# MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

## PERIODIC REVIEW OF REAPPOINTMENT (OR RENEWAL OF CONTRACT), TENURE, PROMOTION GUIDELINES

DEPARTMENT:                            Psychology

COLLEGE:                                Health and Human Services

SEMESTER/YEAR OF CURRENT REVIEW:      Fall 2018

SEMESTER/YEAR OF NEXT REQUIRED REVIEW:    Summer 2021

DEPARTMENT ADOPTION SIGNATURES:

_____     8/28/18
Department Personnel Committee Chair            Date

_____     8/28/18
Department Head                           Date

APPROVAL SIGNATURES:

_____     8/30/18
Dean                                   Date

_____     9-11-18
Provost                               Date

**THIS PLAN IS IN EFFECT FROM FALL 2018, THROUGH SUMMER 2021.**

# DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY EVALUATION PLAN
## Approved (October 2014)

Consistent with the Missouri State University *Faculty Handbook*, this document details the five evaluative processes required in the Department of Psychology. These evaluative processes are 1) annual performance review, 2) annual reappointment for untenured faculty members, 3) pre-tenure review, 4) tenure application review, and 5) promotion application review. Procedures associated with each of these evaluations are described in the *Faculty Handbook*, but further descriptions are provided in this document. If an inconsistency is found, the *Faculty Handbook* will take precedence.

The philosophy of the Department of Psychology evaluation procedures is based on three concepts. First, evaluations are intended to help achieve University, College, and Departmental goals, as described in their respective Long Range Plans. Specifically, we seek to provide the best possible education for Missouri State students in general, our College, and our majors and graduate students. Second, evaluative criteria are derived from roles negotiated between the Department Head and individual faculty members, following from the Faculty Roles and Rewards (1996) document. This means that performance expectations are clear and individualized, within the boundaries set forth by this document. Third, the Department of Psychology embraces a developmental approach to performance evaluation. Although important decisions about the employment contract (such as continuation of employment, promotion, and tenure) are derived ultimately from the evaluation process, the primary purpose of the process is to help faculty members to become the types of scholars, teachers, and citizens that they individually and collectively strive to become.

In addition to individual faculty members, there are two other parties immediately associated with the Departmental evaluation process. The first of these is the Department Head, whose responsibilities include 1) negotiating and providing written summaries of Departmental expectations for new faculty members; 2) initiating and conducting annual performance reviews with each faculty member; 3) writing evaluations for the annual reviews and annual reappointments; and 4) writing recommendations for all candidates for tenure, promotion, and pre-tenure review. The second responsible party is the personnel committee elected to evaluate those applying for tenure and promotion.  Those committees consist of tenured faculty members elected by the tenured faculty members and take the following actions: 1) write evaluations and recommendations for reappointment and pre-tenure review; and 2) make tenure and promotion recommendations based upon materials provided by the candidate(s) and Department Head. The Department Head may not be a member of the Personnel Committee.

This document and the documents upon which it is based are living documents, requiring regular review and change. Pursuant to this, and consistent with the *Faculty Handbook*, the Department of Psychology faculty members will review annually and vote about any revisions suggested for this document.  Psychology faculty members may make changes to the department evaluation plan by majority vote and the approval of the CHHS Dean and Provost Office.

1.      **Annual Performance Review**

Each faculty member will receive an annual performance review conducted in late spring. This review will consist of individual discussions with the Department Head regarding performance during the previous year and objectives for performance during the following year. Discussions of objectives will involve negotiation of faculty roles and associated merit weights for the near term. A written summary will be provided by the Department Head for the faculty member. This summary will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. A copy of this summary will be available to appropriate personnel committees, as required for their reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations.

2.      **Annual Reappointment for Untenured Faculty Members**

In addition to the annual performance review, all untenured, ranked faculty members will receive a review for annual reappointment decisions. This is a review of the performance of each of these faculty members to date while employed at MSU, with special emphasis on performance since the time of appointment or last reappointment review. The main goal of this review is to facilitate the candidate's efforts for eventual tenure.

    2.1     **General Policy**

        2.1.1.  The annual reappointment policy and procedures of the Psychology Department are consistent with those found in the *Faculty Handbook*.

        2.1.2.  The tenure policy and procedures for reappointment decisions will be provided to each new faculty member by the Department Head at the time of initial appointment. The tenure policy that is provided to each new faculty member at the time of initial appointment will be the one used when the new faculty member applies for reappointment. In addition to the policy and procedures for reappointment decisions, copies of the Departmental, College, and University mission statements will be provided by the Department Head.

        2.1.3.  A copy of the policy and procedures will be maintained in the Departmental office and will be available to all faculty members of the Department.

        2.1.4.  This policy will be reviewed by a committee with a membership that is representative of the ranks within the Department upon request of any faculty member.

        2.1.5.  Faculty members applying for reappointment will be evaluated in terms of their teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly activity, service activities to date, and negotiated roles, with emphasis on the most recent year.

            2.1.5.1.    The evaluation will include recommendations for development toward eventual tenure and a rationale for these recommendations.

    3.      **Reappointment Committee**

**3.0.1.** The Reappointment Committee (RC) and Tenure and Promotion Committee (TPC) (section 5.2) may be the same committee if logistics allow.

**3.0.2.** The RC will be composed of five tenured faculty members from the Department. The Department Head will determine who is eligible to serve on the RC and distribute a ballot with the names of all eligible members. A ballot will be distributed to all tenured faculty members in the Department. Each faculty member will choose five committee members from the eligible list printed on the ballot, and will sign the ballot. Faculty members will have at least one week to vote. Ballots will be returned to the Department Head for tabulation. The five faculty members with the most votes will serve on the committee. The RC will elect its own chair from among its members.

**3.0.3.** All tenured faculty members at or above the Associate rank in the Department are eligible for service on the RC. The Department Head, Dean, and President are not eligible for service on the RC. Faculty members who served on the RC in the previous academic year or who have a conflict of interest may choose to withdraw from eligibility.

**3.0.4.** The RC is responsible for 1) gathering performance ratings and comments from tenured faculty members; 2) reviewing applicant materials and tenured faculty ratings and comments; 3) making reappointment recommendations to the tenured faculty members for their vote; 4) tallying the vote results; 5) summarizing faculty comments; and 6) writing the rationale for the Departmental recommendation. The RC has the responsibility to apply the criteria contained within this document and the *Faculty Handbook* fairly. The RC also should be satisfied that each applicant's performance is satisfactory in the areas of teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly activity, and service, and in the applicant's negotiated roles. The RC also should provide the applicant with feedback regarding his or her progress toward tenure, including recommendations for improving or maintaining that progress.

**3.1. Procedure for Applying for Reappointment**

**3.1.1.** At the beginning of the fall semester, the Provost Office will publish Departmental, College and University deadlines for application for reappointment to all faculty members in the Department.

**3.1.2.** The applicants for reappointment are responsible for initiating the process of application and for supplying all documentation in support of their application, including a current vita, previous performance evaluations, and explanation of negotiated roles. Applicants may withdraw their applications at any point in the procedure.

**3.1.3.** The applicants will provide all appropriate forms, a current vita, and supporting documentation of teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly activity, service and adherence to negotiated roles to the Chair of the RC before the deadline established by the RC and the Department Head.

**3.1.4.** Prior to making a recommendation regarding reappointment, the RC will gather performance ratings and comments about the applicant from the tenured faculty. In this rating process, tenured Departmental faculty members should review the submitted materials for each applicant, rate and comment on each applicant's performance in teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly activity, and service, and negotiated roles. The RC will then deliberate upon the application materials, ratings, and comments and make a recommendation to the tenured faculty members whether to reappoint or not to reappoint each applicant based on the criteria outlined in this document and the *Faculty Handbook*. In the event the RC has questions regarding any evidence of teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly activity, service, or fulfillment of negotiated roles, the RC may request applicants to provide more information. The RC will also give the applicant the opportunity to meet with the RC to address any questions that may arise.

**3.1.5.** The recommendation from the RC will be submitted to all tenured Departmental faculty members for their vote. After receiving the RC recommendation, tenured faculty will vote on whether to recommend for reappointment or not recommend for reappointment. This vote will establish the Departmental faculty recommendation. A separate vote will be taken for each applicant. All ballots must be signed. The faculty ballots and the tally of votes will be submitted to the Department Head. A rationale of support for the Departmental faculty recommendation will also be submitted in writing to the Department Head. Opposing faculty views may be submitted as a minority report as provided for in the *Faculty Handbook*.

> **3.1.5.1** Prior to voting on the committee's recommendations, the faculty members are responsible for reviewing the applicants' files and applying fairly the criteria contained within this document and the *Faculty Handbook*.

**3.1.6.** The Department Head will add his or her recommendation to that of the RC and have the candidates undersign the recommendations. The recommendations from the RC and Department Head will then be forwarded to the Dean.

**3.1.7.** A copy of the recommendations from all levels of evaluation will be provided to the candidates, with a copy placed in the candidates' files. Evalautions will be made available to future personnel committees for decisions regarding candidates' reappointments, tenure, and promotions.

**3.1.8.** Applicants are provided two business days to undersign the recommendations and to write a response if desired.
Recommendations for non-reappointment may be appealed by requesting that the Academic Personnel Review Commission (see *Faculty Handbook*) conduct an informal inquiry into the review and decision process.

**3.1.9.** In case of disagreement between the RC and the Department Head, the Head and the RC may share information and perspectives in an effort to resolve differences. If resolution is not possible, the Department Head must offer in writing to the RC the reasons for not accepting the recommendations of the RC.

**3.1.10.** All reappointment applicants will be furnished with written documentation of the decisions at each level of evaluation. Decisions will be forwarded to the next level of decision for evaluation.

**3.1.11.** Throughout the reappointment deliberations, confidentiality of information will be maintained. Materials that applicants submit for reappointment consideration are reviewed by various faculty members and administrators. Faculty members and administrators who review information contained in such materials are obligated to maintain confidentiality with regard to that information. Applicants' files, committee proceedings, and discussions or decisions made are not to be discussed beyond the members who have direct access to that information in the formal reappointment deliberations.

**3.2 Criteria**

See section 5.6. for a discussion of tenure and promotion criteria. These are essentially goals to strive for during the probationary period. Evidence of progress toward meeting or surpassing these goals should be provided with the applications for reappointment and merit review. Because reappointment is based, in part, on cumulative performance, the applicant should include copies of reappointment and merit reviews from all previous years.

**3.3 Amendment**

This reappointment policy may be amended by a simple majority vote of the members of the Department with approval of the CHHS Dean and Provost Office.

**4. Pre-Tenure Review**

Every year during the probationary period the candidate is provided with a performance review and feedback regarding progress toward tenure and promotion, which is shared with the candidate and placed in the candidate's file.

**5. Tenure and promotion to Associate rank application review policies and procedures**

Faculty members in the Department of Psychology at Missouri State will be evaluated according to the criteria contained within this document which was drafted to be consistent with the Departmental, the College, and the University missions.

**5.1 General Policy**

**5.1.1.** The tenure and promotion policy and procedures of the Psychology

Department will be consistent with those found in the *Faculty Handbook*.

5.1.2. The policy and procedures for tenure and promotion decisions will be provided to each new faculty member by the Department Head at the time of initial appointment. The tenure and promotion policy that is use to evaluate the candidate must be no older than 5 years. However, faculty members can choose to be evaluated under newer criteria if they wish. In addition to the policy and procedures for tenure and promotion decisions, copies of the Departmental, College, and University mission statements will also be provided by the Department Head to new faculty members.

5.1.3 An elected faculty committee will convene to discuss evaluation criteria for ranked faculty members who are hired into positions that deviate from the roles and responsibilities that are typical of psychology faculty members (e.g., endowed positions, positions that require significant administrative duties). That faculty committee shall produce a document that specifies evaluation criteria that deviate from the Psychology Department's Evaluation Plan and that will be used to guide decisions about annual reviews, pre-tenure review, tenure, and promotion. The aforementioned document must be approved by majority vote of the Psychology Department Faculty and subsequently approved by the Psychology Department Head, College Dean, and Provost Office. A copy of the amended and approved criteria will be provided to the relevant faculty member by the Department Head at the time of their initial appointment.

5.1.4. A copy of the policy and procedures will be maintained in the Departmental office and will be available to all faculty members of the Department.

5.1.5. This policy will be reviewed by a committee with a membership that is representative of the ranks within the Department upon request of any faculty member.

5.1.6. Years of service at other universities which are to be counted toward tenure and promotion will be negotiated at the time of employment and will be included in the initial letter of appointment.

5.1.7. Faculty members applying for tenure will be evaluated in terms of their teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly activity, service activities, and negotiated roles since employment at Missouri State University.

5.2. Tenure and Promotion Committee

5.2.1. The Reappointment Committee (section 3.2) and Tenure and Promotion Committee (TPC) may be the same committee if logistics allow. The TPC will be composed of five tenured faculty members from the Department who are at Associate level or above. The Department Head will determine who is eligible to serve on the TPC and distribute a ballot with the names of all eligible members to all tenured faculty members in the Department at Associate level

or above. Each of those faculty members will choose five committee members from the eligible list on the ballot, and will sign the ballot. Faculty members will have at least one week to vote. Ballots will be returned to the Department Head for tabulation. The five faculty members with the most votes will serve on the committee. The TPC will elect its own chair from among its members.

5.2.3. All tenured faculty members in the Department are eligible for service on the TPC. The Department Head and Dean are not eligible for service on the TPC. Faculty members who served on the TPC in the previous academic year or who have a conflict of interest may choose to withdraw from eligibility.

5.2.4. The Tenure and Promotion Committee (TPC) is responsible for: 1) gathering performance ratings and comments from tenured faculty members; 2) reviewing applicant materials and tenured faculty members' ratings and comments; 3) making tenure and promotion recommendations to the tenured faculty members at or above Associate rank for their vote; 4) tallying the vote results; 5) summarizing faculty comments; and 6) writing the rationale for the Departmental recommendation. The TPC has the responsibility to apply the criteria contained within this document and the *Faculty Handbook* fairly. It should be satisfied that the applicant has met or exceeded University, College, and Departmental standards for performance in the three areas of teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly activity, and service, and in their negotiated roles. The TPC also is responsible for providing a written rationale for its recommendation to the applicant. The TPC also should provide the applicant with feedback regarding his or her progress toward tenure, including recommendations for improving or maintaining that progress.

5.3. Procedure for Applying for Tenure and Promotion

5.3.1. At the beginning of the fall semester, the Department Head will publish and distribute a list of Departmental, College and University deadlines for application for tenure and promotion to all faculty members in the Department.

5.3.2. The applicants for tenure and promotion are responsible for initiating the process of application and for supplying all documentation in support of their application, including a current vita, previous performance evaluations, and explanation of negotiated roles. Applicants may withdraw their applications at any point in the procedure.

5.3.3. Eligibility for tenure and/or promotion must be verified prior to submitting materials.

5.3.4. The applicants will provide all appropriate forms, a current vita, and supporting documentation of teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly activity, service, and fulfillment of negotiated roles to the Chair of the TPC before the deadline established by the Department Head and the TPC.

**5.3.5.** Prior to making a recommendation regarding tenure and promotion, the TPC will gather performance ratings and comments about the applicants from the tenured faculty. In this ratings process, tenured faculty members at Associate rank and above should review the submitted materials for each applicant, rate and comment on each applicant's performance in teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly activity, service, and fulfillment of negotiated roles. The TPC will then deliberate upon the application materials, ratings, and comments and make a recommendation to the tenured faculty members at Associate rank and above whether to grant tenure and promotion or not to grant tenure and promotion to each applicant based on the criteria outlined in this document and the *Faculty Handbook*. In the event the TPC has questions regarding any evidence of teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly activity, service, or negotiated roles, the TPC may request applicants to provide more information. The TPC will also give applicants the opportunity to meet with the TPC to address any questions that may arise.

**5.3.6.** The recommendation from the TPC will be submitted to all tenured Departmental faculty members at or above Associate rank for their vote. After receiving the TPC recommendation, all tenured Departmental faculty members at or above Associate rank will vote on whether to recommend for reappointment, tenure and promotion or not recommend for reappointment, tenure and promotion. This vote will establish the Departmental faculty recommendation. A separate vote will be taken for each applicant. All ballots must be signed. The faculty ballots and the tally of votes will be submitted to the Department Head. A rationale of support for the Departmental faculty recommendation will also be submitted in writing to the Department Head. Opposing faculty views may be submitted as a minority report as provided for in the *Faculty Handbook*.

    **5.3.6.1.** Prior to voting on the Committee's recommendation, the faculty members are responsible for reviewing the applicants' files and applying fairly the criteria contained within this document and the *Faculty Handbook*.

**5.3.7.** The Department Head will add his or her recommendation to that of the TPC. The recommendations from the TPC and Department Head will then be forwarded to the Dean. Copies of the recommendations from the TPC and Department Head will be provided to the candidate.

**5.3.8.** A copy of the recommendations from the TPC and Department Head will be placed in the candidate's file and will be made available to future personnel committees for decisions regarding that candidate's reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

**5.3.9.** Applicants may file written exceptions to their recommendations with the request that their letters of exception be attached to all official copies of the relevant documents.

A candidate for tenure and promotion may appeal a negative recommendation made by the Provost by requesting that the Provost's Personnel Committee conduct an informal inquiry of the review process.

5.3.10. In case of disagreement between the TPC and the Department Head, the Head will meet with the TPC in an effort to resolve the differences. If resolution is not possible, the Department Head must offer in writing to the TPC and the applicant the reasons for not accepting the recommendation of the TPC.

5.3.11. All tenure and promotion applicants will be furnished with written documentation of the decision at each level of evaluation. Decisions will be forwarded to the next level of decision for evaluation. Supporting material will be forwarded as far as the Dean's office; these will be forwarded beyond the Dean's office at the request of the Provost.

5.3.12. Throughout the reappointment, tenure and promotion deliberations, confidentiality of information will be maintained. Materials that applicants submit for reappointment, tenure and promotion consideration are reviewed by various faculty members and administrators. Faculty members and administrators who review information contained in such materials are obligated to maintain confidentiality with regard to that information. Applicants' files, committee proceedings, and discussions or decisions made are not to be discussed beyond the members who have direct access to that information in the formal tenure and promotion deliberations.

5.4.    Departmental Support and Professional Ethics

The spirit behind this Evaluation Plan is to present faculty members who are eligible for eventual tenure and promotion with guidance for how to accumulate evidence of effective teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service. However, two more factors will be considered by both the faculty members and evaluation committees as well. These include departmental support and professional ethics, which will be rated by the appropriate faculty members in making promotion decisions.

5.4.1.  Evaluation of departmental support evaluates faculty members for their impact on the psychology department's productivity or reputation through the quality of interaction with other faculty members or other activities. A positive example of such behavior might include providing substantial statistical consultation to colleagues, though not enough to warrant authorship. Negative examples of such a behavior may also occur in that faculty may neglect obligations or engage in activities that undermine the productivity of their colleagues in significant ways.

5.4.2.  Ethical behavior will be evaluated with respect to guidelines for ethical behavior such as those published by professional organizations (e.g., APA, APS) and as published in the *Faculty Handbook*.

5.4.3.  If a faculty member provides ratings lower than the center value for

departmental support or ethical behavior, then such ratings imply that the candidate engaged in activities that were detrimental to the rater's performance; adversely impacted the Departmental, College, or University mission; or were unethical according to the standards published by professional organizations or the *Faculty Handbook*. In such cases, that rating faculty member is expected to have conducted themselves in accordance with the APA's code of ethics. Further, that faculty member shall: 1) specifically describe the alleged activities or behaviors that prompted such a rating, 2) detail the results of any attempts to address the behavior of concern, 3) submit the incident and attempts to address the behavior of concern with that their vote. The Committee may contact the rating faculty members for additional information. Rating faculty members are also encouraged to describe specific incidents for which a tenure/promotion candidate stands out with respect to departmental support.

5.4.4. When allegations of unethical or departmental non-supportive behaviors are submitted, then it is the responsibility of the Personnel Committee to: 1) gather relevant information from the faculty member making the allegation and the applicant involved in the situation; 2) when possible, investigate to substantiate the allegation (e.g., interview the candidate; interview others who may have had opportunities to observe or provide informed perspectives about the conduct in question; access formal decisions regarding the specific allegation made in accordance with University grievance structures), and 3) determine whether and how the allegation should be represented in the summary of comments provided to the Department Head.

5.4.5. Should the non-supportive or unethical behavior be substantiated by the committee and included in the committee's evaluation report, then the committee shall: 1) promptly inform the candidate that the incident will be forwarded as part of the committee's evaluation, 2) inform the candidate of his/her right to withdrawal his/her application (as consistent with the Faculty Handbook), and 3) inform the candidate that the faculty members who are eligible to vote on his/her tenure or promotion will be informed of the incident prior to placing their votes.

5.5. <u>Procedural Note</u>

According to the *Faculty Handbook*, the recommendations of the TPC and the Department Head will be forwarded to the College Dean for a decision prior to the deadline established in the Annual Academic Work Calendar. The Dean forwards his or her recommendations to the Provost for a decision. In all cases where the recommendations of the Department Head, Dean, Provost, or the President differ from that of the TPC, the administrator initiating the change will state in writing to the affected faculty member, the TPC, and other involved administrators, the reasons why they cannot agree with the original recommendations. Similarly, when a minority of the faculty members disagree with the TPC recommendation, then the minority may file a minority report as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*. Throughout the procedure, the TPC and each administrator making a recommendation or

decision will provide the individual faculty members with written notice of, and reasons for the recommendation or decisions made concerning their reappointment, tenure and/or promotion.

**5.6.    Criteria**

The Psychology Department recognizes that the traditional tripartite faculty responsibilities of teaching, research/creative scholarship, and service can be complementary activities. These activities serve three goals in the learning process:

a.      Establishing and maintaining student motivation to learn,
b.      Gathering and imparting useful information, and
c.      Developing, implementing, and evaluating learning innovations.

The Psychology Department also recognizes that professional activities may serve any combination of these functions, as well as be indicators of quality effort in combinations of teaching, research, and service. Therefore, it is appropriate for some professional activities to be divided between categories.

The evaluation of teaching, research and scholarly activity, service and negotiated roles will be based on multiple criteria. In recognition that individual Department members may have diverse Departmental roles and unique abilities, it is expected that successful applicants will exceed the criteria detailed below in one or more areas. The application of these criteria will take into consideration whether faculty members received support, such as start-up funds, necessary equipment, or necessary services.

It is recommended that applicants organize their supporting materials according to the Evaluation Matrix (found in the appendix) so that their evidence can easily be compared to the criteria in this document.

**5.6.1.  Teaching**

There are many ways to be a good teacher. However, teaching effectiveness is never a singular construct. Consequently, evaluation of teaching effectiveness must be based on multiple indicators. These should be related to the three goals of faculty work set forth in the Faculty Roles and Rewards document (1996) and consistent with the Teaching Effectiveness Guidelines adopted by the Faculty Senate.

While it is the responsibility of the faculty members to build a case for teaching effectiveness using multiple indicators, the specific indicators used will vary widely. However, it is acknowledged that some of the common sources of these indicators, such as teaching awards, peer evaluations, student ratings, and grants sought or funded are likely to be necessary for establishing a case for tenure and promotion. To the extent that one of these indicators provides more appropriate evidence than another for teaching effectiveness, this source should be given greater weight. For example, while student ratings and teaching awards may be good indicators of faculty responsiveness, they

are not likely to be especially good indicators of currency of course materials. For this, syllabi, assignments, and tests would be more desirable indicators. Thus, effectiveness evidence will vary by criterion.

The applicant is encouraged to provide complete and accurate student evaluations as one of several indicators of teaching effectiveness.

Effectiveness will also vary depending on the term of employment. Because there is a period of initial adjustment to a new position, teaching in the first year of employment will not be weighed as heavily as in subsequent years.

The following list of nine criteria are used to evaluate teaching effectiveness in the Psychology Department (i.e., These criteria were originally extracted from the Faculty Roles and Rewards goals (1996)).  A partial list of possible evidence of teaching effectiveness is included in this list under each of the nine criteria. Faculty members seeking tenure and promotion will be required to provide evidence of effectiveness under at least six of these nine criteria.

### 5.6.1.1. <u>Goal 1: Establishing and maintaining student motivation to learn</u>

5.6.1.1.1.　　Treating students fairly and impartially as unique individuals, including equitable evaluations that accurately reflect student learning and understanding
  a.　　Developing and communicating common standards of performance in classroom, thesis, advisement, internship, and homework activities;
  b.　　Administering and grading assignments according to pre-determined and clearly identified standards (e.g. having and consistently applying make-up, attendance, and grading policies);
  c.　　Developing and administering indices of learning and performance (tests, assignments) that are flexible enough to allow for development of somewhat different skills within the limits set by the topic being presented (e.g. having "integrating" and "synthesizing" assignments along with standard tests)

  Some ways of measuring this criterion include examination of syllabi, course evaluations, tests and course assignments.

5.6.1.1.2.　　Maintaining academic integrity, and high performance expectations appropriate for the level of one's classes and advisement relationships
  a.　　Same as 1. a-c;
  b.　　Updating tests and assignments according to changing standards in the field, and (where appropriate) past performance of students;
  c.　　Updating tests and assignments in order to maintain

**proprietary status of such assignments where necessary**

**Common ways of measuring this criterion include examination of tests and class assignments.**

5.6.1.1.3.  **Fostering & modeling civil discourse, intellectual curiosity, openness to diversity and to new ideas**
a.  **Listening to and responding positively to student questions, comments, & ideas;**
b.  **Posing questions essential to one's field and allowing students free discussion and exploration to try to answer them independently;**
c.  **Providing direct positive reinforcement in response to students' independent attempts to answer questions posed or developed through classroom discussion or individual advisement**

**Some ways of measuring this criterion include teaching awards, examination of student and peer evaluations, and class assignments.**

5.6.1.1.4.  **Promoting and reinforcing independent, creative critical thinking and active student involvement in the learning process**
a.  **Same as 3. a-c;**
d.  **Including students in the process of exploration, including all phases of research/applied activities**
e.  **Clearly describing what is required for answering or refining important research/application questions**
f.  **Developing and administering assignments which require student engagement in the process of understanding, integrating, and problem solving**
g.  **Establishing support from outside administrative units (e.g. curriculum grant funding, computer lab development and use, library activities)**
h.  **Establishing a variety of opportunities for students to contact individual faculty members (e.g. office hours, appointments)**

**Some ways of measuring this criterion include curricular grant applications and funding, grant applications and funding oriented toward student activities, teaching awards, student co-authors on publications and presentations, and examination of student and peer evaluations, and class assignments.**

5.6.1.2.  **Goal 2: Gathering and imparting useful information**

5.6.1.2.1.  **Remaining current in one's field**

13

a. Attending scheduled sessions at professional and public gatherings on a regular (semi-annual, annual, bi-annual) basis to remain current in one's field and develop teaching skills

b. Updating course materials to reflect new information gathered through professional dialogues, readings, and research activities

Some ways of measuring this criterion include attendance at scheduled professional meetings, teaching workshops, and similar activities directed toward teaching improvement, and examination of student and peer evaluations, and class assignments.

5.6.1.2.2. Disseminating findings to students in various ways, such as classroom teaching

a. Same as 5. a-b, above;

c. Assisting students in their gathering of information resources relevant to questions posed through scholarly discourse

d. Serving as consultant, coach, or friendly critic to students by providing directive feedback

e. Involving students in research/applied endeavors

f. Supervising directed readings, practica

g. Serving on thesis and seminar paper committees

Some ways of measuring this criterion include having student co-authors on publications and presentations, acceptance of student products by peer committees, and examination of student & peer evaluations and class assignments.

5.6.1.2.3. Reading critically current and otherwise relevant literature related to professional, teaching, and service activities

a. Same as 5, a above;

b. Reading emerging, relevant scholarly work in one's discipline on a regular (daily, weekly, monthly) basis

c. Developing bibliographies of current and otherwise relevant literature addressing questions posed in scholarly discourse

d. Writing critical reviews of relevant scholarly literature for classroom presentation

e. Supervising directed readings, practica

f. Serving on thesis and seminar paper committees

Some ways of measuring this criterion include updating syllabi, publishing or presenting reviews of recent articles, books, or literature, and examination of peer evaluations, tests and class

assignments, and bibliographies.

5.6.1.3. **Goal 3: Developing, implementing, and evaluating learning innovations**

5.6.1.3.1. **Staying abreast of innovations in methods and technology of teaching/learning**
a. **Reviewing selective textbooks and course materials on a regular (monthly, semi-annual) basis to improve presentation of information**
b. **Evaluating possible applications of new technologies to learning and problem solving processes to enhance student learning**

**Some ways of measuring this criterion include attendance at scheduled professional meetings, teaching workshops, and similar activities directed toward teaching improvement, and examination of syllabi, peer evaluations, and class assignments.**

5.6.1.3.2. **Conducting ongoing critical assessment of teaching and scholarly activities**
a. **Developing and administering measures designed to assess student progress toward identified learning goals**
b. **Seeking and using feedback from one's peers, students, other constituencies in order to improve effectiveness**
c. **Providing pedagogical consulting to peers through public or private advisement**

**Some ways of measuring this criterion include attendance or presentation at scheduled professional meetings, teaching workshops, and similar activities directed toward teaching/advisement improvement, and examination of student, peer, and other constituent evaluations.**

5.6.2. **Research and Scholarly Activity**

5.6.2.1. **Activities which lead to publications will be weighted more heavily than other activities. Because of the high rejection rate in professional journals in psychology, works in progress are included as indicators of research and scholarly activity.**

5.6.2.2. **Evidence of at least 5 quality indicators is required to meet Departmental standards for attaining tenure and promotion. At least two of these indicators must come from category 'a' below, and at least one additional indicator either a or b. First authorship in a category 'a' indicator will count for an additional half of a quality indicator in category a.**

15

**5.6.2.3.** Applicants cannot submit a single research product or activity as a quality indicator of both research and either teaching or service.

**5.6.2.4.** Due to the variety of publication outlets in psychology, the TPC is to use the following quality indicators in determining the strength of the applicant's research and scholarly activity.

    **a.** Any of the following are to be considered single quality indicators:

        1) an article accepted for publication in a refereed print or electronic journal.

        2) a discipline-related book published or in press of which the applicant was an author.

        3) a chapter published or in press in an edited book.

        4) receipt of an external research grant of $5000 or greater. Credit is awarded for being either the principal investigator or a co-investigator.

        5) a peer-reviewed technical report available for public consumption.

    **b.** Any combination of two of the following is to be considered a single quality indicator:

        1) a presentation at a regional, national, or international convention or conference.

        2) a round table discussion at a regional, national, or international convention or conference.

        3) a poster session at a regional, national, or international convention or conference.

        4) organizing a symposium for a national-level conference.

        5) receipt of an external research grant less than $5000. Credit is awarded for being either the principal investigator or a co-investigator.

        6) receipt of an internal research grant. Credit is awarded for being either the principal investigator or a co-investigator.

        7) a technical report.

        8) a publication in a non-refereed journal or magazine.

        9) a manuscript submitted for publication in a refereed journal but not yet accepted for publication

        10) a published book review in a professional journal

        11) one external grant submitted to a peer reviewed funding agency.

    **c.** Any combination of three of the following is to be considered a single quality indicator:

1) publication or acceptance for publication of course materials that are not limited to use with a course offered through Missouri State. This includes publication on the Internet of such course materials.
2) one grant submitted for either internal or external funding.
3) participation in a research-related workshop.
4) participation in a grant-writing workshop.
5) receiving additional formal training in research design or statistics.
6) a laboratory study in the process of data collection.
7) a manuscript either near completion but not yet submitted for publication in a refereed journal.
8) longitudinal research or research requiring time-intensive data collection,
9) a book or book chapter in progress,
10) a technical report in progress or under review.

5.6.2.5. In those cases where the TPC is uncertain how to interpret a publication effort, the TPC will meet with the applicant to discuss the publication in an effort to come to an agreement on its value toward tenure.

5.6.2.6. Applicants may ask the TPC to treat a specific research activity or product as meeting a higher level of quality than is presented in the list, or to include a non-listed activity or product as a quality indicator, when the nature of such activities or products required extensive effort or the quality of the research activity or product is not adequately reflected in the list of quality indicators. In such cases, the TPC will meet with the applicant to discuss the activity or product in an effort to determine its value toward tenure and promotion to Associate rank.

5.6.3. Service

5.6.3.1. The applicant for tenure and promotion to Associate rank is expected to participate in Departmental governance by attending faculty member meetings and demonstrating a willingness to serve on Departmental committees.

5.6.3.2. Beyond participation in Departmental governance, the successful candidate also must provide at least 3 quality indicators of service. The following list contains examples of such indicators and is not intended to be a complete list. Applicants may present evidence of additional quality indicators of service that are not on this list, as well as a rationale for such indicators.

17

| | |
|---|---|
| a. | serving as a member of a departmental committee |
| b. | Serving as a member of a college committee |
| c. | Serving as a member of a university committee |
| d. | serving as an officer or chair of Departmental, College, and/or University committees |
| e. | participation in College or University governance activities, |
| f. | membership in professional organizations and attendance of meetings of those organizations |
| g. | serving as an officer in a professional organization |
| h. | serving as a faculty member advisor for a student organization |
| i | organizing a conference for a professional meeting or community organization |
| j. | scholarly presentations at community organizations, |
| k. | submitting a grant for community service activities or community organizations |
| l. | obtaining a grant for community service activities or community organizations |
| m. | service to individual faculty members and administrators, including such activities as assisting with the use of technology, statistical analysis, pedagogical decision-making |
| n. | community service activities related to the faculty members member's discipline, or extensive community service outside of the discipline |
| o. | promoting student involvement in community activities |
| p. | supervision of students in community service activities |
| q. | maintaining or providing other Departmental services, such as maintaining program Web pages, coordinating budget requests, supporting grant writing within the Department, etc. |
| r. | attendance of official Departmental functions |

**5.6.3.3.** In those cases where the TPC is uncertain how to interpret a service activity, the TPC will meet with the applicant to discuss the activity in an effort to come to an agreement on its value toward tenure.

**5.6.3.4.** Applicants may ask the TPC to treat a specific service activity as being worth more than a single quality indicator, or to include a non-listed activity as a quality indicator. Such requests are reasonable when the nature of the service activity required extensive time or effort. In such cases, the TPC will meet with the applicants to discuss the service activity in an effort to determine its value toward tenure.

**5.7. Amendment**

This tenure policy may be amended by a simple majority vote of the members of the Department with approval of the CHHS Dean and Provost Office.

**6.**      **Promotion to Professor Rank Application Review Policy and Procedures**

Faculty members in the Department of Psychology at Missouri State University will be evaluated according to the criteria contained within this document which was drafted to be consistent with the Departmental mission, the College mission, and the University mission. Because effectiveness in teaching is the primary goal at Missouri State University and because effective teaching must be demonstrated for tenure, effective teaching is required for promotion.

     **6.1**      **General Policy**

         **6.1.1.**    The promotion policy and procedures of the Psychology Department will be consistent with those found in the *Faculty Handbook*.

         **6.1.2.**    The policy and procedures for promotion decisions will be provided to each new faculty member by the Department Head at the time of initial appointment. The promotion policy that is provided to each new faculty member at the time of initial appointment will be the one used when the new faculty member applies for promotion. In addition to the policy and procedures for promotion decisions, copies of the Departmental, College, and University mission statements will also be provided by the Department Head.

         **6.1.3.**    A copy of these policies and procedures will be maintained in the Departmental office and will be available to all faculty members of the Department.

         **6.1.4.**    This policy will be reviewed by a committee with a membership that is representative of the ranks within the Department upon request of any faculty member.

         **6.1.5.**    Years of service at other universities which are to be counted toward promotion will be negotiated at the time of employment and will be included in the initial letter of appointment.

         **6.1.6.**    Faculty members applying for promotion will be evaluated in terms of their teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly activities, service, and fulfillment of negotiated roles in their present rank.

     **6.2.**      **Promotion Committee**

         **6.2.1.**    The PC will consist of five Departmental faculty members at the rank of Professor. For each year in which applications are made for promotion, separate PC committees will be constituted for screening applications at each rank. The Department Head will determine who is eligible to serve on the PC and distribute a ballot with the names of all eligible members. A ballot will be distributed to all full professors in the Department. Each faculty member will choose five committee members from the eligible list printed on the ballot, and will sign the ballot. Faculty members will have at least one week to vote. Ballots will be returned to the Department Head for tabulation. The five

faculty members with the most votes will serve on the committee. The PC will elect its own chair from among its members.

6.2.2.  All full professors in the Department who are not applying for promotion in the current academic year are eligible to serve on the PC. The Department Head and Dean are not eligible for service on the PC. Faculty members who served on the PC in the previous academic year or who have a conflict of interest may choose to withdraw from eligibility.

6.2.3.  The Promotion Committee (PC) is responsible for: 1) gathering performance ratings and comments from appropriate faculty members, 2) reviewing applicant materials and faculty members' ratings and comments, 3) making promotion recommendations to the appropriate faculty members for their vote, 4) tallying the vote results, 5) summarizing faculty members' comments, 6) writing the rationale for the Departmental recommendation. The PC has the responsibility to apply the criteria contained within this document and the *Faculty Handbook* fairly. It should be satisfied that the applicant has met or exceeded University, College, and Departmental standards for performance in the three areas of teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly activity, and service. The PC is responsible for providing a written rationale for its recommendation to the applicant. The PC also should provide the applicant with feedback regarding his or her progress toward promotion, including recommendations for improving or maintaining that progress.

6.3.  Procedure for Applying for Promotion

6.3.1.  At the beginning of the fall semester, the Department Head will publish and distribute a list of Departmental, College and University deadlines for application for promotion to all faculty members in the Department.

6.3.2.  The applicants for promotion are responsible for initiating the process of applying and for supplying all documentation in support of their application, including a current vita, previous performance evaluations, and explanation of negotiated roles. Applicants may withdraw their applications at any point in the procedure.

6.3.3.  Eligibility for tenure and/or promotion must be verified prior to submitting materials.

**6.3.4.** The applicants will provide all appropriate forms, a current vita, and supporting documentation of teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly activity, to the Chair of the PC before the deadline established by the Department Head and the PC.

**6.3.5.** Prior to making a recommendation regarding promotion, the PC will gather performance ratings and comments about the applicant from the tenured Departmental faculty members at and above the rank of professor. In this rating process, the appropriate faculty members should review the submitted materials for each applicant, rate and comment on each applicant's performance in teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly activity, and service, and/or negotiated roles. The PC will then deliberate upon the application materials, ratings, and comments and make a recommendation to all tenured Departmental faculty members at and above the rank of Professor regarding whether to promote or not promote each applicant based on the criteria outlined in this document and the *Faculty Handbook*. In the event the PC has questions regarding any evidence of teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly activity, or service, the PC may request applicants to provide more information. The PC will also give applicants the opportunity to meet with the PC to address any questions that may arise.

**6.3.6.** The recommendation from the PC will be submitted to all tenured Departmental faculty members at the rank of Professor for their vote. After receiving the PC recommendation, the appropriate faculty members will vote on whether to recommend for promotion or not recommend for promotion. This vote will establish the Departmental faculty recommendation. A separate vote will be taken for each applicant. All ballots must be signed. The faculty ballots and the tally of votes will be submitted to the Department Head. A rationale of support for Departmental faculty recommendations will also be submitted in writing to the Department Head. Opposing faculty views may be submitted as a minority report as provided for in the *Faculty Handbook*.

 **6.3.6.1.** Prior to voting on the Committee's recommendation, the faculty members are responsible for reviewing the applicants' files and applying fairly the criteria contained within this document and the *Faculty Handbook*.

**6.3.7.** The Department Head will add his or her recommendation to that of the PC. The recommendations from the PC and Department Head will then be forwarded to the Dean. Copies of the recommendations from the PC and from the Department Head will be provided to the candidates.

**6.3.8.** A copy of the recommendations from the PC and Department Head will be placed in candidates' files and will be made available to future personnel committees for decisions regarding those candidates' future promotions.

 **6.3.9.** Applicants may file written exceptions to PC and/or Department Head recommendations with the request that their letters of exception be attached to

all official copies of the relevant document.  Candidates for promotion may appeal negative recommendations by the tenured faculty members of the Department by requesting that the Academic Personnel Review Commission (see *Faculty Handbook*) conduct an informal inquiry and documented vote of all the tenured faculty members.

6.3.10. In case of disagreement between the PC and the Department Head, the Department Head will meet with the PC in an effort to resolve the differences. If resolution is not possible, the Department Head must offer in writing to the PC and the applicant the reasons for not accepting the recommendation of the PC.

6.3.11. All promotion applicants will be furnished with written documentation of the decision at each level of evaluation. Decisions will be forwarded to the next level of decision for evaluation. Supporting material will be forwarded as far as the Dean's office; these will be forwarded beyond the Dean's office at the request of the Provost.

6.3.12. Throughout the promotion deliberations, confidentiality of information will be maintained.  Materials that applicants submit for promotion consideration are reviewed by various faculty members and administrators.  Faculty members and administrators who review information contained in such materials are obligated to maintain confidentiality with regard to that information. Applicants' files, committee proceedings, and discussion or decisions made are not to be discussed beyond the members who have direct access to that information in the formal promotion deliberations.

.4.     Departmental Support and Professional Ethics

The spirit behind this Evaluation Plan is to present faculty members who are eligible for eventual tenure and promotion with guidance for how to accumulate evidence of effective teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service. However, two more factors will be considered by both the faculty members and evaluation committees as well. These include departmental support and professional ethics, which will be rated by the appropriate faculty members in making promotion decisions.

6.4.1.  Evaluation of departmental support evaluates faculty members for their impact on the psychology department's productivity or reputation through the quality of interaction with other faculty members or other activities.  A positive example of such behavior might include providing substantial statistical consultation to colleagues, though not enough to warrant authorship.  Negative examples of such a behavior may also occur in that faculty may neglect obligations or engage in activities that undermine the productivity of their colleagues in significant ways.

6.4.2.  Ethical behavior will be evaluated with respect to guidelines for ethical behavior such as those published by professional organizations (e.g., APA, APS) and as published in the *Faculty Handbook*.

**6.4.3.** If a faculty member provides ratings lower than the center value for departmental support or ethical behavior, then such ratings imply that the candidate engaged in activities that were detrimental to the rater's performance; adversely impacted the Departmental, College, or University mission; or were unethical according to the standards published by professional organizations or the *Faculty Handbook*. In such cases, that rating faculty member is expected to have conducted themselves in accordance with the APA's code of ethics. Further, that faculty member shall: 1) specifically describe the alleged activities or behaviors that prompted such a rating, 2) detail the results of any attempts to address the behavior of concern, 3) submit the incident and attempts to address the behavior of concern with that their vote. The Committee may contact the rating faculty members for additional information. Rating faculty members are also encouraged to describe specific incidents for which a tenure/promotion candidate stands out with respect to departmental support.

**6.4.4.** When allegations of unethical or departmental non-supportive behaviors are submitted, then it is the responsibility of the Personnel Committee to: 1) gather relevant information from the faculty member making the allegation and the applicant involved in the situation; 2) when possible, investigate to substantiate the allegation (e.g., interview the candidate; interview others who may have had opportunities to observe or provide informed perspectives about the conduct in question; access formal decisions regarding the specific allegation made in accordance with University grievance structures), and 3) determine whether and how the allegation should be represented in the summary of comments provided to the Department Head.

**6.4.5.** Should the non-supportive or unethical behavior be substantiated by the committee and included in the committee's evaluation report, then the committee shall: 1) promptly inform the candidate that the incident will be forwarded as part of the committee's evaluation, 2) inform the candidate of his/her right to withdrawal his/her application (as consistent with the Faculty Handbook), and 3) inform the candidate that the faculty members who are eligible to vote on his/her tenure or promotion will be informed of the incident prior to placing their votes.

**6.5.** **Procedural Note**

According to the *Faculty Handbook*, the recommendations of the PC and the Department Head will be forwarded to the College Dean for a decision prior to the deadline established in the Annual Academic Work Calendar. The Deans forwards his or her recommendations to the Provost for a decision. Discussions and/or negotiations will occur in those cases where the recommendations are not acceptable to the higher level administrator. In all cases where the recommendations of the Department Head, Dean, Provost, or the President differ from that of the PC, the administrator initiating the change will state in writing to the affected faculty member, the PC, and other involved administrators, the reasons why he or she

cannot agree with the original recommendations. Similarly, when a minority of the faculty members disagrees with the PC recommendation, then the minority may file a minority report as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*. Throughout the procedure, the PC and each administrator making a recommendation or decision will provide the individual faculty member with written notice of and reasons for the recommendation or decisions made concerning his or her promotion.

**6.6.    Criteria**

The Psychology Department recognizes that the traditional tripartite faculty members' responsibilities of teaching, research/creative scholarship, and service can be complementary activities. These activities serve three goals in the learning process:

a.      establishing and maintaining student motivation to learn,
b.      gathering and imparting useful information, and
c.      developing, implementing, and evaluating learning innovations.

The Psychology Department also recognizes that professional activities may serve any combination of these functions, as well as be indicators of quality effort in combinations of teaching, research, and service. Therefore, it is appropriate for some professional activities to be divided between categories.

The evaluation of teaching, research and scholarly activity, service, and negotiated roles will be based on multiple criteria. In recognition that individual Department members may have diverse Departmental roles and unique abilities, it is expected that successful applicants will exceed the criteria detailed below in one or more areas. The application of these criteria will take into consideration whether faculty members received support, such as start-up funds, necessary equipment, or necessary services.

It is recommended that applicants organize their supporting materials according to the Evaluation Matrix (found in the appendix) so that their evidence can easily be compared to the criteria in this document.

**6.6.1.  Teaching**

There are many ways to be a good teacher. However, teaching effectiveness is never a singular construct. Consequently, evaluation of teaching effectiveness must be based on multiple indicators. These should be related to the three goals of faculty members' work set forth in the Faculty Roles and Rewards document.

While it is the responsibility of faculty members to build a case for teaching effectiveness using multiple indicators, the specific indicators used will vary widely. However, it is acknowledged that some of the common sources of these indicators, such as teaching awards, peer evaluations, student ratings, and grants sought or funded are likely to be necessary for establishing a case for promotion. To the extent that one of these indicators provides more appropriate evidence than another for teaching effectiveness, this source

should be given greater weight. For example, while student ratings and teaching awards may be good indicators of faculty members' responsiveness, they are not likely to be especially good indicators of currency of course materials. For this, syllabi, assignments, and tests would be more desirable indicators. Thus, effectiveness evidence will vary by criterion.

Applicants are encouraged to provide complete and accurate student evaluations as one of several indicators of teaching effectiveness.

Effectiveness will also vary depending on the term of employment. Because there is a period of initial adjustment to a new position, teaching in the first year of employment will not be weighed as heavily as in subsequent years.

The following list of nine criteria are used to evaluate teaching effectiveness of applicants applying for promotion (i.e., these goals were originally drawn from the Faculty Roles and Rewards document (1996)). A partial list of possible evidence of teaching effectiveness is included in this list under each of the nine criteria. Faculty members seeking promotion will be required to provide evidence of effectiveness using the following nine criteria.

### 6.6.1.2. Goal 1: Establishing and maintaining student motivation to learn

**6.6.1.2.1.** Treating students fairly and impartially as unique individuals, including equitable evaluations that accurately reflect student learning and understanding

a. Developing and communicating common standards of performance in classroom, thesis, advisement, internship, and homework activities;

b. Administering and grading assignments according to pre-determined and clearly identified standards (e.g. having and consistently applying make-up, attendance, and grading policies);

c. Developing and administering indices of learning and performance (tests, assignments) that are flexible enough to allow for development of somewhat different skills within the limits set by the topic being presented (e.g. having "integrating" and "synthesizing" assignments along with standard tests)

Some ways of measuring this criterion include examination of syllabi, course evaluations, tests and course assignments.

**6.6.1.2.2.** Maintaining academic integrity, and high performance expectations appropriate for the level of one's classes and advisement relationships

a. Same as 1. a-c;

d. Updating tests and assignments according to changing

25

standards in the field, and (where appropriate) past performance of students;

    e.      Updating tests and assignments in order to maintain proprietary status of such assignments where necessary.

Common ways of measuring this criterion include examination of tests and class assignments.

**6.6.1.2.3.**      **Fostering & modeling civil discourse, intellectual curiosity, openness to diversity and to new ideas**

    a.      Listening to and responding positively to student questions, comments, & ideas;

    b.      Posing questions essential to one's field and allowing students free discussion and exploration to try to answer them independently;

    c.      Providing direct positive reinforcement in response to students' independent attempts to answer questions posed or developed through classroom discussion or individual advisement

Some ways of measuring this criterion include teaching awards, examination of student and peer evaluations, and class assignments.

**6.6.1.2.4.**      **Promoting and reinforcing independent, creative critical thinking and active student involvement in the learning process**

a.      Same as 3. a-c;

d.      Including students in the process of exploration, including all phases of research/applied activities

e.      Clearly describing what is required for answering or refining important research/application questions

f.      Developing and administering assignments which require student engagement in the process of understanding, integrating, and problem solving

g.      Establishing support from outside administrative units (e.g. curriculum grant funding, computer lab development and use, library activities)

h.      Establishing a variety of opportunities for students to contact individual faculty members (e.g. office hours, appointments)

Some ways of measuring this criterion include curricular grant applications and funding, grant applications and funding oriented toward student activities, teaching awards, student co-authors on publications and presentations, examination of student and peer evaluations, and class assignments.

**6.6.1.3.** **Goal 2: Gathering and imparting useful information**

    **6.6.1.3.1.** **Remaining current in one's field**

        **a.** Attending scheduled sessions at professional and public gatherings on a regular (semi-annual, annual, bi-annual) basis to remain current in one's field and develop teaching skills

        **b.** Updating course materials to reflect new information gathered through professional dialogues, readings, and research activities

Some ways of measuring this criterion include attendance at scheduled professional meetings, teaching workshops, and similar activities directed toward teaching improvement, and examination of student and peer evaluations, and class assignments.

    **6.6.1.3.2.** **Disseminating findings to students in various ways, such as classroom teaching**

        **a.** Same as 5. a-b, above;

        **c.** Assisting students in their gathering of information resources relevant to questions posed through scholarly discourse

        **d.** Consulting with, coaching, or critiquing students and their work by providing directive feedback

        **e.** Involving students in research/applied endeavors

        **f.** Supervising directed readings, practica

        **g.** Serving on thesis and seminar paper committees

Some ways of measuring this criterion include having student co-authors on publications and presentations, acceptance of student products by peer committees, and examination of student & peer evaluations and class assignments.

    **6.6.1.3.3.** **Reading critically current and otherwise relevant literature related to professional, teaching, and service activities**

        **a.** Same as 5, a above;

        **b.** Reading emerging, relevant scholarly work in one's discipline on a regular (daily, weekly, monthly) basis

        **c.** Developing bibliographies of current and otherwise relevant literature addressing questions posed in scholarly discourse

        **d.** Writing critical reviews of relevant scholarly literature for classroom presentation

        **e.** Supervising directed readings, practica

        **f.** Serving on thesis and seminar paper committees

Some ways of measuring this criterion include updating syllabi, publishing or presenting reviews of recent articles, books, or literature, and examination of peer evaluations, tests and class

assignments, and bibliographies.

**6.6.1.4.**          **Goal 3: <u>Developing, implementing, and evaluating learning innovations</u>**

**6.6.1.4.1.**      **Staying abreast of innovations in methods and technology of teaching/learning**

**a.**     **Reviewing selective textbooks and course materials on a regular (monthly, semi-annual) basis to improve presentation of information**

**b.**     **Evaluating possible applications of new technologies to learning and problem solving processes to enhance student learning**

**Some ways of measuring this criterion include attendance at scheduled professional meetings, teaching workshops, and similar activities directed toward teaching improvement, and examination of syllabi, peer evaluations, and class assignments.**

**6.6.1.4.2.**      **Conducting ongoing critical assessment of teaching and scholarly activities**

**a.**     **Developing and administering measures designed to assess student progress toward identified learning goals**

**b.**     **Seeking and using feedback from one's peers, students, other constituencies in order to improve effectiveness**

**c.**     **Providing pedagogical consulting to peers through public or private advisement.**

**Some ways of measuring this criterion include attendance or presentation at scheduled professional meetings, teaching workshops, and similar activities directed toward teaching/advisement improvement, and examination of student, peer, and other constituent evaluations.**

**6.6.2.**   **Research and Scholarly Activity**

**6.6.2.1.**      **Activities which lead to publications will be weighted more heavily than other activities. Because of the high rejection rate in professional journals in psychology, works in progress are included as indicators of research and scholarly activity.**

**6.6.2.2.**      **For promotion to the rank of Professor, evidence of at least an additional 8 quality indicators are required to meet Departmental standards for attaining promotion. These indicators must be attained since promotion to the level of Associate professor. At least 4 of these indicators must come from category "a" below, and at least one of these indicators must be attained within the three years prior to the application**

for promotion. First authorship in a category 'a' indicator will count for an additional half of a quality indicator in category a.

6.6.2.3.  Applicants cannot submit a single research product or activity as a quality indicator of both research and either teaching or service.

6.6.2.4.  Due to the variety of publication outlets in psychology, the PC is to use the following quality indicators in determining the strength of the applicant's research and scholarly activity.

a.  Any of the following are to be considered single quality indicators:

1)  article accepted for publication in a refereed print or electronic journal
2)  discipline-related book(s) published or in press on which the applicant was an author
3)  chapter published or in press in an edited book.
4)  receipt of an external research grant of $5000 or greater Credit is awarded for being either the principal investigator or a co-investigator
5)  peer-reviewed technical report available for public consumption

b.  Any combination of two of the following is to be considered a single quality indicator:

1)  presentation at a regional, national, or international convention or conference.
2)  round table discussion at a regional, national, or international convention or conference.
3)  poster session at a regional, national, or international convention or conference.
4)  organizing a symposium for a national-level conference.
5)  receipt of an external research grant less than $5000. Credit is awarded for being either the principal investigator or a co-investigator.
6)  receipt of an internal research grant. Credit is awarded for being either the principal investigator or a co-investigator.
7)  technical report.
8)  published book review in a professional journal
9)  publication in a nonrefereed journal or magazine
10)  data-based manuscript under revision, but not yet accepted for publication in a refereed journal
11)  one external grant submitted to a peer reviewed funding agency.

> **c.** Any combination of three of the following is to be considered a single quality indicator:
>
> > 1) publication or acceptance for publication of course materials that are not limited to use with a course offered through MSU. This includes publication on the Internet of such course materials.
> > 2) one grant submitted for either internal or external funding.
> > 3) participation in a research-related workshop.
> > 4) participation in a grant-writing workshop.
> > 5) receiving additional formal training in research design or statistics.
> > 6) laboratory study in the state of data collection.
> > 7) manuscript either near completion, submitted for publication, or under revision but not yet accepted for publication in refereed journals.
> > 8) longitudinal research or research requiring time-intensive data collection,
> > 9) book or book chapter in progress,
> > 10) technical report in progress or under review.

**6.6.2.5.** In those cases where the PC is uncertain how to interpret a publication effort, the PC will meet with the applicant to discuss the publication in an effort to come to an agreement on its value toward promotion.

**6.6.2.6.** Applicants may ask the PC to treat a specific research activity or product as meeting a higher level of quality than is presented in the list, or to include a non-listed activity or product as a quality indicator, when the nature of such activities or products required extensive effort or the quality of the research activity or product is not adequately reflected in the list of quality indicators. In such cases, the PC will meet with the applicants to discuss the activity or product in an effort to determine its value toward promotion.

## 6.6.3. Service

**6.6.3.1.** Applicants for promotion are expected to participate in Departmental governance by attending faculty meetings and demonstrating a willingness to serve on Departmental committees.

**6.6.3.2.** Beyond participation in Departmental governance, the successful candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor also must provide at least 4 quality indicators of service. The successful candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor also

must provide at least 4 quality indicators of service, and at least one indicator must represent service on one University-level committee, in one community organization, or in one professional organization. The following list contains examples of such indicators and is not intended to be a complete list. Applicants may present evidence of additional quality indicators of service that are not on this list, as well as a rationale for such indicators.

    a.    serving as members of Departmental committee

    b    serving as a member of a College committee

    c    serving as a member of a University committee

    d.    serving as an officer or chair of Departmental, College, and/or University committees

    e.    participation in College or University governance activities

    f.    membership in professional organizations and attendance of meetings of those organizations

    g.    serving as an officer in a professional organization

    h.    serving as a faculty member advisor for a student organization

    i.    organizing a conference for a professional meeting or community organization

    j.    scholarly presentations at community organizations,

    k.    submitting a grant for community service activities or community organizations

    l.    obtaining a grant for community service activities or community organizations

    m.    service to individual faculty members and administrators including such activities as assisting with the use of technology, statistical analysis, pedagogical decision-making

    n.    community service activities related to the faculty member's disciplines, or extensive community service outside of the disciplines,

    o.    promoting student involvement in community activities,

    p.    supervision of students in community service activities.

    q.    maintaining or providing other Departmental services, such as maintaining program Web pages, coordinating budget requests, supporting grant writing within the Department, etc.

    r.    attendance at official Departmental functions.

**6.6.3.3.** In those cases where the PC is uncertain how to interpret a service activity, the PC will meet with the applicant to discuss the activity in an effort to come to an agreement on its value toward promotion.

**6.6.3.4.** Applicants may ask the PC to treat a specific service activity as being worth more than a single quality indicator, or to include a non-listed activity as a quality indicator. Such requests are reasonable when the nature of the service activity required extensive time or effort. In such cases, the PC will meet with

applicants to discuss the service activity in an effort to determine its value toward promotion.

### 6.7. Amendment

This promotion policy may be amended by a simple majority vote of the members of the Department with the approval of the CHHS Dean and Provost Office.

## 7. Promotion to Senior Instructor Rank Application Review Policy and Procedures

Faculty members in the Department of Psychology at Missouri State will be evaluated according to the criteria contained within this document which was drafted to be consistent with the Departmental, the College, and the University missions.

Assuming a12-hours per semester teaching load, promotion to the Senior Instructor rank will be based on the criteria of teaching (Section 5.6.1) and service (Section 5.6.3) that are applicable for promotion to Associate Professor and the criteria for ethics and collegiality (Section 5.4) that are applicable to faculty applying for tenure. If the teaching load of an Instructor varies from the typical 12-hour teaching load, then the Department Head and Instructor will negotiate criteria that will be used for annual reviews and promotion. In such cases, negotiated criteria are to be documented, filed, and made available for the relevant Promotion Committee members.