Item	Points
1. Peer-reviewed publications		
2. Published/edited books/book chapters/workbooks		
3. Published critical review articles		
4. Awarded grants and evidence of subsequent work		
5. Other published work		
6. Professional presentations		
7. Active involvement of students in scholarship		
8. Other contributions		
Total		

Service Category	Item	Points
1. Departmental service		
2. College/University service		
3. Professional service		
4. Service to the community		
5. Service learning		
6. Other contributions		
Total		

Appendix B

Publication Quality

The following guidelines are general and should be considered examples only. We do not include specific outlet titles as there are several hundred peer-reviewed outlets in Psychology.

Excellent outlets

These are respected but not necessarily the “top” outlets in the field. Some areas are large and can support 15-20 excellent outlets.

These outlets include but are not limited to a) publications of respected psychological or related organizations (e.g., American Psychological Association, Association for Psychological Science, Society for Neuroscience, Psychonomic Society); b) publications associated with divisions of the American Psychological Association (e.g., Society for the Teaching of Psychology, Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, Developmental Psychology), c) publications where faculty at Research I universities often publish (even if not as their first choice), and d) outlets that boast prestigious editorial boards.

Good Outlets

These are outlets that take flawed work but still retain some rigor. These are outlets that faculty at Research I universities generally avoid and have editorial boards that are, on the whole, not populated by prominent members of the field.

Passing Outlets

These are outlets that employ a limited form of peer review and usually accept the majority of articles submitted.