

Standards and Criteria for Retention, Tenure and Promotion Humboldt State University

Department of Psychology

Date Submitted: 12/7/2007

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 2008-2009).

NOTE: This version of Appendix J is available on the UFPC web site:

<http://www.humboldt.edu/~acadsen/UFPC/ufpcindex.htm>

Caveat: We view this document as open to regular revision. Each semester the IUPC will meet with candidates undergoing review to discuss the applicability of these criteria to their work. If certain areas of contribution are not receiving sufficient recognition, criteria will be revised for the next review cycle.

The Department acknowledges that exceptional situations may arise in which the specific criteria and rankings delineated below may not provide an appropriate rubric for the awarding of tenure. For example, such situations may arise when faculty are specifically hired to conduct activities in addition to instruction, such as clinical training.

Accordingly, the specific requirements for scholarly and service activities may be modified on a case-by-case basis, in consultation with the CNRS Dean, so long as faculty have met the primary requirement of demonstrating excellence and effectiveness in their teaching assignments. Any requested modifications of tenure criteria should be specifically itemized and presented to the IUPC by the faculty member at least one year prior to the submission of personnel files for the tenure decision.

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.

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,” “minimal acceptable,” 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 comprise peer-review, editorial review, collegial review, and/or comments from students or others involved in the scholarship.

Our scholarship criteria address the distinction between faculty with an academic focus and those who serve in our professional programs. Faculty in our professional programs (M. A. in School Psychology and M. A. in Counseling Psychology) have different training and responsibilities than faculty with an academic focus. We have focused the “scholarship of application” and “consultation with and/or providing technical assistance for community organizations” criteria to recognize the contributions of professional program faculty. Faculty, in consultation with the IUPC, define themselves as having a primarily academic or a primarily professional focus.

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 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.

A. Activities to be assessed

1. Peer-reviewed publications
2. Published/edited books/book chapters
3. Published critical review articles
4. Awarded grants and evidence of subsequent work
5. Other published work
6. Professional presentations
7. Promoting experiential learning and professional development
8. Scholarship of application relevant to clinical training
9. Consultation with and/or providing technical assistance for community organizations
10. Service learning
11. 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 noted 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 writer's 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.
- 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 three rating 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 three 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 reviewer's comments were mostly positive.
 - iii. 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 up to one 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 who average one conference presentation or more per year may earn two points if most presentations were at national conferences and one point if most of the presentations were at regional conferences.
 - b. An additional point may be awarded for presenting invited addresses.
 - c. We make no distinctions based on authorship or whether the presentation was poster or paper format.
 - d. There is a cap of three points for this category.

7. Promoting experiential learning and professional development
 - a. Faculty may earn up to three points for activities related to experiential learning and professional development.
 - b. We highly value experiential learning and professional development achieved through student involvement in research and other activities but recognize that evaluation of such activities is difficult.
 - c. 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), and c) student evaluations of these experiences (e.g., student letters addressing the value of the experience).
 - d. Points will be awarded for clear evidence of contributions that exceed expectations of research and thesis supervision as these contributions are recognized in the service section.
 - e. There is a cap of three points for this category.

8. Scholarship of application relevant to clinical training
 - a. For most projects faculty may earn up to two points for each unique clinical training application. For unique and extraordinary contributions (e.g., a multi-year project), faculty may earn up to four points.
 - b. The scholarship of application involving the use of knowledge to address demanding, substantive human problems is particularly relevant to our professional program faculty. Faculty in this area may be extensively involved in experiential learning and professional development activities consistent with the training of counselors and school psychologists.
 - c. Activities in this category may include earning state licensure, clinical supervision, presentation of workshops and other training activities, and providing services to the community.
 - d. Although we focus on professional faculty in this section, any faculty member may contribute to this category in various capacities.
 - e. For each activity faculty should a) document time commitment, b) develop and provide an assessment of the effectiveness of their activities (e.g., evaluation forms for clinical trainees; licensing exam scores), and c) arrange for regular collegial observation and evaluation of activities.
 - f. Points will only be awarded for clear evidence of contributions that exceed expectations for teaching and supervision.
 - g. There is no cap on the total points earned in this category.

9. Consultation with and/or providing technical assistance for community organizations
 - a. For most projects faculty may earn up to two points for each unique project. For unique and extraordinary contributions (e.g., a multi-year project), faculty may earn up to four points.
 - b. Like clinical training above, consultation with and/or providing technical assistance for community organizations is particularly relevant to our professional program faculty.

- c. Although we focus on professional faculty in this section, any faculty member may contribute to this category in various capacities.
- d. 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.
- e. Points will only be awarded for clear evidence of contributions that exceed expectations for teaching and supervision. Additionally, these contributions must be distinct from those reported as community service in the PDS.
- f. There is no cap on the total points earned in this category.

10. Service learning

- a. Faculty may earn up to two points for each significant and unique service learning project.
- 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. There is no cap on the total points earned in this category.

11. 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 four 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 11 categories above with the following restrictions.
 - a. To earn a rank of good or excellent, regardless of points accumulated, academically-oriented 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) multiple unfunded extramural grant proposals where reviewer's comments were mostly positive.
 - b. To earn a rank of good or excellent, regardless of points accumulated, professional 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), d) multiple unfunded extramural grant proposals where reviewer's comments were mostly positive, e) activities from sections B.8 or B.9 that are

shared with other professionals or community organizations through means including but not limited to professional presentations or professional newsletter publications reporting on the activity.

- i. Regarding the “activities shared with other professionals” statement above, these activities must include considerable external review and evaluation. External reviewers may include faculty at other universities with similar specialties, examination of materials by professionals who provide services relevant to the contribution, consumer feedback and evaluations, direct observations by experts, or other means of evaluation by relevant parties. These evaluations should speak to the contribution to the field and quality of the work. Evaluations will be more compelling when they come from multiple, independent sources.
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,” “minimal acceptable,” 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 (13.0% of the total college majors from 1997-2007; 5.4% of the university over the same period). We have one of the highest yearly FTES (13.5% of the college and 5.1% of the university). Also, our student to faculty ratio (20.4) exceeds both the college (16.0) and university (17.4) averages and is consistently among the highest in our college. 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.

The primary criteria for judging service are time commitment, quality of participation, level of participation, and letter writer's 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, and, where appropriate, describe of 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 of service.

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.
 - iii. Committee service may include but is not limited to graduate program committees, coordinating committee, 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) are time commitment required for each activity and quality of service.
 - 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 coordinating assessments beyond the routine of updating existing courses, mentoring colleagues, advising students beyond normal responsibilities, 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 and quality of service.
 - iii. For each activity faculty should document a) time commitment and b) their contributions to the service activity.
 - iv. There is a maximum of two points for each activity.
 - v. The total cap for service falling in this category is six points.
 - e. Unit Overloads
 - i. C-factor overloads over multiple semesters will earn up to two points.
 - ii. S-factor overloads over multiple semesters will earn one point.
 - iii. Faculty should document both C and S-factor overload clearly in their PDS.
 - iv. The total cap for service falling 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 two points per committee, depending on the time commitment and contribution to the committee.
 - 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 six 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, ad hoc reviewing, continuing education to maintain licensure, 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 six 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.
 - 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. 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 six 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

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. These outlets often charge publication fees or page costs in fields where this is not the norm.