

Psychology Department Leave, Rank and Tenure (LRT) Policy

Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (September 2011)

The mission of the Southern Utah University Psychology Department is to provide a superior education through a personalized, integrative, and experiential learning environment where information, procedures and practices from a wide variety of sources are used to facilitate learning. This environment is designed to foster academic excellence and professional expertise, instill ethics and values, and encourage a life-long love of learning.

To fulfill our mission, faculty members of the Psychology Department will:

1. Promote self-motivated study and learning
2. Foster an understanding of and appreciation for the scientific method
3. Provide opportunities for research and other scholarly activities
4. Provide opportunities for quality clinical training and service-learning activities
5. Foster an understanding of and respect for others

Consistent with SUU Policy 6.1.IV.A.1, educating students is our first priority. In our LRT policies and procedures we value activities and efforts that provide individualized opportunities for students to realize their academic, professional, and personal goals. We promote and support the role and mission of SUU as Utah's Liberal Arts and Sciences University. We strive to advance the role and missions of the Department, College, and the University in each of the four areas of professional responsibility: Teaching, Scholarship, Service, and Collegiality.

To facilitate our tenured and tenure track faculty's progress toward fulfilling the department's mission, each member in this group will 1) submit an activity report of the previous year at the beginning of the following academic year, and 2) complete an activity plan for the upcoming academic year. The details of this procedure are described in Appendix A of this document and are summarized in order of completion below:

At the beginning of the Fall Semester:

- According to SUU policy 6.1, each faculty member completes a *Faculty Annual Activity Report (FAAR)* to summarize his/her accomplishments and contributions from the previous year. In addition, every faculty member completes a *Department Evaluation of Peers (DEP) form* for every other member. A faculty member's FAAR and DEP scores constitute the primary materials used by subsequent evaluative committees/individuals.
- the department LRT Committee reviews each non-tenured, tenure track faculty member's FAAR and DEP scores, and then summarizes their evaluation using the *Faculty Evaluation Form (FEF)*. The department chair then summarizes each faculty's FEF and forwards his/her evaluation to the appropriate LRT committees, Dean, and Provost, as applicable. Refer to SUU policy 6.1 Appendix A for deadline schedules.
- faculty members complete their *Faculty Annual Activity Plan (FAAP)* for the upcoming year. This is reviewed by the department LRT Committee, or at the faculty member's request, the entire department. The department Chair and LRT Committee use the FAAP to approve the member's weighted values for teaching, scholarship, and service. See Appendix B for weighting standards.

FACULTY ANNUAL ACTIVITY REPORT (FAAR)

Teaching: weighted 50-90% of overall FAAR score

In our department, quality teaching is the primary expectation. We value curricular currency, relevancy, and practical application. We value active learning pedagogies such as practicum, internships, service-learning activities, course-related writing assignments, course related laboratories, research activities, etc... We appreciate that different pedagogies are appropriate for different courses and that learning objectives vary from course to course. As such, we have no “one-size fits all” evaluation criteria. In our department, we employ the IDEA evaluation system to evaluate teaching effectiveness because it is adaptable and sensitive to the things we value. Other evaluations methods, such as peer observation of teaching, may be used and submitted to the department’s faculty for their consideration as they complete a DEP for each faculty.

IDEA Report:

Progress on Relevant Objectives: mean of scores or adjusted scores for all courses _____

Excellent Teacher: mean of scores or adjusted scores for all courses _____

Excellent Course: mean of scores or adjusted scores for all courses _____

Summary: mean* of all scores or adjusted scores across all 3 categories above _____

*This measure is used to calculate overall teaching effectiveness

Meritorious	score between 4.50 and 5.00 (T score** of 63 or higher)
Superior	score between 4.00 and 4.49 (T score between 56 and 62)
Standard	score between 3.00 and 3.99 (T score between 45 and 55)
Low	score between 2.50 and 2.99 (T score between 38 and 44)
Unacceptable	score below 2.50 (T score below 38)

** T scores based on converted averages when compared to all classes in the IDEA Database.

Scholarship: weighted 0-45% of overall FAAR score

In addition to professional growth and development, the Psychology Department sees scholarly endeavors as an important mechanism through which quality educational experiences are developed, maintained, and promoted. Activities that meet our definitions for the scholarship of teaching, discovery, application, and integration are assigned up to 1 point each, in so far as they support the mission of the Department, the College, and/or the University (see Appendix C). A given activity may be awarded additional points based on the consideration of the following factors:

1. involvement of students in a manner that promotes their academic and professional growth (1 point);
2. nature of the peer reviewed professional outlet or venue through which the results of the activity are disseminated: off campus publication (2 points), international/national/regional conference (1 point), campus/community/department level publication or presentation (1/2 point);
3. funding of the activity: external (1.5 points), internal (1/2 point), none (0 points);
4. other factors which meet department approval.

Faculty Collaborations

In such cases where faculty members collaborate on a scholarly activity, all members are awarded equally up to one point for the activity. In such cases where faculty members contribute equally, they shall be awarded equally with the additional points. Where one or more faculty members clearly contributed most to the activity and the remaining faculty made relatively minor contributions, only the former is/are eligible to receive additional points from consideration of the factors described above. Faculty are encouraged to document their contributions on an ongoing basis. Any dispute over point allocation shall be resolved by the Department LRT and Chair.

A faculty member's annual scholarly score is determined by summing scores for all scholarly activities, as follows:

Meritorious	score between 4.50 and 5.00
Superior	score between 4.00 and 4.49
Standard	score between 3.00 and 3.99
Low	score between 2.50 and 2.99
Unacceptable	score below 2.50

Service: weighted 5-25% of overall FAAR score

Extracurricular service to students, faculty, the department, college, university, profession, and the community (that which relies on the faculty's professional experience and skills) is a vital part of our mission. The value of a given service is based on the consideration of two factors:

a) the potential impact the service could have on any/each of the groups identified above (high, moderate, low), and; b) the time commitment invested in the activity (high, moderate, low)

Service points will be awarded according to the following standards:

3 points each

Service activities which score high on potential impact and actual time investment

2 points each

Service activities which score high on either potential impact or actual time investment

Service activities which score moderate on potential impact and actual time investment

1 point each

Service activities which score moderate on either potential impact or actual time investment

1/2 point each

Service activities which score low on potential impact and actual time investment

Using these criteria, faculty members score each activity they engaged in for the academic year and provide a brief justification for their assessment. The department LRT will affirm these self-assessments.

A faculty member's annual service score is determined by summing scores for all service activities, as follows:

Meritorious	score between 4.50 and 5.00
Superior	score between 4.00 and 4.49
Standard	score between 3.00 and 3.99
Low	score between 2.50 and 2.99
Unacceptable	score below 2.50

Collegiality

We appreciate and value amicable, ethical, and responsible colleagues. Psychology faculty members must adhere to all SUU policies and APA ethical standards and codes of conduct. The psychology department assumes that faculty members have complied with SUU policies on professional and ethical conduct unless evidence is presented to the contrary. A faculty member's collegiality will be assessed as either acceptable or unacceptable.

Annual Overall FAAR Score:

$$(\text{weight})(\text{Teaching Score}) + (\text{weight})(\text{Scholarship Score}) + (\text{weight})(\text{Service Score}) = \text{Annual Overall FAAR Score}$$

Meritorious	score between 4.50 and 5.00
Superior	score between 4.00 and 4.49
Standard	score between 3.00 and 3.99
Low	score between 2.50 and 2.99
Unacceptable	score below 2.50

DEPARTMENT EVALUATION OF PEERS (DEP)

For each of the four areas of professional responsibility (teaching, scholarship, service, collegiality), tenured and tenure track faculty members will evaluate all other tenured and tenure track faculty members of the department, using the scale described below. To assist them, peer reviewers may consider any evidence the faculty member wishes to provide (e.g. FAARs), or other available information (e.g. peer observation of teaching, teaching awards/recognition).

Meritorious	score between 4.50 and 5.00
Superior	score between 4.00 and 4.49
Standard	score between 3.00 and 3.99
Low	score between 2.50 and 2.99
Unacceptable	score below 2.50

Using the DEPs, the Department Chair will calculate an unweighted mean peer evaluation score for each of the four areas, for each faculty member. In the event a faculty member receives a mean which places them “unacceptable” in any of the four areas of evaluation, this could indicate a significant barrier to rank advancement, tenure, and/or merit pay consideration, regardless of the faculty member’s scores on her/his FAAR. In such a case, the Department Chairperson will meet with the faculty member to develop a remedial action plan to facilitate improvement.

Southern Utah University Department of Psychology
Rank & Tenure Requirements & Schedules

To be considered for rank advancement and/or tenure, *Annual Overall FAAR Scores of 3.00* or greater will be counted. The minimum required number of such scores is listed in the table below under the columns titled # FAARs. Faculty must also satisfy the department's requirement for collegiality every year during the evaluative period. The Department Chair and LRT committees will further consider annual unweighted mean peer evaluation scores (calculated from the DEP forms). Should a faculty member receive one or more scores below 3.00 in any area (teaching, scholarship, service, collegiality) in any year during the evaluative period, this could have a negative impact on his/her rank advancement and/or tenure.

RANK ADVANCEMENT

Eval. period begins	<u>Mid-term review</u>		<u>Associate Status</u>		<u>Full Status *</u>		<u>Full Status **</u>	
	date hired		date hired		date granted assoc. prof status		date hired	
<u>Years granted toward rank</u>	<u># full years to be evaluated</u>	<u># FAARs</u>	<u># full years to be evaluated</u>	<u># FAARs</u>	<u># full years to be evaluated</u>	<u># FAARs</u>	<u># full years to be evaluated</u>	<u># FAARs</u>
0	3	2	6	5	5	5	5	5
1	2	2	5	4	5	5	4	4
2	1	1	4	3	5	5	3	3
3	1	1	3	3	5	5	2	2

* requirements for faculty hired at the assistant level

** requirements for faculty hired at the associate level

Advancement to Full Professor Additional Requirement: In addition to the required number of FAAR scores of 3.00 or greater (as described in the table above), eligible faculty must demonstrate effective leadership within the department, college, university, or profession. Some examples include, but are not limited to: department or associate department chair, director or associate director of a college or university program, faculty senate president, a leadership position within a professional/academic organization, and peer-recognized, impactful scholarly contributions to one's subfield of psychology.

TENURE

Regardless of whether a faculty member is hired with assistant or associate status, the evaluative period for tenure begins with their date of hire. The table below lists the number of *Annual Overall FAAR Scores* of 3.00 or greater required for faculty granted 0 – 3 years toward tenure. The requirements for collegiality are the same as those described for rank advancement. The same is true for the annual unweighted mean peer evaluation scores (calculated from the DEP forms).

<u>Years granted toward tenure</u>	<u># full years to be evaluated</u>	<u># FAARs</u>
0	6	5
1	5	4
2	4	3
3	3	2

Appendix A
SUU Department of Psychology: Summary of Faculty Evaluation Tasks and Deadlines

<u>Whose Task</u>	<u>Form to be completed</u>	<u>Materials to be used</u>	<u>Deadline/recipient</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
Each faculty member	Faculty Annual Activity Report (FAAR)	IDEA reports, any supporting documentation of stated activities	by 1 st Tue in Sept. to all other faculty members & Dept. Chair	self-evaluation of previous year's activities
Each faculty member	Faculty Annual Activity Plan (FAAP)	previous FAARs to serve as a guideline	by Sept. 15* to Dept. Chair & Dept. LRT	dept. approval of self-plan for present academic year
Each faculty member	Department Evaluation of Peers (DEP)	FAARs & any other relevant doc.	by 2 nd Tue in Sept. to Dept. Chair	evaluation of others in dept. for the previous year
Department LRT Committee	Faculty Evaluation Form (FEF) i.e. Evaluative letter (Appendix C Policy 6.1)	FAARs, DEPs other relevant documentation	by 3 rd Mon in Sept. to dept. chair	evaluation of faculty up for rank or tenure consideration
Department Chair	Evaluative Letter (Appendix C policy 6.1)	FEF, FAAR, DEPs	by 1 st Mon in Nov. to Dean and/or Provost as applicable	to evaluate each faculty member's activities/performance during the previous year**

* Adjustments to a FAAP after Sept.15 may be deemed necessary should a review of the member's most current FAAR suggest a need

** For tenured faculty members, this letter does not go beyond the chairperson unless a) a problem in one or more of the evaluated categories was identified, or b) the faculty member is undergoing a 5-year post-tenure review.

Appendix B
SUU Department of Psychology
Weighting Standards

4 / 4 load	teaching 70%	scholarship ___% + service ___% = 30%
3 / 4 load	teaching 60%	scholarship ___% + service ___% = 40%
3 / 3 load	teaching 50%	scholarship ___% + service ___% = 50%
5 / 4 load	teaching 80%	scholarship ___% + service ___% = 20%
5 / 5 load	teaching 90%	scholarship ___% + service ___% = 10%

As a general rule, faculty members in the psychology department teach a 4 / 4 load. **Any deviation from this expectation must be approved by the department chair and dean.** As a general rule, faculty who desire to teach less than a 4 / 4 load will be accommodated as long as there are faculty who wish to teach more than a 4 / 4 load (or vice-versa). Only faculty who teach a 5 / 5 load may weight scholarship at 0%, and no faculty may weight service less than 5%. A faculty member may not weight scholarship at 0% in two consecutive years.

The opportunity for a one or two course reduction in exchange for increased scholarly activity must be assigned in fair and non-prejudicial manner among members of the department.

Note that faculty who teach a 5 / 4 or 5 / 5 load may not receive overload compensation for these additional courses should their combined scholarly and service activity requirements be weighted at 20% and 10% respectively. Any additional course loads they teach ARE subject to overload compensation.

Similarly, faculty on a 3 / 4 or 3 / 3 load may teach additional courses on overload as long as the combined weight for scholarship and service activities remain at 40% and 50% respectively.

Appendix C
 SUU Department of Psychology
 Statement on Scholarship

Pursuant to SUU policy 6.10 (dated 11/02/90 and amended 11/29/07) which states:

Scholarly/Creative Activity: The University has adopted the Boyer model for scholarship, as outlined in *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (Ernest L. Boyer, 1990, Jossey Bass Publishing, ISBN: 0787940690)

The Psychology Department has adopted The Boyer Model which includes a broad and comprehensive definition of scholarship. The different forms of scholarship and examples of valued activities which fall under each are outlined in the table below.

	scholarship			
	<u>of teaching</u>	<u>of discovery</u>	<u>of application</u>	<u>of integration</u>
definition	faculty study and apply teaching models and practices to achieve optimal learning for students and faculty	faculty gain new knowledge by engaging in traditional research appropriate to their discipline and field of study	faculty aid the institution, communities and profession in addressing problems they face	faculty interpret the use, implication, or application of knowledge across disciplines
valued activities	pedagogical research which is disseminated to their peers or profession, developing instructional materials which are disseminated to their peers or profession, mentoring UG or grad students, designing and implementing a program level assessment system	peer or professionally reviewed publications and/or presentations, creating an infrastructure for future studies, discoveries which contribute to the intellectual climate of the university	serving the institution, community groups, non-profit organizations, industry or government as a consultant, assuming leadership roles in professional organizations, and advising student leaders thereby fostering their professional growth. Such activities must be specifically tied to the faculty's field of knowledge and professional activities	preparing a comprehensive literature review which is disseminated to their peers or relevant professionals, writing a textbook, manual or instructional video for use in multiple disciplines, designing and delivering a core course which services multiple disciplines

- Notes
- 1 The list of "valued activities" identified in this document is not exhaustive. Additional activities may be included as a "valued activity" with consensus from the department's faculty.
 2. A single scholarly project may incorporate two or more valued activities. In such cases, the project counts for 1 point; not the sum of valued activities of which it may be comprised.