



| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--------------|
| College | College of Liberal Arts and Sciences | |
| Unit | Department of Psychology | |
| Document | Promotional Evaluation Considerations and Criteria | |
| Approved by the faculty | | Date: |
| Reviewed by the dean | | Date: |

Provost office approval

| | |
|--|-------------|
| | |
| Vice Provost for Academic Personnel | Date |

Office of the University Provost

300 East University Drive
P.O. Box 877805 Tempe, AZ 85287-7805
(480) 965-4995 Fax: (480) 965-0785
<https://provost.asu.edu/>

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
PROMOTIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS AND CRITERIA

Heuristic criteria and considerations for faculty evaluation and promotional decisions by the Department of Psychology at Arizona State University (ASU) are presented in this document.

For nearly three decades, Psychology at ASU has been responding to the mandate to become a first class department at a major research university. Our criteria for faculty excellence are founded on the desire to nurture this status. Because of contemporary concerns, and public misunderstanding, the present document begins by discussing our view of the inter-related nature of scholarship and instruction at a research university.

Scholarship and Instruction at a Research University

Scholarly activities contribute extensively, directly and indirectly, to the instructional mission of the university. These contributions may be documented by records of graduate and undergraduate participation in the scholarly activities of a faculty member, and vice versa. Such records may identify co-authorship, by students, of presentations, posters, chapters and published papers; independent study, masters thesis and dissertation mentoring; the use of personal research facilities, established by special funding, for teaching research-oriented courses; post-doctoral seminars and training, and post-graduate education seminars. These all are regarded as important teaching contributions, and these kinds of instructional activities are expected of faculty in addition to a formal course load of four catalogue courses a year.

The kinds of activities identified above distinguish a research university setting from a basic research institution, on the one hand, and from a community college, on the other. We count and value these kinds of activities as teaching contributions in the service of scholarship or, conversely, as scholarly contributions in the service of teaching. Faculty are expected to make scholarly contributions with students as their apprentices; we thereby encourage the emergent contributions to creative scholarship of teacher and student, and we regard such activity as an important defining characteristic of our program.

Although we view scholarship and teaching as inextricably intertwined (in that scholarship activities at a research university serve important teaching functions), we do not regard this relation between teaching and scholarship as symmetrical: teaching *per se* is not counted as scholarship by our department. Teaching becomes a scholarly contribution, however, in the following circumstances: The first occurs when a teaching enterprise results in an archival contribution or is presented at a national or regional scholarly conference. In such cases the *product* of the teaching exercise testifies to scholarly activity as well as to successful teaching activity. The second circumstance is when *research about teaching, or course design*, becomes archival or may be otherwise disseminated as an applied or basic research finding. A third instance occurs when textbooks, lab manuals, or specialized training software are produced in the pursuit of enhancing teaching. The key defining features of scholarship of any kind are creativity and communication. Although teaching without scholarship is appreciated as necessary to the basic educational mission of the university, all scholarship may be regarded as teaching. Research and other scholarly activity are thus doubly justified in the research university setting.

Teaching

Teaching contributions are expected of all faculty members both for promotion and tenure, and for other evaluation considerations. As indicated above, if these contributions are creative and up-to-date, and may result in scholarly products, they receive extra regard. Likewise, extra efforts to upgrade one's teaching by leaning and applying new approaches (e.g., self-paced learning, cooperative learning) are valued, as are efforts to disseminate teaching innovations.

All faculty are encouraged to maintain and update a teaching portfolio that includes samples of their work, indications of their approaches to teaching their courses, syllabi, student evaluations with commentary, and indications of special mentoring, advisement, honor's program contributions, and other less formal kinds of teaching activities as indicated in the previous section. Included also should be indications of any outreach or post-graduate

mentoring or teaching.

Such a portfolio, and a record of archival contributions, provide the foundation for evaluation by our department; substantial overlap between teaching and research is expected and appreciated.

Routes to Successful Promotion and Tenure: General Considerations

Just as there are vast differences in areas of study and scholarly styles within Psychology, there are many ways to be successful. Because of this we are reluctant to provide what might appear to be a single, specific template for a "best" route to success.

First, Psychology is a broad field, encompassing work that may use, and contribute to, the methods, perspectives, and core subject matter of fields as diverse as anthropology, architecture, epidemiology, health sciences, law, microbiology, neuroscience, political science, sociology, and zoology. Members of our faculty have published articles in journal outlets of high quality representing all of the fields listed as examples here. Also, adding further variation, our department equally promotes and endorses both applied and basic research, asking only that a colleague's creative work be of high quality and disseminated through reputable channels.

Second, the array of approaches to research problems in Psychology also is associated with highly diverse requirements and expectancies. Some absolutely require interdisciplinary collaboration, for example, whereas others do not; some are very expensive initially to develop as a perspective and resource for the department, and others require very little to get started. It obviously would not be appropriate to impose the criteria for success in one kind of endeavor upon the credentials of an individual engaged in the other, in these kinds of instances. It is also inappropriate, we believe, to imply in any way that one kind of approach may be inherently superior to another - that "field research," for example, may be somehow superior or inferior to "laboratory studies."

Mainstream considerations

To be sure, mainstream pathways to career success are happily acknowledged, and many of our faculty fit this category. The "mainstream" is characterized by work distinctly within an established subdiscipline in Psychology (i.e., Social, Developmental, Clinical, Cognitive, Behavioral Neuroscience, Animal Behavior, Quantitative), and it is associated with core outlets that are highly regarded by the overall discipline. Core specialty journals in these subdisciplines in Psychology are generally, but not always, published by the American Psychological Association (A.P.A.); these typically have greater than 75% rejection rates and their citation index values tend to be higher than competing (generally non-A.P.A.) journals.¹ The evaluation task is easiest when candidates for promotion have published their works principally in these sources: acceptance implies having met stringent peer-review criteria and acknowledgement by editors and distinguished reviewers that the work in question is outstanding.

When the work of a candidate for promotion and tenure typically has been submitted to "non-mainstream" outlets, or journals outside of Psychology, the candidate, and ultimately the review committee, must justify this choice of outlets. If the outside journals are considered excellent in their domain, if the submissions are competitively reviewed, and if their selection by the candidate represents an attempt to address a more interdisciplinary audience, or an otherwise more appropriate audience, there is little problem. In addition, when a candidate has clearly demonstrated with other publications the ability to publish in top quality journals, has been invited to contribute chapters to scholarly books, and has by other criteria (e.g., editing invitations) demonstrated high quality productivity, non-mainstream publication is not much of an issue.

However, although all kinds of scholarly work should be able to stand and be valued on their own merits, some kinds are indeed regarded as unacceptable avenues to promotion and tenure. For example, writing basic textbooks, or novels, about psychology, and journalistic writing (e.g., advice columns or news columns) would not be acceptable as a principal basis for promotional evaluation, although such contributions could, if well done, contribute positively to an evaluation based mainly upon research and instructional activities. For example, an

article published in *Atlantic Monthly* might be regarded a valuable publication, but such articles alone, without a context of original creative contributions to the discipline of Psychology, would not provide an adequate basis for recommendation for promotion and tenure.

Qualitative Evaluation

As already indicated, the importance for promotion and tenure of high quality creative productivity based on work while on the Psychology faculty at A.S.U. is a constant and inescapable requirement for promotional considerations. Without clear evidence of a capacity for such scholarship, and positive testimony from the "gatekeepers"² of the profession regarding its quality, promotion will not be recommended.

We know what individuals do when we hire them; the act of offering them a faculty position testifies to the value of the kind of work they are most likely to pursue during the initial stages of their careers. The question to be answered by subsequent performance evaluations during career development is, *"does the work meet high expectations for competence, quality, creativity and independence in the appropriate arena of expertise and scholarly contribution, and does it show promise for sustaining, or even improving, in the future?"*

Qualitative assessment of scholarly productivity ideally avoids treating an evaluation process as a numbers game; we avoid this by evaluating the proportion of a person's papers and ideas that have received high positive regard by editors and other established colleagues, the thoroughness of the work, and the citation index data. We also look for the work to be programmatic and to exhibit depth and formal competence that are appreciated by senior faculty within the candidate's core area. We have among our faculty many examples of exceptionally high productivity AND impact, but we agree completely that assessment of one's research and other creative contributions should not become a simple accounting exercise: Although the "numbers" can be construed in many ways, it is relatively difficult to obfuscate a lack of depth, quality and visibility of one's archival work.

New faculty in Psychology know from the outset that they must develop solid teaching credentials and an excellent record of scholarly research productivity, and they are continually reinforced for good work by our departmental culture. They are told also that University and Departmental Service is initially not expected of them to any great degree, that service will neither make nor break their career development, and that we discourage service when it may interfere with their initial development toward promotion and tenure. In addition, the department makes evident in many ways (e.g., resource commitment) its support for the development of new faculty.

Within the frame of reference provided above, the rest of this document outlines the factors involved, and their relative weights, in the determination of our recommendations for promotion and/or tenure, and in determining whether one is "on track" at the time of the third year review.

¹ This also tends to be true for many of the leading specialized scientific society journals that are not associated with the A.P.A. (e.g. Psychonomic Society; Society for Research in Child Development).

² Editors, established researchers, colleagues distinguished for their own contributions to a candidate's field of study, authors of advanced texts in the field, overall citations, and successes with peer-review funding.

Third Year Review

The third year review occurs in the late Fall of the year following the second full year of employment. The third-year review seeks to determine that probationary faculty are solidly on track: That they have developed courses, both graduate and undergraduate, and have been participating, with clear contributions, in the graduate training programs of the department. We also look for clear evidence that a candidate has mounted his or her own research program. Such evidence includes grant submissions, both internal and external, presentations at regional and national meetings based on work at ASU, and paper submissions. Publication activity, ideally as a principal author, is expected also. At this juncture, some publication activity may be based on work done either as a

graduate student or as a post-doctoral trainee prior to coming to ASU. But also important at this time is visible evidence of independent research productivity based on work completed at ASU. Published work in excellent journals (highly cited journals with high rejection rates), presentations at regional and national meetings, grants submitted, grants approved, manuscripts in press, submitted and in preparation, all testify to research momentum.

Emerging evidence of a programmatic focus to the bulk of a person's creative work, and testimony to the recognition of the individual's work by others in the field, is also of value. Invited presentations, workshops, symposium contributions, book chapters, review papers and *ad hoc* editing requests are examples of early recognition for quality, productivity and visibility.

Summarizing, probationary faculty should display clearly established momentum as teachers and as researchers at this point in their careers.

Although we do not strongly encourage general service contributions at this stage, service in the pursuit of teaching (i.e., workshops) or that testifies to visibility as a scholar (editorial work) clearly counts. But extensive service contributions are not necessary for a strong third year review.

Communication to the candidate based upon this review should be either encouraging, explicitly corrective, or discouraging with regard to the probability of eventual promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

Promotion & Tenure: Assistant to Associate Professor

Recognizing that our reputation has been earned principally by the successes of faculty who started here as Assistant Professors, we take very seriously the decision process at this juncture.

All of the criteria and commentaries for the Third Year Review process (described above) apply, of course, to this review. In addition, we solicit written evaluations from prominent colleagues, editors, and from distinguished researchers in the candidate's area. We also examine science citation index data and any honorifics including special invited presentations and symposia, prestigious invited chapters, and awards for exceptional work.

After five years of independent work, we believe that a candidate's promise and capacity for scholarship of enduring significance should be clear; if there is ambiguity we may look to teaching and mentoring contributions as possible compensatory factors. But if there has been little scholarly activity of merit, then promotion and tenure will not be recommended. *Exceptional teaching or service contributions will not compensate for a weak record of scholarly activity.*

In teaching, we like to see a willingness to shoulder a fair share of the undergraduate teaching load, to develop special honors courses, to make formal teaching contributions to the graduate program, and to do these tasks well by both student evaluations and by our own evaluations of course materials and other teaching-related activities of the candidate. In addition, we expect to see clear and positive contributions in mentoring students at both graduate and undergraduate levels. We encourage the development of new courses, and participation in seminars and workshops devoted to improving or otherwise promoting teaching, and we count these activities in the candidate's favor. We will not promote someone without evidence of competent teaching performances, and we inform all of our probationary faculty of the importance of acquiring a track record as a teacher and independent study supervisor.

Exceptional service contributions will not compensate for inadequate teaching or research contributions, as indicated above. Once again, it is important to emphasize our concern that probationary faculty concentrate on developing initially in the areas we value most: teaching and scholarly research. Excessive service obligations should never be the reason offered for weak development in the other two areas.

Promotion: Associate Professor to Professor

After five or more additional years of continuous development and elaboration of a research career, tenured Associate Professors may be considered for promotion to Professor. The candidate usually will have demonstrated a continuous record of productivity and further development of basic research interests over this period of time after the initial promotion to Associate Professor.

Fresh scholarly contributions throughout this period should be evident, showing a level of new productivity that characterized the previous record. In cases of faculty who may have shifted foci to new scholarly interests and approaches, we seek the same testimony to high competence and impact in the new area.

In addition, activities indicating professional maturity - review articles, books, invited chapters, special journal editions, invited symposia and distinguished presentations, regular extramural funding, special awards, consultation activities, editorial board memberships - are expected to have become increasingly prevalent in a candidate's record of post-tenure productivity.

Especially important is evidence of impact and visibility of one's accumulated contributions as seen in Science Citation Index data (excluding self-citations), and as found in advanced textbooks in one's area(s) of expertise. Such activity should be clearly evident for work completed since the original promotion to Associate Professor, and this testimony to special impact and visibility must be corroborated by promotional reviews that are solicited from distinguished scientists at peer institutions.

During the five years since promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate is expected also to have increased his or her teaching portfolio by, for example, adding new courses, expanding and updating old ones, or through special training workshops. In addition, we expect a record of continuous contribution to mentoring graduate and undergraduate students, participating in, and chairing, Honors, Master's and Ph.D. committees, and serving on advisory committees for graduate students.

Finally, service becomes increasingly important; we expect a candidate for Professor to have contributed to administration of the department, successfully carrying out tasks on behalf of his or her core program as well as for the department in general. Chairing and participating in departmental committees, serving as Faculty Senator, area head, director of graduate or undergraduate studies, and so on count as departmental service. In addition, we look for evidence of extramural citizenship in the form of community and/or university service and activity in regional or national professional organizations.

However, as with other important evaluation junctures in a faculty member's career development to this point, we place the greatest weight for promotion to Professor on evidence of scholarly competence and impact, and maturity, as both a teacher and a scientist.

Final Note

In evaluating the performance of faculty members for considerations of promotion and tenure, the Department of Psychology embraces the concept of integration of scholarship, teaching and service in the work of its faculty. Faculty activity cannot be neatly divided into three exhaustive and mutually exclusive categories, as might be implied by the way faculty workload is defined for each individual. Rather, faculty activities contribute to the institutional goals of creating knowledge, disseminating knowledge, and applying knowledge. In assessing faculty performance, we make professional judgments of the individual faculty member's contribution in each of these domains. Although these domains are not independent, they are sufficiently separable so that standards of achievement can be set in each one. In the Department of Psychology, at each evaluation point in a faculty member's career, we assess performance against the standards described in this document. In order to be recommended for promotion, each candidate must surpass the standards in all three domains. Extraordinary performance in any one domain cannot compensate for substandard performance in the others.