

# The University of Texas at Tyler

## Department of Psychology and Counseling

### **Procedures and Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion**

#### **A. Procedures**

This document complies with section 3.05. B. of the UT Tyler Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP, Revised, 2001). If a University procedure or guideline as stated in the HOP conflicts with a procedure of the Department of Psychology and Counseling, the HOP will prevail.

#### **A-1.0 Responsibility of the Candidate and the Promotion Packet**

Candidates are responsible for knowing the guidelines, policies and procedures for tenure and promotion. Candidates will prepare an organized packet of materials to demonstrate teaching, scholarship, service, collegiality and other credentials in accordance with university guidelines in the HOP for the pre-tenure review and the tenure and promotion evaluation. The packet will contain a letter of application and the candidate's curriculum vitae, which may be derived from Faculty 180. Once the candidate submits the packet to the Department Chair, no additional materials may be submitted, unless permission to do so is given by the College Dean. However, the candidate may answer questions posed by evaluators and may provide specific documents at the request of the committee. These documents may be added to the packet as the packet progresses from level to level in the process.

#### **A-2.0 Representatives and Committees**

##### **A-2.1 Department Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair**

The Department Tenure and Promotion (TAP) Committee will conduct an election of the Chair of the Department TAP Committee (Committee Chair) by secret ballot following nominations from the eligible faculty. Nominees for TAP Committee Chair must be eligible to vote on all candidates considered within a given year. The representative will meet the eligibility requirements specified in the HOP.

##### **A-2.2 Department Representative to the College Tenure and Committee**

The Chair of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee (Committee Chair) will serve as the representative to the College of Education and Psychology Tenure and Promotion Committee.

##### **A-2.3 Department Tenure and Promotion Committee**

The Department Tenure and Promotion Committee (Department TAP Committee) will consist of all Department faculty members who are eligible to vote according to the provisions of the HOP. The Department TAP Committee does not include the Department Chair. The Committee Chair will call meetings of the Department TAP Committee at times when no eligible faculty are scheduled to teach.

The Department TAP Committee may act only when no less than the majority of eligible faculty are present for a meeting.

In years in which more than one candidate is considered for promotion or tenure, multiple ballots will be cast. Faculty eligible to vote for one but not another candidate will be excused from the meeting at appropriate times.

## A-3.0 Procedures for Pre-tenure Review

### A-3.1 Purpose and Overview of Procedure.

The purpose of the Pre-tenure Review is to inform the candidate of strengths and weaknesses so the candidate may maintain or enhance strong points and address shortcomings. Thus, the purpose of the pre-tenure review is to provide guidance. Therefore, the pre-tenure review will be similar in procedure and standards of evaluation to the tenure and promotion evaluation.

### A-3.2 Procedure

The Department Chair will conduct an election of an eligible TAP Committee Chair who will call a meeting of the Department TAP Committee, as presented earlier. The TAP Committee will review the candidate's packet and discuss the candidate's progress. The TAP Committee Chair will conduct a vote by secret ballot. TAP Committee members may vote that the candidate's progress is "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory." The TAP Committee Chair will count the votes and convey the results (by number of votes per category) to the Department Chair. The TAP Committee Chair, with input from committee members, will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's progress which the TAP Committee Chair will convey to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will communicate the Committee vote and written evaluations to the candidate as well as the Department Chair's independent evaluation. The Department Chair will clearly identify the candidate's progress as "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" and will identify and comment on the candidate's strengths and weaknesses. The Department Chair's evaluation will be written, but the Chair also will discuss the evaluation in an interview with the candidate. The candidate may prepare a letter of rebuttal to include in the pre-tenure review file.

## A- 4.0 Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Evaluation

The Department Chair will conduct an election of an eligible TAP Committee Chair who will convene a meeting of the Department TAP Committee. With the Committee having reviewed the candidate's packet, the TAP Committee Chair will lead a discussion of the candidate's credentials. Following the discussion, the TAP Committee Chair will produce two ballots that bear the TAP Committee Chair's signature. The first ballot is for the committee to vote on an applicant's bid for tenure, if applicable. The second ballot is for the committee to vote on an applicant's bid for promotion. The TAP Committee Chair will distribute the official ballots at the meeting and deliver an official ballot to any eligible Committee member who did not attend the meeting due to illness, travel or other approved reason. Ballots will be secret. In years in which more than one candidate is considered for promotion or tenure, multiple ballots will be cast in succession (not simultaneously). The ballots will be shuffled, opened, authenticated and counted aloud by the TAP Committee Chair in the presence and view of the Department TAP Committee. The TAP Committee Chair will communicate the vote count, the recommendation, and the rationale for the recommendation in writing to the Department Chair.

### ***A-5.0 Procedures for Post-tenure Periodic Systematic Review***

As required by the HOP and UT-Tyler policies, tenured faculty will undergo periodic systematic review every six years after receiving tenure. This review is based upon all relevant performance in teaching, scholarship, service and collegiality to the university. The Comprehensive Evaluation will review the tenured faculty member's professional responsibilities in teaching, research, and service using the same evaluation categories as the Annual Evaluation: "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," "Does Not Meet Expectations," and "Unsatisfactory." Specifications for the criteria for these levels of performance will be designated at the individual institutional unit level, as described in Section B 5.0. The review will be conducted by the Department TAP Committee and the Department Chair, using the candidate's curriculum vita, all six Annual Evaluation reports (inclusive of the sixth year review), a summative report of student evaluations of teaching over the entire 6 year period, a summative report of any peer evaluations of teaching over the entire 6 year period, and a summary statement of professional accomplishments. The candidate may also provide any additional materials that he or she wants considered. The faculty member will submit materials in the Spring, no later than March 15. The Department Chair will forward the materials to the TAP Committee Chair, who will distribute them to the TAP Committee for their review. The TAP Committee Chair will solicit votes of each TAP Committee member, electronically or in person at a called meeting. If an electronic vote includes any Unsatisfactory votes, the TAP Chair will convene a meeting to discuss the concerns of the TAP Committee member(s) who voted Unsatisfactory. After discussion, a new vote will be held, and the results of that vote will be final and forwarded within a summary report written by the TAP Committee Chair and signed by all Committee members, to the Department Chair. If the result of the review is unsatisfactory, any of the following may occur:

(1) If it is determined that a more intensive review of a faculty member is needed, or if the faculty member requests it, the dean, in consultation with the faculty member, shall appoint a peer committee whose members shall be representative of the school or division and who will be appointed on the basis of their objectivity and academic strength. In all schools and divisions, the committee appointed to perform the more intensive review shall be, if possible, comprised of faculty of the same or higher rank as the faculty member being reviewed. The committee may request further information from the faculty member under review. Upon his or her request, the faculty member will be provided with the opportunity to meet with the review committee. The committee shall report its findings within six months of its being constituted. The result of the review will be communicated in writing to the faculty member, the department chair (or equivalent), the dean, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President for review and appropriate action.

(2) If it is determined that a faculty member would benefit from a remedial plan, a remediation plan, the period of which is not to exceed two years, will be developed. The purpose of the plan is to give the faculty member the opportunity to correct the deficiencies in the faculty member's performance that were identified in the evaluation. If at the end of the plan period it is the opinion of the dean that adequate progress toward correcting the deficiencies has not been made, the matter will be referred to a peer committee for further review as in (a) above.

(3) The faculty member's duties may be reassigned – the faculty could be given different duties, transferred to another department, transferred to another college, suspended, or terminated. Any consideration regarding reassignment should be reviewed by a committee instituted by the Dean of the college and consisting of at least two tenured members from a college or colleges outside the department. The Faculty Senate will be asked to recommend the two outside members. The Committee's recommendation must be approved by a majority vote. The Department Chair will complete his/her review and forward a summary of that review as well as the TAP Committee's review to the faculty member and the Dean of the College no later than May

1. The faculty member may submit a written response to the review, within 15 days, to the

Dean, if he/she believes that any portion of the summary is inaccurate or incomplete. The Dean will determine whether to amend the review summary or not, based upon his/her judgment.

## **B. Departmental Guidelines for Evaluating Teaching, Scholarship, and Service**

### **B-1.0 Teaching**

#### **B-1.1 Teaching is a Primary Responsibility**

A primary responsibility of faculty at The University of Texas at Tyler is teaching. Thus, competence, preparedness, accessibility, and respect for students are desirable qualities. Whether the candidate is an effective teacher and mentor is also fundamental to the decision to promote and award tenure.

#### **B-1.2 Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness**

Because teaching is a multifaceted activity, evaluating teaching may require examination of various kinds of information. Elements of effective teaching include: (a) mastery of the course content; (b) currency in the subject; (c) clear communication of course material; and (d) high standards for students' academic performance. As stated in the HOP, it is vital that teaching effectiveness be evaluated through multiple and flexible assessment methods. Teaching effectiveness may involve innovative techniques for enhancing student interest and performance as well as traditional pedagogical techniques (e.g., information technology, laboratory classes, demonstrations, etc.). Student judgments of teacher effectiveness are considered in accordance with the policy of the Board of Regents. Course and teacher evaluations provide information regarding student satisfaction and constitute one important gauge of teaching effectiveness. However, because student evaluations can be influenced by factors other than the quality of teaching, other evidence of instructor effectiveness which complement student evaluations is considered. This includes peer review of teaching effectiveness, workload, number and variety of courses taught, course syllabi, student learning outcomes, use of technology, innovation, continuous development of courses, alternative assessments of teaching effectiveness, awards and honors. Specific details about what constitutes strong or outstanding teaching are described in Section B-5.0, below.

#### **B-1.3 Mentorship of Students**

Faculty mentors are actively engaged in the scholarly and professional development of individual students and guide students in academic experiences that transcend the classroom. For example, faculty mentors may engage students in any aspect of empirical scholarship, including presentations at scholarly or professional meetings and publications. Faculty mentors may also mentor students in community service, internships, clinical supervision, supervision of graduate/undergraduate research or teaching assistants, special clinical training, field trips, and student organizations, and other activities.

### **B-2.0 Scholarship**

**B-2.1 Scholarship is a Primary Responsibility.** Psychology and counseling are diverse disciplines, so meritorious scholarship ranges from the scientific and experimental to the intuitive and phenomenological. Sub-disciplines of psychology and counseling (which include experimental psychology, clinical psychology, counseling psychology, counselor education, clinical mental health counseling, couple & family therapy and other related mental health disciplines), may have clear (if implicit) criteria for quality scholarship, but no single simple set of features characterizes high quality scholarship across the entire field.

#### **B-2.2 Evaluating Scholarly Merit**

All scholarly contributions have merit. Scholarship in psychology and counseling at the University of Texas at Tyler, whether it involves basic or applied research, is predominantly empirically-based. The central and irreplaceable feature of evaluating the substance of a fellow scholar's work is to read it and carefully evaluate its creativity, sophistication, rigor and other aspects of scholarly merit. Scholarly contributions of all kinds are evaluated in the context of the standards and practices of the area of psychology and counseling to which the work belongs, but evaluating scholarly contributions is difficult because there are exceptions to any set of criteria. Nonetheless, scholarship which is anonymously refereed by peers, which consists of multiple experiments or studies, which requires greater time and effort, and which has greater influence on scholarly peers is more highly regarded than its opposite. Scholarship in which the candidate is the first or senior author (in the case of promotion to full Professor) is more highly regarded than scholarship in which the candidate has made a lesser contribution. Scholarly work in which students participate has particular merit. Specific details about what constitutes strong or outstanding research are described in Section B-5.0, below.

## B-3.0 Service

### B-3.1 Service is Necessary

Although teaching and scholarship are the primary considerations in tenure and promotion decisions, service is integral to the effective operation of the University and contributes to community development. Service may be categorized as university service, professional service or community service.

### B-3.2 University Service

University service involves membership, participation and leadership in committees, task forces and governance. Candidates may be elected to the Faculty Senate or serve in Faculty Senate committees. Candidates may also serve in standing University, College and Department committees and in ad hoc committees. Candidates may serve in administrative positions. University service at the departmental level includes recruitment, administering undergraduate or graduate programs, conducting examinations, and developing new projects such as clinics, laboratories, and programs. Other service which sustains departmental vitality includes bringing guest speakers to campus, developing workshops and network organizations for alumni, and hosting events for students and faculty. Another category of departmental service is collecting information through archives and surveys. Participation in and compliance with accreditation initiatives, data collection and related activities is expected for department service. The expenditure of time and effort is an important consideration in evaluating service at the departmental and other levels.

### B-3.3 Community Service

Community service is taken into consideration in tenure and promotion decisions when the candidate's scholarly and professional assets are used for the benefit of the community. Therefore, community service may take a variety of forms depending on the nature of the candidate's expertise. Excellence in community service is sometimes marked by the receipt of honors and awards. Community service which is unremunerated is more highly regarded in tenure and promotion decisions than remunerated service.

### B-3.4 Professional Service

Professional service contributes to consideration for promotion and tenure decisions when the candidate's expertise is provided to the profession, through professional organizations, national/regional/state appointed committees and boards, professional honoraries, or other contexts that contribute to the advancement of the profession. For professional organizations, this goes beyond membership and attendance. Leadership roles in professional organizations are indicators of higher levels of professional service, as are awards for contributions to the profession.

## B-4.0 Collegiality

### B-4.1 Collegiality is important

Professional collegiality leads to a productive, congenial workplace. A candidate's behavior may contribute to or detract from departmental collegiality, but collegiality is not an individual trait, such as congeniality.

### B-4.2 Guidelines of Organizations

All faculty are expected to follow the policies of UT Tyler, the UT system and the laws of the State of Texas. Candidates who are Licensed Psychologists should follow the guidelines of the Texas State Board of Examiners of Psychologists and the American Psychological Association. Counselors and Counselor Educators should follow the guidelines of the Texas State Board of Examiners of Professional Counselors and the American Counseling Association, as applicable. Other candidates are expected to follow the guidelines and ethical principles of their respective scholarly societies or professional organizations, whether or not they maintain membership.

### B-4.3 Collegial Behavior

Thinking about collegiality leads to an incomplete list of exemplars of desirable behaviors and behaviors which should be avoided. Colleagues share classroom resources with colleagues, assist colleagues in obtaining research subjects, help colleagues to meet instructional responsibilities when emergencies arise, attend graduation ceremonies, attend departmental functions including colloquia, and convey the Department's interest and perspective to University and College committees. Colleagues do not behave in a threatening, disparaging or dishonest manner toward students, faculty, staff, administrators, or the public. Colleagues do not involve students in faculty disputes. Collegiality also includes adherence to department, college and university guidelines and policies, including published schedules for classes and exams, syllabi and other document formats, and collection and reporting of faculty and student data. These principles are formally articulated in the UT Tyler Psychology and Counseling Code of Faculty Conduct, with which all faculty members agree to comply as a condition of their service.

(<https://www.uttyler.edu/psychology/files/UTTyler%20PC%20Faculty%20Conduct%20Code%20Approved%20by%20Faculty%20Vote.pdf>),

## B-5.0 Promotion Criteria Summarized by Rank for Undergraduate and Master's Level Faculty

### B-5.1 Assistant Professor.

The candidate is expected to have earned a doctorate in psychology, counseling, school counseling or counselor education. The candidate is expected to show evidence of the potential to become a meritorious teacher. The potential to become a strong teacher can be evaluated using multiple sources, including (a) teaching evaluations, (b) direct observation of teaching in the classroom, and (c) any other information the candidate wishes to be considered. The candidate is expected to be the first author (or "principal contributor" as defined in the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association) of an original empirical article in a peer reviewed journal.

### B-5.2 Associate Professor.

In **Teaching**, the candidate must be a strong teacher based on an array of evidence from multiple assessment methods. Evidence for strong or outstanding teaching will include (a) consistently high teaching evaluations, and (b) teaching awards. A candidate would be considered "strong" if she or he has an average teaching evaluation across all courses between 3.20 and 4.19. Average teaching evaluations across

all courses exceeding 4.19 would constitute “outstanding.” Alternatively, receipt of a University or BOR teaching award will, in itself, constitute outstanding teaching performance.

In **Scholarship**, the candidate must have produced *a consistent body of* original scholarship, including the publication of at least **five (5)** original published or accepted for publication articles by the time tenure review is commenced. Among the five, the candidate should be first author or senior author of at least **three** empirical, peer-reviewed scholarly works (journal articles, book chapters, books, reviews, etc.). *Paid publications that are not peer reviewed are not considered scholarly works and will not be counted towards tenure and promotion.* The remaining publications may be journal articles, monographs, book chapters in edited volumes or invited published manuscripts, as long as they involve a review process. This level of performance (e.g., five articles) would constitute “strong” scholarly performance. Scholarship above this level will constitute “outstanding” scholarly performance.

Also, the candidate is expected to have as the principal investigator, a viable coherent research program demonstrated by other evidence, such as presentation, workshops, addresses, or submission of grant proposals, whether funded or not. At the discretion of the Department Committee and other reviewers, the submission of external peer-reviewed research grant proposals (no more than two in total) may be substituted for peer-reviewed articles, with the candidate as principal investigator. The articles should represent work performed, or at least completed, while employed at UT Tyler. If the candidate is granted years toward tenure as part of their initial contract, then scholarship completed during prior credited service elsewhere may be included in the body of scholarship to be considered for promotion. The scholarship of the candidate should be recognized by multiple external reviewers as representing a significant contribution to the candidate’s discipline.

In **Service**, the candidate is expected to have contributed consistently to university, departmental, and/or community service functions and show evidence of other professional service appropriate to the candidate’s expertise. Strong performance will be defined as “meets expectations” on the service section of departmental annual evaluations for four out of the five years of review. Service ratings exceeding this standard constitutes “outstanding performance.”

In **Collegiality**, the candidate is expected to have met the departmental expectations as described above in B-4.3, over the course of the service period being evaluated.

### ***Annual Evaluations***

For the period of service being considered for promotion, the candidate should have received annual performance evaluation ratings of Meets Expectations or better in Teaching and in at least two of the remaining three categories, for at least 80% of the evaluation years being considered (e.g., 4 of 5 yearly evaluations). Meeting or exceeding these standards will likely result in a positive vote for tenure and/or promotion.

### **B-5.3 Professor.**

In **Teaching**, the candidate must be an excellent teacher with continuing evidence of mentorship and other efforts to improve the quality of instruction. In **Teaching**, the candidate must be a strong teacher based on an array of evidence from multiple assessment methods. Evidence for strong or outstanding teaching will include (a) consistently high teaching evaluations, and (b) teaching awards. A candidate would be considered “strong” if she or he has an average teaching evaluation across all courses between 3.20 and 4.19. Average teaching evaluations across all courses exceeding 4.19 would constitute “outstanding.” Alternatively, receipt of a University or BOR teaching award will, in itself, constitute outstanding teaching performance.

In **Scholarship**, the candidate must have published at least **five (5)** additional original empirical scholarly articles in peer reviewed journals or review articles, chapters, monographs, or books and be the first or senior (usually last) author on at least **two (2)** of these. This level of performance (e.g., five articles) would constitute “strong” scholarly performance. Scholarship above this level will constitute “outstanding” scholarly performance. *Also, the candidate is expected to have as the principal investigator, a well-*

*established and viable research program demonstrated by other evidence, such as continued scholarly presentation, workshops, addresses, and the submission of external grant proposals. If the candidate seeks promotion to Professor after the typical 6-year period, an individual must have additional publications equal in number to the years since the last promotion. It is expected that candidates will mentor research for students and junior faculty as well.* The candidate must have achieved scholarly distinction, as shown by citations by scholarly peers, external reviews, or by other evidence.

In *Service*, the candidate is expected to have contributed consistently to university, departmental, and/or community service functions and show evidence of other professional service appropriate to the candidate's expertise. Strong performance will be defined as "meets expectations" for all review years and "exceeds expectations" for at least two of those years on the service section of departmental annual evaluations. Service ratings exceeding this standard constitutes "outstanding performance."

In *Collegiality*, the candidate is expected to have met the departmental expectations as described above in B-4.3, over the course of the service period being evaluated.

### ***Annual Evaluations***

For the period of service being considered for promotion, the candidate should have received annual performance evaluation ratings of Meets Expectations or better in Teaching and in at least two of the remaining three categories, for at least 80% of the evaluation years being considered (e.g., 4 of 5 years' evaluations).

## **B-6 Promotion Criteria Summarized by Rank for DOCTORAL FACULTY**

### **B-6.1 Assistant Professor.**

The candidate is expected to have earned a doctorate in psychology, counseling, school counseling or counselor education. The candidate is expected to show evidence of the potential to become a meritorious teacher. The potential to become a strong teacher can be evaluated using multiple sources, including (a) teaching evaluations, (b) direct observation of teaching in the classroom, and (c) any other information the candidate wishes to be considered. The candidate is expected to be the first author (or "principal contributor" as defined in the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association) of an original empirical article in a peer reviewed journal.

### **B-6.2 Associate Professor.**

In *Teaching*, the candidate must be a strong teacher based on an array of evidence from multiple assessment methods. Evidence for strong or outstanding teaching will include (a) consistently high teaching evaluations, and (b) teaching awards. A candidate would be considered "strong" if she or he has an average teaching evaluation across all courses between 3.20 and 4.19. Average teaching evaluations across all courses exceeding 4.19 would constitute "outstanding." Alternatively, receipt of a University or BOR teaching award will, in itself, constitute outstanding teaching performance. Finally, doctoral faculty are expected to mentor students in thesis and dissertation research with completion in a timely manner.

In *Scholarship*, the candidate must have produced **a consistent body of** original scholarship, including the publication of at least eight (**8**) original published or accepted for publication articles by the time tenure review is commenced. Among the eight, the candidate should be first author or senior author of at least **four** empirical, peer-reviewed scholarly works (journal articles, book chapters, books, reviews, etc.). *Paid publications that are not peer reviewed are not considered scholarly works and will not be counted towards tenure and promotion.* The remaining publications may be journal articles, monographs, book chapters in edited volumes or invited published manuscripts, as long as they involve a review process. This level of performance (e.g., eight articles) would constitute "strong" scholarly performance. Scholarship above this level will constitute "outstanding" scholarly performance.



Also, the candidate is expected to have as the principal investigator, a viable coherent research program demonstrated by other evidence, such as presentation, workshops, addresses, or submission of grant proposals, whether funded or not. At the discretion of the Department Committee and other reviewers, the submission or funding of external peer-reviewed research grant proposals (no more than two in total) may be substituted for peer-reviewed articles, with the candidate as principal investigator. The articles should represent work performed, or at least completed, while employed at UT Tyler. If the candidate is granted years toward tenure as part of their initial contract, then scholarship completed during prior credited service elsewhere may be included in the body of scholarship to be considered for promotion. The scholarship of the candidate should be recognized by multiple external reviewers as representing a significant contribution to the candidate's discipline.

In *Service*, the candidate is expected to have contributed consistently to university, departmental, and/or community service functions and show evidence of other professional service appropriate to the candidate's expertise. Strong performance will be defined as "meets expectations" on the service section of departmental annual evaluations for four out of the five years of review. Service ratings exceeding this standard constitutes "outstanding performance."

In *Collegiality*, the candidate is expected to have met the departmental expectations as described above in B-4.3, over the course of the service period being evaluated.

### ***Annual Evaluations***

For the period of service being considered for promotion, the candidate should have received annual performance evaluation ratings of Meets Expectations or better in Teaching and in at least two of the remaining three categories, for at least 80% of the evaluation years being considered (e.g., 4 of 5 yearly evaluations). Meeting or exceeding these standards will likely result in a positive vote for tenure and/or promotion.

### **B-6.3 Professor.**

In *Teaching*, the candidate must be an excellent teacher with continuing evidence of mentorship and other efforts to improve the quality of instruction. In *Teaching*, the candidate must be a strong teacher based on an array of evidence from multiple assessment methods. Evidence for strong or outstanding teaching will include (a) consistently high teaching evaluations, and (b) teaching awards. A candidate would be considered "strong" if she or he has an average teaching evaluation across all courses between 3.20 and 4.19. Average teaching evaluations across all courses exceeding 4.19 would constitute "outstanding." Alternatively, receipt of a University or BOR teaching award will, in itself, constitute outstanding teaching performance. Finally, doctoral faculty are expected to mentor students in thesis and dissertation research with completion in a timely manner.

In *Scholarship*, the candidate must have published at least four (**4**) additional original empirical scholarly articles in peer reviewed journals or review articles, chapters, monographs, or books and be the first or senior (usually last) author on at least **three (3)** of these. This level of performance (e.g., eight articles) would constitute "strong" scholarly performance. Scholarship above this level will constitute "outstanding" scholarly performance. ***Also, the candidate is expected to have as the principal investigator, a well-established and viable research program demonstrated by other evidence, such as continued scholarly presentation, workshops, addresses, and the submission of external grant proposals. If the candidate seeks promotion to Professor after the typical 6-year period, an individual must have additional publications equal in number to the years since the last promotion. It is expected that candidates will mentor junior faculty as well.*** At the discretion of the Department Committee and other reviewers, the submission or funding of external peer-reviewed research grant proposals (no more than two in total) may be substituted for peer-reviewed articles, with the candidate as principal investigator. The candidate must have achieved scholarly distinction, as shown by citations by scholarly peers, external reviews, or by other evidence.

In *Service*, the candidate is expected to have contributed consistently to university, departmental, and/or

community service functions and show evidence of other professional service appropriate to the candidate's expertise. Strong performance will be defined as "meets expectations" for all review years and "exceeds expectations" for at least two of those years on the service section of departmental annual evaluations. Service ratings exceeding this standard constitutes "outstanding performance."

In *Collegiality*, the candidate is expected to have met the departmental expectations as described above in B-4.3, over the course of the service period being evaluated.

### ***Annual Evaluations***

For the period of service being considered for promotion, the candidate should have received annual performance evaluation ratings of Meets Expectations or better in Teaching and in at least two of the remaining three categories, for at least 80% of the evaluation years being considered (e.g., 4 of 5 years' evaluations).

## B-7.0 Promotion Criteria Summarized by Rank for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

### B-7.1 Lecturer.

The candidate is expected to have earned an advanced degree in psychology, counseling, school counseling or counselor education. The candidate is expected to show evidence of the potential to become a meritorious teacher. The potential to become a strong teacher can be evaluated using multiple sources, including (a) teaching evaluations, (b) direct observation of teaching in the classroom, and (c) any other information the candidate wishes to be considered.

### B-7.2 Senior Lecturer.

In **Teaching**, the candidate must be a strong teacher based on an array of evidence from multiple assessment methods. The candidate must have at least five years of teaching experience in which the applicant has “Exceeded Expectations” each year, or has “Met Expectations” in teaching each year with a clear description of how “special qualifications” and the “significance” of responsibilities other than teaching will be evaluated. Evidence for strong or outstanding teaching will include (a) consistently high teaching evaluations, and (b) teaching awards. A candidate would be considered “strong” if she or he has an average teaching evaluation across all courses between 3.20 and 4.19. Average teaching evaluations across all courses exceeding 4.19 would constitute “outstanding.” Alternatively, receipt of a University or BOR teaching award will, in itself, constitute outstanding teaching performance.

In **Service**, the candidate is expected to have contributed consistently to university, departmental, and/or community service functions and show evidence of other professional service appropriate to the candidate’s expertise. Strong performance will be defined as “meets expectations” on the service section of departmental annual evaluations for four out of the five years of review. Service ratings exceeding this standard constitutes “outstanding performance.”

In **Collegiality**, the candidate is expected to have met the departmental expectations as described above in B-4.3, over the course of the service period being evaluated.

### **Annual Evaluations**

For the period of service being considered for promotion, the candidate should have received annual performance evaluation ratings of Meets Expectations or better in Teaching and in at least two of the remaining three categories, for at least 80% of the evaluation years being considered (e.g., 4 of 5 yearly evaluations). Meeting or exceeding these standards will likely result in a positive vote for promotion.

### B-7.3 Distinguished Senior Lecturer.

In **Teaching**, the candidate must be a strong teacher based on an array of evidence from multiple assessment methods. The candidate must have at least five additional years of teaching experience, beyond those involved in promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, in which the applicant has “Exceeded Expectations” each year and other ways in which their “teaching experiences and qualifications demonstrate extraordinary service and performance.” Evidence for strong or outstanding teaching will include (a) consistently high teaching evaluations, and (b) teaching awards. A candidate would be considered “strong” if she or he has an average teaching evaluation across all courses between 3.20 and 4.19. Average teaching evaluations across all courses exceeding 4.19 would constitute “outstanding.” Alternatively, receipt of a University or BOR teaching award will, in itself, constitute outstanding teaching performance.

In **Service**, the candidate is expected to have contributed consistently to university, departmental, and/or community service functions and show evidence of other professional service appropriate to the candidate’s expertise. Strong performance will be defined as “meets expectations” for all review years and

“exceeds expectations” for at least two of those years on the service section of departmental annual evaluations. Service ratings exceeding this standard constitutes “outstanding performance.”

In *Collegiality*, the candidate is expected to have met the departmental expectations as described above in B-4.3, over the course of the service period being evaluated.

### *Annual Evaluations*

For the period of service being considered for promotion, the candidate should have received annual performance evaluation ratings of Meets Expectations or better in Teaching and in at least one of the remaining two categories, for at least 80% of the evaluation years being considered (e.g., 4 of 5 years' evaluations).

## B-8 Periodic Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

### Annual Evaluations

For the six-year period of service being considered for post-tenure review, the faculty member should have received annual performance evaluation ratings of Meets Expectations or better in at least three of the four categories, for at least five of the six evaluation years being considered. In teaching, Meets Expectations must be earned for a minimum of five of those years. In scholarship, Meets Expectations must be earned a minimum of three of those years. The candidate must participate at least twice in the peer review of his or her teaching during the review period.

If a tenured faculty member receives an unsatisfactory evaluation from a six-year review, the specific procedures outlined in the HOP will be followed. As part of this procedure, the Department Chair will provide specific feedback about the outcome and will work with the faculty member to develop a plan for addressing the deficiencies identified in the review.

Performance will then be reviewed again by the Department Chair at the end of the planned remediation period.

### B8 Tenure

A candidate for tenure must meet the criteria specified for Associate Professor at least. Except in special circumstances of hiring, the criteria are met by work performed at UT Tyler.

---