

Evaluative Criteria, Procedures, and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointment, Promotion, Tenure, and Annual Review of Faculty and Appointment and Annual Review of Professional Staff

The following criteria, procedures, and general standards were developed by the faculty of the Department of Psychology and approved by the Dean, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Chancellor, and President. In some cases, the department has modified certain dates, but these modifications always provide for earlier notification of the affected faculty member than that specified by University guidelines.

I. Criteria and Procedures for Initial Appointment

A. Criteria for initial appointments

Except in the most extraordinary of circumstances, only candidates possessing the Ph.D. degree are considered for tenure-track appointments. Potential for scholarly activity and teaching excellence are the major criteria for evaluation. Except in rare circumstances, candidates for clinical positions must have graduated from an APA-approved doctoral program and have completed an APA-approved clinical internship. Candidates for clinical positions must also be eligible for licensure in the State of Arkansas.

Assistant Professor - Normally, appointees hold a Ph.D. degree and show potential for excellence in both teaching and research.

Associate Professor - Normally, appointees hold a Ph.D. degree with post-doctoral teaching and research experience at the college level. Appointees also will have established records of effective teaching at the undergraduate and (when appropriate) graduate levels, demonstrated success of mentoring of undergraduate and (when appropriate) graduate students, and evidence of independent, programmatic research productivity by publications in the top outlets in their field.

Professor - Normally, appointees hold a Ph.D. with post-doctoral teaching and research experience at the college level. Appointees will have established records of effective teaching at the undergraduate and (when appropriate) graduate levels, demonstrated success of mentoring of undergraduate and (when appropriate) graduate students, and a continuous record of independent, programmatic research productivity by publications in the top outlets in their field. Appointees will have clearly established themselves as major contributors to their field of expertise, with greater quantity and quality of research productivity than that expected of appointees at lower ranks.

University Professor - Appointment to a University Professorship signifies a special honor normally conferred on active faculty of extraordinary merit. This distinction is bestowed on active faculty who are widely recognized for their sustained excellence in scholarship, teaching, research or creative activity germane to the discipline of Psychology and who have provided exemplary service to the university, to the profession, or to the public through professional activity.

Distinguished Professor - Appointment to a Distinguished Professorship is reserved for those individuals who are recognized nationally and internationally as intellectual leaders in the field of Psychology for extraordinary accomplishments in teaching and in published works, research, and creative activities germane to the field. Appointment to a Distinguished Professorship shall be made only when clear indication exists that individuals so appointed will provide exemplary academic and intellectual leadership and will continue their professional activities to maintain national and international recognition and commensurate level of accomplishment.

Clinical Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor - These ranks are used to establish official association of a clinical psychologist or mental health practitioner with the Department to provide clinical supervision for students in the Clinical Training program. Except in rare circumstances, candidates for these clinical ranks must have graduated from an APA-approved doctoral program and have completed an APA-approved clinical internship. Candidates for clinical positions must be licensed in the State of Arkansas. Appointments to these ranks do not involve tenure; they must be renewed annually and are usually without salary. An appointment to a clinical title requires meeting the criteria and standards for appointment to the rank without the prefix "Clinical."

In addition to those academic ranks above that typically involve tenure, temporary appointments may be made to other faculty and professional staff ranks. The criteria for appointments to these ranks (including lecturer, instructor, visiting assistant professor, associate professor, and professor; research assistant professor, associate professor, and professor; adjunct assistant professor, associate professor, and professor; emeritus status; post-doctoral appointees; graduate teaching assistant; graduate research assistant; research assistant, and research associate) are defined by Board of Trustees Policy 405.1 (see also Academic Policy Series 1435.50).

B. Procedures for initial appointments

When the department has been authorized to fill a tenure-track position, the Chair will appoint a search committee charged with the task of soliciting applications from prospective candidates and identifying the top candidates for the position from the pool of applicants. The application materials of these candidates, including letters of recommendations from those knowing the applicant's work and professional potential, will be reviewed by each member of the faculty. Evidence of scholarly activity may include papers presented at professional conventions, participation on symposium panels, articles in refereed journals, chapters, monographs, and books. Evidence of teaching potential may include previous teaching experience, teaching evaluations, individual instruction experience, and provision of practicum supervision. The qualifications of the candidates will be considered at a departmental meeting, and a vote will be taken to establish the rank-order of the applicants. The top candidates will be invited for on-campus interviews. Interviews will consist of meetings with the faculty, graduate students, and appropriate administrative officials and the presentation of a colloquium to the department. After all invited candidates have been interviewed, a departmental meeting will be held to make hiring recommendations.

In order to attract a diverse pool of qualified applicants, the department will advertise positions in a wide variety of print or on-line publications.

Appointments to temporary, non-tenure track faculty and professional staff positions to meet departmental responsibilities may be made by the Chair (in consultation with the Director of the appropriate graduate training committee, if necessary).

II. Criteria and Procedures for Reappointment, Performance Review, and Salary Increases

A. Reappointment

1. Criteria for reappointment. The criteria for reappointment of nontenured, tenure-track faculty will be the faculty member's demonstrated performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service while at the University of Arkansas and progress toward a positive recommendation for the granting of tenure. In addition, no faculty member in the Clinical Training program will be recommended for reappointment if not licensed as a Psychologist by the State of Arkansas before the beginning of their third-year of service.

2. Procedure for reappointment. The Chair is responsible for initiating and conducting the evaluation of each faculty member in the Department of Psychology and for initiating the process of deciding whether to recommend the reappointment of each non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member. The Chair's recommendation regarding reappointment is to be made only after consultation with the departmental Personnel Committee and the faculty member involved. The Personnel Committee will consist of four members elected for staggered, two-year terms by and from the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the department. (the dates indicated in the following sections are approximations only; the exact deadlines will be specified each year.)

a. Annual review for reappointment. The Annual Resume Update will be used as the primary information source for reappointment reviews. The Personnel Committee will consider the materials submitted and make a written recommendation to the Chair. Recommendations for reappointment concerning untenured, tenure-track faculty must be submitted to the Chair by February 1, except in cases involving second-year faculty. For faculty members in their second year of service, preliminary resume updates will be submitted by October 15 for review, and recommendations from the personnel committee must be submitted to the Chair BY NOVEMBER 1.

The Chair will independently review the materials submitted, consider the recommendation of the Personnel Committee, and meet with the faculty member prior to submitting a final recommendation concerning reappointment to the Dean. All appointed non-tenured faculty in continuing positions will be notified of reappointment recommendations in accordance with a schedule that conforms to that of Board Policy 405.1.

When a recommendation for non-reappointment is made by the Chair, the faculty member may appeal that recommendation in writing to the Personnel Committee within 5 working days of receiving the negative recommendation from the Chair. The Personnel Committee will make a recommendation to the Chair, which the Chair will consider in making a final recommendation to the Dean. The Chair will provide a copy of his or her final recommendation to the faculty member, who may submit a written response that will be forwarded to subsequent levels of review. Further procedures and deadlines regarding nonreappointment, including provision for appeals, as prescribed in Section II of the campus personnel document, "Evaluative Criteria, Procedures and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Annual and Post-tenure Review, Promotion and Tenure" (hereafter "Evaluative Criteria") and Section IV.B of Board Policy 405.1, must be followed. The Chair will recommend non-reappointment in a letter to the Dean, with a copy to the faculty member, by the applicable deadline established in Board Policy 405.1.IV.B.

For temporary faculty members who are appointed for terms of a year or less, the letter of offer will serve as notification by specifying the terms and responsibilities of the appointment and stating that the contracts do not extend beyond the end of the appointment period. Such a statement does not preclude future appointments, however. Copies of all letters of offer will be sent to the Dean's Office.

b. Pre-tenure review. In addition to the annual review that is conducted for all non-tenured, tenure-track faculty, a thorough review of each faculty member's professional accomplishments will be conducted in the third-year of service. The purpose of this comprehensive review is to assess the faculty member's progress toward a positive recommendation for tenure and to provide early advice and counsel to the faculty member. For faculty members being considered for pre-tenure review, a complete dossier presenting their professional accomplishments in teaching, research, and service will be submitted by March 15. In general, the materials to be included in the dossier and the format of presentation should conform to the Faculty Review Checklist, contained in the Faculty Handbook. However, recommendations will not be sought from outside reviewers for pre-tenure reviews, unless specifically requested by the faculty member[, and agreed to by the Chair and Personnel Committee][?].

The submitted materials will be considered by the Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee will provide a written assessment of the faculty member's progress toward tenure and will make a recommendation concerning reappointment to the Chair. The Chair will independently review the materials submitted, consider the recommendations of the Personnel Committee, and meet with the faculty member prior to making an evaluation. The Chair will provide written review of the faculty member's record, including the faculty member's professional strengths and weaknesses as reflected in the professional record, expectations for continuing activities, needs for further faculty development, and an explicit statement of whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure. Such an assessment may be qualified with explicit statements that a successful tenure recommendation will be contingent upon the candidate being able to bring current projects to completion (e.g., publications, improvement of teaching efforts) prior to the tenure evaluation. Copies of the recommendations made by the Personnel Committee and by the Chair will become a part of the faculty member's personnel file and will be provided to the Dean.

If the pre-tenure review determines that insufficient progress toward a positive recommendation for granting tenure has been made, a recommendation for non-reappointment may be made to the Dean, with procedures and appeals as provided for above.

B. Performance Review and Salary Increases

Salary increases for each full-time faculty member are considered annually and are based on individual performance and accomplishment in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. The weighting for faculty evaluations will be 40% for teaching, 40% for research/scholarship, and 20% for service. However, an individual faculty member whose responsibilities to the department are atypical may be evaluated according to idiosyncratic teaching, research, and service weights that have been approved by the faculty member, the Chair of the department, and the Dean. Weightings different from the 40/40/20 scheme must be approved annually by the Chair and the Dean.

The following are the criteria and procedures used by the Department of Psychology to evaluate its full-time faculty as a major source of data for salary increments and performance reviews. All performance reviews will include peer evaluations provided by the Personnel Committee (which may involve both in-class observations and review of syllabi, reading lists, examinations, etc.) and student evaluations of teaching.

1. Criteria. Each permanent full-time member of the Department is evaluated annually on the basis of achievement in the areas of teaching, scholarly activities, and professionally relevant service. In accordance with the Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences "Criteria, Procedures, and Standards" Section II.B., faculty members' performances will be rated using the following scale: "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations," "minimally meets expectations," and "does not meet expectations."

In the area of teaching, "exceeds expectations" = excellence in teaching. Criteria for exceeding expectations generally include meeting criteria for "meets expectations fully" plus demonstrated significant achievement in one or more areas of teaching. Examples of this type of significant achievement may include, but are not limited to: outstanding student success (e.g., national award winner, publishing in peer-reviewed scholarly journals); excellent student evaluations in undergraduate and graduate courses; or making substantial contributions to the department's teaching mission over and above what is normally expected. Faculty presenting several examples of scholarly activity that, in isolation, would "meet expectations fully" may warrant a rating of "exceeds expectations."

“meets expectations fully” = strong performance in teaching. Examples of this type of strong performance may include, but are not limited to: evidence of competence in classroom teaching (e.g., good student evaluations); supervision or mentoring of graduate students and/or honors students; supervision or mentoring of undergraduate students for which reasonable progress on the part of the student(s) has occurred during the year; service on student committees (e.g., Honors, Master’s, third-year, or dissertation); and/or advising responsibilities for undergraduate or graduate students.

“minimally meets expectations” = satisfactory performance in teaching. This rating is typically given if there is one or more identifiable minor deficiencies in meeting the criteria for “meets expectations fully.” Examples of this type of deficiency may include, but are not limited to: fair student evaluations; little mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students; or little involvement in student committees.

“does not meet expectations” = unsatisfactory teaching performance. This rating is typically given if there is one or more identifiable major deficiencies in meeting the criteria for “meets expectations fully,” or evidence of teaching-related ethical violations. Major deficiencies in teaching performance may include, but are not limited to: poor student evaluations; no mentoring of undergraduate or graduate students; unreliable classroom attendance as the instructor of record; or no evidence of contributing to the department’s teaching mission.

In the area of research,

“exceeds expectations” = research excellence. Meets criteria for “meets expectations fully” plus demonstrated significant achievement in one or more areas of research. Examples of this type of significant achievement may include, but are not limited to: national research awards; prolific publishing in peer-reviewed scholarly journals; securing or managing a competitive, indirect cost-paying research grant; publishing a book; or delivering a keynote address for a national or international scholarly organization. Faculty presenting several examples of research activity that, in isolation, would “meet expectations fully” may warrant a rating of “exceeds expectations.”

“meets expectations fully” = strong research performance. This rating is typically given if there is evidence of productivity in research, which may include publications, conference presentations, invited presentations, grant seeking, award of grants or contracts, grant administration, sponsorship of student research grants or awards, manuscripts under review, evidence of progress in book preparation, and/or ongoing data-collection activities.

“minimally meets expectations” = satisfactory research performance. This rating is typically warranted given clear evidence of research or other scholarly activity, along with several identifiable minor deficiencies in meeting the criteria for “meets expectations fully.” Examples of this type of deficiency may include, but are not limited to: little research dissemination in written or presentation format or little evidence of ongoing data collection or analysis.

“does not meet expectations” = unsatisfactory research performance. This rating is typically given if there is one or more identifiable major deficiencies in meeting the criteria for “meets expectations fully,” or evidence of research-related ethical violations. Examples of this type of major deficiency may include, but are not limited to, no research dissemination or no evidence of data collection or analysis.

In the area of service,

“exceeds expectations” = excellence in service. Meets criteria for “meets expectations fully” plus demonstrated significant achievement in one or more areas of service. Examples of this type of significant achievement may include, but are not limited to: election to national office for a professional society; service on review panels or editorial boards; service awards or other evidence of recognition for contributions to the discipline; university or community service relevant to the university’s mission as a

land-grant institution. Faculty presenting several examples of service activity that, in isolation, would “meet expectations fully” may warrant a rating of “exceeds expectations.”

“meets expectations fully” = strong service to the department, college, university, and/or academy. This rating is typically given if there is evidence of regular attendance at departmental and graduate training committee faculty meetings and departmental colloquia and events, and active involvement in discipline-related service at the national, regional, state, university, college and/or department level, which at the department level may include program advising. “Active involvement” occurs only when official business was conducted for a particular service activity during the year (i.e., membership on a committee alone is not evidence of active involvement unless that committee conducted some official business during the year). Other examples of strong service may include, but are not limited to: service membership on departmental committees; service to the profession through activity such editorial duties, reviewing for peer review journals or funding agencies; service to professional societies; or organizing sessions at professional meetings. Service may also be defined as contributing specific professional expertise for non-profit and government agencies and/or community outreach efforts as per the mission of a land-grant institution.

“minimally meets expectations” = satisfactory service to the department, college, and/or university. This rating is typically given if there is one or more identifiable minor deficiencies in meeting the criteria for “meets expectations fully.” Examples of these deficiencies may include minimal service as a member of a standing or ad-hoc committee (given it meets during the year) and limited evidence of active assistance in departmental affairs.

“does not meet expectations” = unsatisfactory service to the department, college, and university. This rating is typically given if there is one or more identifiable major deficiencies in meeting the criteria for “meets expectations fully,” or evidence of service-related ethical violations, or evidence of unreliability in service activities. For example, this rating may be given if no clear evidence of service exists, or when a faculty member refuses to carry out assigned duties or demonstrates an unwillingness to serve.

Overall Evaluation

A single overall evaluation will also be given based on an aggregation of the three evaluations for teaching, research, and service.

2. Procedure. Each member of the department will submit a report of his or her yearly activities in teaching, research, and service to the Chair; copies of these reports are distributed to each member of the departmental Personnel Committee. This committee will consist of four members of the faculty elected for staggered, two-year terms by and from the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the department.

a. The performance of each faculty member shall be reviewed annually by the Chair. A comprehensive cumulative record of annual review forms and summaries of discussions with the Chair shall be maintained and shall be made available to the faculty member upon his or her request. The responsibility for the initiation of evaluation procedures for each faculty member lies with the Chair.

b. Each member of the department submits the Annual Resume Update of his or her yearly activities in teaching, research, and service to the Chair, typically by January 15.

c. To ensure peer review of each faculty member's performance, copies of the resume updates are distributed to each member of the departmental Personnel Committee for evaluation. This committee evaluates each faculty member on a common scale for the college. General guidelines for the

categorical ratings are included in the College's Personnel Document. The Personnel Committee submits the ratings for each of the three areas of evaluation (including supporting expository statements) and the weighted merit rating of each member of the faculty to the Chair.

d. On the basis of the material submitted with the Annual Resume Update and the advisory recommendations from the Personnel Committee, the Chair makes evaluations of each faculty member in each of the three areas of evaluation and includes expository statements supporting the categorical ratings given. The Chair may ask to meet with the Personnel Committee to discuss and consider rating discrepancies.

e. Copies of the Personnel Committee's evaluation and the Chair's recommendations to the Dean are provided to the faculty member by the Chair. Before the Chair's recommendations are submitted to the Dean, the Chair will provide an opportunity for each faculty member to schedule a meeting to discuss the evaluations. Faculty members who do not desire such a meeting must waive this option in writing on a form to be provided at the time the evaluations are distributed. However, all untenured faculty members must meet with the Chair to discuss their evaluations. The dates of such meetings and any unresolved disagreements should be recorded on the forms or in accompanying materials to be sent forward with the forms. A record of such meeting shall be a part of the faculty member's personnel record in the department. Any written response to the evaluation by the faculty member shall also be included in the faculty member's file. The faculty member may also send a copy of this response to the Dean.

After all faculty have had an opportunity to meet with the Chair, the Chair's evaluations shall be submitted to the Dean.

f. Appeals of Chair's evaluations are to be considered first by the Personnel Committee, which will make a recommendation to the chair, who will take such recommendation into account in preparing a final recommendation. Written appeals are to be submitted within five working days of the faculty member's meeting with the Chair. If the appeal is unresolved at this level, the appeal can be made to the Dean, but such appeals must be made within ten working days after the deadline for submission of forms to the College.

g. In addition to the categorical rating and brief expository justifications provided to the Dean for merit evaluation and salary increase purposes, the Chair shall provide a written performance evaluation of each faculty member that will include an identification of faculty development needs and of problems in performance. The performance evaluation will also include an explicit statement of progress toward tenure and promotion for all faculty who have not achieved the rank of Professor. One copy of the performance evaluation letter will be signed by the faculty member and retained in the faculty member's personnel file; faculty members who disagree with any statements in the performance evaluation letter will be given an opportunity to attach a statement outlining their points of disagreement with the contents of the letter.

h. Evaluations of temporary faculty will be conducted by the Chair using the criteria listed above that are appropriate for their work assignments.

III. Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

Promotion is based primarily on the accomplishments of the individual while in the most recent rank. Promotion is a distinct honor and is not based on length of service; criteria for promotion to each rank are essentially the same as those for initial appointment, with work completed while at the University of Arkansas being given greater weight in all considerations. No minimum time in rank is required

before a faculty member is eligible for promotion. Tenure is granted on the basis of the expectation that the candidate will continue to contribute materially to the goals of the Department and to the field of Psychology in the areas of teaching and research. (The dates indicated in the following sections are approximations only; the exact deadlines will be specified each year.)

A. Criteria for Promotion

Each faculty member who is being considered for promotion shall be evaluated on the basis of his or her demonstrated achievement in the areas of teaching, scholarly activities, and academically related service. While these criteria are similar to the criteria for reappointment and performance evaluation specified in previous sections of this document, the relative emphasis placed on each rating area and the levels of achievement differ, with greater weight being given to teaching and research accomplishments in promotion considerations. As a consequence, in some cases there may appear to be discrepancies between annual merit evaluation ratings and promotion recommendations.

B. Procedures for Promotion

1. In consultation with the departmental Personnel Committee, the Chair shall begin, in the spring semester prior, consideration of whom to nominate for promotion that year. By May 1, the Chair shall notify in writing each faculty member who is being considered for promotion or tenure that they are being considered. A faculty member in the sixth year of appointment who has not previously been granted tenure must be evaluated. According to University policy, no later than May 5, any faculty member may request in writing to the Chair to be nominated for promotion that year; such requests shall be honored by the Chair.

2. The Chair shall ask each individual to be considered for promotion to submit information following the Faculty Review Checklist and any other materials that the nominee believes will facilitate consideration of his or her competence and performance. The Chair will also solicit evaluation letters of the candidate's research record, based on the candidate's vita, reprints (and preprints) of research reports, and other materials deemed relevant by the Chair and Promotion and Tenure Committee, from at least three distinguished scholars in the candidate's field from other institutions, according to the procedures outlined in Section III. B. 8. g. of "Evaluative Criteria." The Chair may also request evaluations from members of the department faculty who may possess information important to the promotion and tenure deliberations.

The following procedures are followed by the department for promotions:

a. Whenever a candidate is to be considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor or for tenure, a four-person Promotion and Tenure Committee will be formed. All members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will be tenured faculty at or above the rank for which the candidate is to be considered. Members of the Personnel Committee who meet these criteria will serve ex officio on the Promotion and Tenure Committee; additional members will be elected as necessary by a vote of all tenured and tenure-track faculty.

b. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will receive the documents submitted by the candidate and copies of the confidential evaluations provided by the three outside referees. The Committee reviews these documents, individually and collectively, and makes its recommendation to the Chair no later than October 1. The department tenured faculty will also meet and vote independently and furnish a recommendation to the chair.

c. The Chair will receive the materials submitted by the candidate, the letters from the outside evaluators, and the recommendation of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the department tenured faculty. The Chair then makes a recommendation of the candidate's case for promotion and provides the appropriate justification and

documentation.

d. The Chair shall inform the candidate of the results of the Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation and of the tenured faculty recommendation. The candidate shall also be informed of the recommendation the Chair will make, both for positive recommendation (i.e., to promote) and for negative recommendation (i.e., not to promote). If either recommendation (promotion or tenure) is unfavorable, the Chair will provide the reasons for the negative recommendation to the candidate in writing on or about October 5.

3. Prior to the submission of the Chair's recommendation to the Dean, the faculty member may withdraw from further consideration. Such withdrawal shall be made in writing to the Chair. The faculty member may also appeal the Chair's recommendation to the Promotion and Tenure Committee; a written appeal must be submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee within five working days of the candidate receiving the written recommendation from the Chair. A written statement of the bases for the appeal, a record of the Promotion and Tenure Committee's recommendation, and the Chair's response to the candidate's appeal and the Promotion and Tenure Committee's recommendation shall become a part of the faculty member's promotion materials.

4. Each nomination shall be forwarded to the Dean by the specified deadline and shall be accompanied by the Chair's recommendation, the recommendations of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and department tenured faculty, all materials submitted by the candidate, and the letters from the outside evaluators. Any recommendation shall also be accompanied by a written statement of the Chair's rationale for the recommendation. A copy of the Chair's recommendation shall be given to the faculty member and to members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Remaining members of the faculty will be notified of the recommendations made by the Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

5. After the departmental recommendations are sent to the Dean, the nominee's materials receive further review at the college and university levels. The regulations, criteria, and appeal procedures are outlined in the approved campus policy. The Chair shall review these procedures with the faculty member at the time the nomination materials are sent forward.

C. Criteria for Tenure

Each faculty member who is being considered for the granting of tenure shall be evaluated on the basis of their likelihood to continue to make significant contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarly activities, and academically-related service. Tenure is granted on the basis of the candidate's demonstrated accomplishments in the areas of classroom teaching, individual instruction, and research. Granting of tenure will be recommended only when the evidence indicates that the candidate will continue to meet the highest standards for competence, quality, scholarship, and independence in their future work and that this work will promote the goals of the department and the field of psychology. Exceptional teaching or service contributions will not compensate for a weak record of scholarly activity; exceptional research activity will not compensate for a weak record of teaching. It is incumbent upon the candidate for tenure to compile a record of performance that clearly and unambiguously demonstrates that these criteria have been met.

While these criteria may resemble the criteria for reappointment and performance evaluation specified in previous sections of this document, the relative emphasis placed on each rating area and the levels of achievement differ, with greater weight being given to teaching and research accomplishments in tenure considerations.

D. Procedure for Tenure

The procedures for the granting of tenure, including the materials required in the Faculty Review Checklist, the solicitation of outside evaluations, recommendation of the Promotion and Tenure Committee within the Department, and the recommendation of the Chair, are the same as the procedures for promotion contained in Section III.B of this document. As noted previously, a faculty member in the sixth year of appointment who has not previously been granted tenure must be evaluated.

Adopted by the faculty of the Department of Psychology on December 5, 2011.
Denise R. Beike, Chair