

Faculty Performance Expectations PSYCHOLOGY

Professional faculty members will be measured against the expectations listed under teaching and service (see section 5.224 and 5.226). Professorial faculty members will be measured against the expectations listed under teaching, scholarship and service (see sections 5.224-5.226).

All faculty members should be making progress toward performing at the preferred level in each of the areas applicable to their appointment. The acceptable level describes the minimum performance expected for continued employment. Note: unacceptable performance is defined as below an acceptable level and may require a plan for correction (see 5.370).

The preferred level describes the average or typical performance level for a faculty member making good progress toward final promotion. The exceptional level would characterize and recognize faculty who demonstrated significant achievements, well beyond the preferred level.

All faculty members must have the educational background required and have completed the required years in rank prior to the effective date of promotion or the required years of service prior to the date of awarding of tenure or a three-year extendable appointment (see section 5.223).

In addition, the faculty member's performance portfolio must be reviewed and demonstrate that there are sufficient contributions in each of the areas appropriate to the faculty member's appointment. Faculty must meet or exceed the acceptable performance level in each area applicable to their appointment. The number of areas required to exceed the acceptable level gradually increases (see table below) until all areas must be at the preferred level for final promotion (Senior Instructor 2 or Full Professor). Note: exceptional performance is not expected, nor required for promotion to any rank, however faculty members may elect to replace preferred performance in two areas with acceptable performance in one area and exceptional performance in the other.

Minimum Promotion and Tenure Performance Requirements

	Min Acceptable	Min Preferred	Min Exceptional
SR Instructor 1 (3 year extendable appt.)	1	1	
SR Instructor 2		2 — OR —	
Associate	1	1	1
Tenure	2	2 — OR —	
Professor		3 — OR —	
	1	1	1

In reviewing the characteristics at each level, no faculty member will exactly fit the description in any one column. The evaluation goal is to identify the column that best describes an individual faculty member's performance in this area.

Teaching Performance Levels

Acceptable	Preferred	Exceptional
<p>Student evaluations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate instructor’s teaching effectiveness “very good” or higher (see section 5.260) <p>Classroom Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a commitment to improve instruction, such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Professional development activities that impacted instruction ○ Work with colleagues that impacted instruction • Evidence of effective practices, such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reflection and self-improvement ○ Engaging teaching methods ○ Providing meaningful classroom experiences <p>Curricular Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrates courses into departmental programs, such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Effectively prepares students for subsequent courses ○ Effectively builds on students prior learning ○ Effectively addresses dept’l learning outcomes <p>Departmental Needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperates with program faculty in meeting departmental loading needs 	<p>Student evaluations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate instructor’s teaching effectiveness at or near “outstanding” (see section 5.260) <p>Classroom Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a commitment to improve instruction (see acceptable column) • Beyond evidence of effective practices (see acceptable column), also shares successful and/or innovative practices with colleagues <p>Curricular Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beyond integrating courses into departmental programs (see acceptable column), also is an effective partner in curricular and program design and delivery <p>Mentoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively involved in some student mentoring activities <p>Departmental Needs (see acceptable column)</p>	<p>Student evaluations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate the instructor’s teaching effectiveness well into the “outstanding” category (see section 5.260) <p>Classroom Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognized by colleagues as a highly skilled and knowledgeable instructor • Models excellent teaching • Demonstrates attention and responsiveness to student needs <p>Curricular Development (see preferred column)</p> <p>Mentoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant student mentoring activities (either in quantity or quality of work with students) • Mentors colleagues to develop their instructional abilities (assessment, curricular design, effective delivery, etc.) <p>Departmental Needs (see acceptable column)</p>

[Department Expectations take the form of added bullets (solid circles) under any or all of the headings above as well as added bullets (open circles) under any or all of the existing bullets above.]

Service Performance Levels

Acceptable	Preferred	Exceptional
<p>Departmental Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active participant in dept'l work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Advising students in dept'l programs; writing letters of recommendation; assisting at preview days, registration and orientation activities; and other advising related activities ○ Effective contributor on his/her fair share of dept'l committees ○ Effectively carrying out his/her fair share of individual dept'l tasks <p>University/Professional Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some activity beyond department or program (e.g. serve on active University committee most years under review). Active service in professional organization or capacity may substitute for a University committee. 	<p>Departmental Service (see acceptable column)</p> <p>University/Professional Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University service on active committees (at least one committee every year under review, more if committee(s) is not very active). Active service in professional organization or capacity may substitute for a University committee. • Effective partner in accomplishing assignments <p>Leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some documentable accomplishment in a leadership role at the departmental, institutional or professional level during period under review (department chair, program coordinator, faculty program director, chair active committee, lead taskforce, significant individual task, etc.) 	<p>Departmental Service (see acceptable column)</p> <p>University/Professional Service (see preferred column)</p> <p>Leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognized as a faculty leader on campus • Served in multiple leadership roles • Significant accomplishments at the institutional level as a faculty leader (either multiple committees or taskforces, as a program director, as a department chair, or other significant leadership responsibilities resulting in multiple documentable achievements that furthered the institutional mission)

[Department Expectations take the form of added bullets (solid circles) under any or all of the headings above as well as added bullets (open circles) under any or all of the existing bullets above.]

Scholarship Performance Levels

Acceptable	Preferred	Exceptional
<p>Originality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scholarship is preferably original, but may replicate. <p>Meaningfulness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scholarship can comprise basic or applied research, as well as scholarship of teaching. Comprises at least three items from two of the following categories, one of which must be a peer-reviewed publication that is published or accepted for publication at the time of submitting application materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> International or national conference Regional/State conference Book or textbook Book chapter Research article Review article Invited lecture to outside campus Obtaining significant, extramural grant funding Program evaluation/consulting resulting in published or presented report. Peer adopted innovation (e.g., application, website, technology) <p>Note: An unfunded grant proposal can count for one item as long as it was submitted and reviewed by a major funding body such as NIH or NSF.</p> <p>Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leniency toward level of peer review rigor and selectivity. <p>Dissemination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentations can be given at 	<p>Originality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scholarship is original. <p>Meaningfulness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scholarship can comprise basic or applied research, as well as scholarship of teaching. Comprises at least four items from three of the following categories, one of which must be a peer-reviewed publication that is published or accepted for publication at the time of submitting application materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> International or national conference Regional/State conference Book or textbook Book chapter Research article Review article Invited lecture to outside campus Obtaining significant, extramural grant funding Program evaluation/consulting resulting in published or presented report. Peer adopted innovation (e.g., application, website, technology) <p>Note: Applicants for promotion and tenure who do not meet the minimum number of alternatives across the categories listed, in this case three, may justify an exception for the diversity requirement based upon the quality, scope, or impact of their work.</p>	<p>Originality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scholarship is original. <p>Meaningfulness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scholarship can comprise basic or applied research, as well as scholarship of teaching. Comprises at least five items from three of the following categories, two of which must be peer-reviewed publications that are published or accepted for publication at the time of submitting application materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> International or national conference Regional/State conference Book or textbook Book chapter Research article Review article Invited lecture to outside campus Obtaining significant, extramural grant funding Program evaluation/consulting resulting in published or presented report. Peer adopted innovation (e.g., application, website, technology) <p>Note: Applicants for promotion and tenure who do not meet the minimum number of alternatives across the categories listed, in this</p>

<p>regional level, with at least one at national level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Published materials are in books and/or journals that have at least a national readership. • Program evaluation/consulting presentation or publication is at minimum delivered to the contracting professional agency. 	<p>Also, an unfunded grant proposal can count for one item as long as it was submitted and reviewed by a major funding body such as NIH or NSF.</p> <p>Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes at least one peer-reviewed journal article or review <p>Dissemination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of presentations are at national level or broader. • Published materials are in books and/or journals that have a national readership • Program evaluation/consulting presentation or publication is at minimum delivered to the contracting professional agency. 	<p>case three, may justify an exception for the diversity requirement based upon the quality, scope, or impact of their work.</p> <p>Also, one publication is acceptable if it is a pivotal contribution published in a top-tiered journal, and results in conference invitation(s), workshops or other significant follow up activity.</p> <p>Also, an unfunded grant proposal can count for one item as long as it was submitted and reviewed by a major funding body such as NIH or NSF.</p> <p>Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes at least two peer-reviewed journal articles and/or reviews <p>Dissemination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National and/or international scholarly presentations. • Published materials are in books and/or journals that have a national and/or international readership • Program evaluation/consulting presentation or publication is at minimum delivered to the contracting professional agency.
---	---	---