

Department of Graduate Psychology

Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Guidelines

Approved: 2012

DEPARTMENT OF GRADUATE PSYCHOLOGY

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

Revised 1/9/12

Faculty members in the Department of Graduate Psychology reflect the diversity of the field of psychology in their knowledge, scholarship, and service. Below are the criteria that the Department Personal Advisory Committee (PAC) and Department Head will use to evaluate the performance of faculty members in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement, and professional service for the purpose of annual evaluations and for promotion and tenure decisions. Recognizing that there are unique features to the activities, assignments, and appointments of each faculty member, both the PAC and the Department Head will use professional judgment in evaluating the merits of each application. A faculty activities assignment plan (FAAP) is made between the faculty member and the Department Head at the beginning of each academic year. The proposed FAAP is included at the end of the FAR document and finalized at the FAR conference. The FAAP identifies anticipated activities in teaching, scholarship and service and indicates any reassigned time. Unusual weightings of teaching, scholarship and service must be approved by the Department Head and will be noted in the FAAP. Faculty are expected to have substantive activity (i.e., meets the criteria for Satisfactory performance evaluation) in teaching, scholarly activity, and service as specified in FAR documents. Faculty members assume responsibility for providing the necessary documentation (including a narrative description of their individual unique professional activities). This information should be submitted in the Faculty Annual Review (FAR) for annual evaluations, or with the professional dossier for promotion/tenure. Performance in each of the three areas will be evaluated as “Excellent,” “Satisfactory,” or “Unsatisfactory.”

In addition, each year the designation of “Distinctive” is awarded to one faculty member in each of the three areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. To be evaluated as Distinctive, faculty must meet the criteria described for the rating of “Excellent”. Further, for designation as Distinctive, the pattern of evidence submitted for the “Excellent” rating must suggest a rich level of performance that goes beyond even “Excellent” performance when compared to others in this group. The “Distinctive” designation will be granted based on the scope, history, complexity, or impact of the faculty member’s performance. The three faculty designated as Distinctive will be the department’s nominees for the College awards, provided they meet the College criteria for these awards. Distinctive non-tenured faculty may be nominated for the College’s “Outstanding Junior Faculty” award.

Tenure track faculty are encouraged to request a pre-tenure review during their third year by the Department Head and PAC to facilitate successful professional progress at JMU. This review will be based on two FARs and a narrative description presented by the faculty member.

The annual evaluations of faculty are completed as a collaborative process between the Department Head and PAC. The Department Head writes the letter of evaluation and has final responsibility for performance reevaluation. Evaluations for promotion/tenure are completed independently by the Department Head and PAC and

forwarded to the Dean. The Department Head and PAC exchange letters after submission to the Dean. The Dean, after review of the dossier and formulation of an independent recommendation, presents all three recommendations to the Provost.

TEACHING

As the PAC and Department Head of Graduate Psychology evaluate teaching performance, they will stay mindful of the fact that teaching responsibilities differ according to the program and nature of assignment within a program. Teaching responsibilities may include lecturing, leading a seminar, supervising research or clinical work, advising, and mentoring. Evaluations will take into account the difficulty level of the course, the intrinsic appeal of the course, and other relevant factors such as the special skills, knowledge, and commitment the instructor must possess in order to effectively train competent entry level professionals and/or prepare students for doctoral level study.

Satisfactory Performance

To receive a rating of “Satisfactory Performance” in Teaching, faculty will show evidence in the following:

1. Fulfillment of assigned teaching responsibilities
These can include course assignments including clinical/research supervision and reassigned time for special projects or administrative duties, or special contract arrangements.
2. Satisfactory course evaluations on the required questions (for undergraduate classes, faculty should use the undergraduate teaching evaluation forms)
3. A sample course syllabus that includes:
 - course objectives and outline
 - readings
 - assignments
 - evaluation proceduresNOTE: ALL course syllabi must be accessible electronically for review.
4. Advising and mentoring advisees as assigned (the submission of advising comments is optional)
5. Maintaining accessibility to students and effective collaboration
6. Faculty reflections about feedback from peers and/or students should be included in the narrative, including evidence of modifications made, if needed.

Excellent Performance

To receive a rating of “Excellent Performance” in Teaching, faculty must meet the criteria described for the rating of “Satisfactory Performance” and submit materials showing evidence of excellent performance in some of the following:

1. *High quality* teaching or innovations in teaching
 - evidence of consistent high quality, such as documentation of favorable peer review (including positive comments from external reviewers), and strong student evaluations (including written comments)
 - new and innovative assignments with rationale for change

- implementation of new evaluation/teaching techniques with rationale for change
 - substantial course revision
 - curriculum and/or program revision
 - design and implementation of new course
 - use and/or development of innovations in emerging instructional technology
2. *High quality* supervision of students in independent directed reading, research projects and/or clinical work
 - independent reading or research projects
 - chair or member of honors theses, master's theses, Ed.S. projects, or doctoral dissertation committees
 - acceptance for publication or conference presentation of supervised research project(s)
 - reports from students or other supervisors or other evidence regarding effective clinical or research supervision
 3. *High quality* (informal and formal) advising and mentorship
 - description of advising assignment/role
 - service as a mentor for students who are not assigned advisees
 - description of specialized advising functions as a resource person, e.g., assistance with research design
 - description of type and quantity of letters of recommendation, particularly when your assignments entail an unusual number of these responsibilities
 - description of faculty advisor role of successful student clubs/organizations
 4. Sample assignments that reflect appropriate design for course level and size and that promote intellectual development (e.g., writing, critical thinking)

SCHOLARLY ACHIEVEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

As the PAC and Head of the Graduate Psychology evaluate scholarly performance, they will be mindful of the way scholarship is defined by JMU (See “Scholarly Activity at James Madison University: Seeking A Common Understanding” – A report from the Role of Research Subcommittee). Research production involves products that have been shared with and evaluated by other professionals. These may include presentations at professional meetings, journal articles, books, book chapters, book reviews, computer software, grant proposals, consulting activities, or scholarly products shared through electronic or other media. A single scholarly project or product may be deemed by the Department Head and PAC to be of such outstanding quality that it may be counted as more than one project or product.

Satisfactory Performance

To receive a rating of “Satisfactory Performance” in Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, faculty will show evidence of **all** of the following during the last **three year** period:

1. Engage in professional development related to scholarship.
2. Demonstrate involvement in scholarship and/or student research projects.
3. Produce a minimum of *three* scholarly products, *one* of which is a publication OR documented evidence of a longitudinal or other ongoing scholarly activity and one publication (i.e., peer-reviewed article, book chapter, position paper, grant application, book review, *significant* newsletter piece). *For promotion and tenure decisions, adjust quantities to cover the review period e.g. 5 products in five years, two publications in six years.*

Excellent Performance

For a rating of “Excellent Performance” in Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, the applicant substantially exceeds the criteria for “Satisfactory Performance”. A minimum of six products (or the equivalent) during the three-year period, at least two of which are publications. *For promotion and tenure decisions, adjust quantities to cover the review period e.g. 10 products in five years, four publications in six years.* In addition, the faculty member submits materials showing evidence of high quality in **some** of the following:

1. High quality and/or high impact scholarship
2. Engagement in systematic professional development that involves substantial retooling of skills
3. Consistently high quality contributions to student research projects or research of colleagues
4. A productive research team
5. Additional high quality research products

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

As the PAC and Department Head evaluate professional service performance, they will stay mindful of the fact that possibilities for faculty service are quite broad. Some faculty may concentrate their service in more narrowly defined areas while other faculty may render service broadly across many domains.

Satisfactory Performance

To receive a rating of “Satisfactory Performance” in Professional Service, faculty will show evidence of the following:

1. Active involvement in at least one program committee
2. At least one additional service commitment at the program, department, college, university, or professional organization level
3. Membership in at least one professional organization

Excellent Performance

To receive a rating of “Excellent Performance” in Professional Service, faculty must meet the criteria described for the rating of “Satisfactory Performance” and submit materials showing evidence of high quality in **some** of the following:

1. Taking a leadership role in a productive committee at the program, departmental, college, university, or professional organization level
2. Providing professional development sessions at JMU or as part of a professional organization
3. Mentoring junior colleagues
4. Serving as a consultant to a community organization (local, state, national, international)
5. Providing service to professional organizations
6. Providing editorial service

Procedures for Annual Evaluations in Graduate Psychology

Faculty will submit two copies of Faculty Activity Reviews (FAR’s), one to the Department Head and one directly to the PAC, which evaluates the faculty performance and forwards their evaluations to the Department Head. The Department Head incorporates PAC evaluations into the final performance evaluation. According to the Faculty Handbook, final responsibility for faculty evaluations rests with the Department Head. The Department Head’s performance evaluation is shared with the faculty member by letter and conference. Merit awards are decided by the Department Head based upon performance ratings. Faculty identified by PAC and approved by the Department Head as Distinctive receive additional merit. Merit recommendations are forwarded to the Dean for approval and final adjustment.

Time Frame For Annual Evaluations, Promotion, And Tenure

For the annual evaluation of faculty performance, the time frame for teaching and professional service is the previous twelve-month period. For scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, the time frame is the previous three-year period. In both promotion and tenure decisions, the PAC and the Department Head will consider the quality of performance in teaching, scholarly achievement and, and professional service over the previous five years, since employment at JMU, or the last promotion.

It should be noted that evaluation for tenure is not just an average of the annual evaluation ratings. It is based on a cumulative review of faculty performance that takes into account the totality of the candidate’s record during the entire time of their appointment.

As indicated in the Faculty Handbook, if a faculty member applies for promotion before completing five years in academic rank, or if a faculty member applies for tenure prior to the penultimate year of the probationary period, he or she must present compelling evidence to be awarded promotion or tenure. Compelling evidence in the

Department of Graduate Psychology is defined as fulfilling all usual criteria for promotion and/or tenure as specified in the Department's Evaluation Criteria Policy and providing evidence to support a demonstrated national and/or international professional reputation. Specific evidence to support this reputation may include external letters of support, publication in top rated journals, invited presenter to conferences, symposium or other professional venues, national or international awards or recognition, external funding, and leadership to professional organizations.

Statements Regarding Promotion and Tenure in the JMU Faculty Handbook 2011

III.E.6. Promotion in Academic Rank

The promotion of an instructional faculty member shall be determined by merit regardless of the distribution of faculty by academic rank within the academic unit. Normally, a faculty member should have completed five years in academic rank before being reviewed for promotion. Though length of service may be given consideration, it is not a sufficient basis for recommendation for promotion. If a faculty member applies for promotion before completing five years in academic rank, he or she must present a compelling case to be awarded promotion. A faculty member's pattern of prior annual evaluations should be carefully considered in the analysis of an application or nomination for promotion, but each administrator and committee should use judgment and discretion in making recommendations on promotion and should clearly indicate a positive or negative recommendation on the promotion. A&P faculty members and fixed term faculty members may also apply for or be nominated for promotion in academic rank, and the following policies and procedures shall apply.

The BOV is the only authority that can award promotions or make a commitment that promises promotion in academic rank. Regardless of the division in which a faculty member holds an appointment, the academic affairs division is the appropriate administrative division through which applications and nominations for promotion in academic rank will be processed.

III.E.6.a. Standards

Teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service are the bases for evaluating the performance of candidates for promotion in academic rank. In each of these areas, the faculty member shall be evaluated as excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Problems with a faculty member's conduct may disqualify a candidate for promotion in academic rank. In the evaluation of faculty members being considered for promotion in academic rank, the following standards apply:

III.E.6.a.(1) Assistant Professor. At least satisfactory ratings in all areas are required for promotion to assistant professor.

III.E.6.a.(2) Associate Professor. An excellent rating in one area and at least satisfactory ratings in the others are required for promotion to associate professor.

III.E.6.a.(3) Professor Excellent ratings in two areas and at least a satisfactory rating in the third area are required for promotion to professor

TENURE

III.E.7.e. Standards

The award of tenure is based on the qualifications, performance and conduct of individual faculty members and the long-term needs, objectives and missions of the academic unit, college and university. To be awarded tenure, the faculty member must meet performance and conduct standards required for promotion to associate professor and should enhance the academic environment of the academic unit and the university.

Length of service is not a sufficient basis for recommendation for tenure. Tenure may be denied on any legitimate grounds including the lack of need for a faculty member in the particular academic unit or academic specialization, program reduction or elimination, financial exigency, or conduct. Problems with a faculty member's conduct may disqualify a candidate for tenure. Teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service shall be used in evaluating the performance of a candidate for tenure. A faculty member's pattern of prior annual evaluations should be carefully considered in the analysis of an application for tenure, but each administrator and committee should use judgment and discretion in making recommendations on tenure.

For statements regarding **Promotion and Tenure** guidelines, see the *JMU Faculty Handbook* using the following link:

<http://www.jmu.edu/facultysenate/facultyhandbook/>

For information/forms regarding the College awards, use the following CISAT link:

http://www.jmu.edu/cisat/forms_documents.html