

Faculty Promotion Review Guidelines

Tenure-Track Faculty
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Version 11-04-24

Revision History: Adopted November 2002; With dean's requested revisions of April 2003; Third-year review update, 2005; Amendments in December 2007; Amendments in December 2008; Amendments in December 2010; Amendments in December 2012; CAS Dean's revisions incorporated, May 2013; Amendments in November 2013; Faculty Senate revisions, February 2014; Amendments of October 2014; Amendments of October 2017; Amendments of September 2018; Amendments of October 2020; Amendments of October 2022, Redesigned and streamlined, November 2024.

Table of Contents

Section 1: Overview	4
1.1. Department Mission and Philosophy	4
1.2. General Guidelines	7
Section 2: Demonstrating Performance	8
2.1. Teaching and Mentoring (Teaching).....	8
2.2. Research and Scholarly/Creative Activities (Research).....	11
2.3. Professionally Related Service (Service)	14
Section 3: Tenure and Promotion Review (Tenure Track)	18
3.1. Mid-Tenure Review	18
3.2. Service Requirement for Promotion.....	19
3.3. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	19
3.4. Criteria for Promotion to Professor	20
Section 4: Promotion Review (Non-Tenure Tracks).....	20
4.1. Service Requirement for Promotion	20
4.2. Promotion Review Process	21
4.3. Criteria for Promotion	21
4.4. External Peer Review	21
Section 5: Application Process	22
5.1. Declaration of Candidacy	22
5.2. Candidate Subcommittees	22
5.3. Candidate Dossiers.....	23
5.4. External Letters.....	24
Section 6: Department Tenure and Promotion Committee.....	25
6.1. Composition	25
6.2. Selection of Committee Chair	27

6.3. Meetings	27
6.4. Voting Procedures.....	28
6.5. Committee Reports	29
6.6. Modification of Guidelines	30

Section 1: Overview

1.1. Department Mission and Philosophy

1.1.1. The Department of Psychology is a community of faculty who share common interests, including scholarship, teaching, service, and maintenance of a comfortable working environment through positive collegial relations and contributions. New tenure-track faculty members are hired into the department as probationary members, with the intent that they will become permanent members after a specified probationary period. During this period, the department conducts annual faculty evaluations and mid-tenure reviews.

After the predetermined probationary period, non-tenured faculty on the tenure track may apply for tenure and/or promotion and faculty on a non-tenure track may apply for promotion. Just as in their initial employment applications, it is the primary responsibility of candidates for tenure and/or promotion to provide convincing evidence to support and justify a positive tenure and/or promotion decision. It is the purpose of these guidelines to communicate departmental expectations and ideals to junior faculty, and to suggest various sources of evidence to attest to the quality, quantity, and breadth of candidate accomplishments.

The guidelines are consistent with the Department's Mission Statement:

Psychology is a major discipline, which contributes to the social and natural sciences. The primary mission of the Department of Psychology is to advance the science and profession of psychology through the production and dissemination of knowledge related to the discipline, and the preparation of academic and professional psychologists. Consistent with the mission of the Center for Applied Psychological Research (CAPR), departmental emphasis is placed upon scholarly activities, which maintain and enhance the department's national research reputation. The department strives to provide high quality liberal and general education for undergraduate students, a coherent, high quality program for its majors and graduate students, service courses to

students in other majors, and services to the general public. The breadth of the faculty's commitment is reflected in graduate programs in both basic and applied science and in diverse research and scholarly pursuits. The department's mission is consistent with the university's mission to advance learning through excellence in teaching, research, and service.

1.1.2. All candidates for tenure and/or promotion must meet the departmental, college, and university eligibility criteria in effect at the time of application for tenure and/or promotion. Because departmental guidelines supplement the university's Faculty Handbook and the tenure and promotion guidelines of the College of Arts and Sciences, candidates for tenure and/or promotion are expected to be familiar with each set of guidelines. Candidates should recognize, however, that it is impossible for the department, college, or university to construct rigid and exact standards or criteria against which candidates should be judged. Rather, candidate contributions to their students, to their department, college, and university, to their professional disciplines, and to the larger community must be evaluated by their peers within the context of individual ideals and expectations.

1.1.3. Despite the difficulties of making evaluative judgments, decisions about tenure and promotion are vital to the maintenance and advancement of the quality of the faculty community and to the productivity and growth of the university; and, despite the specialty of the talents of each faculty member there is a range of professional activities within which a particular configuration of contributions may be viewed. These professional activities are subdivided into the categories of teaching and mentoring, research and scholarly/creative activities, and professionally related service.

1.1.4. Teaching and mentoring, research and scholarly/creative activities, and professionally related service constitute the three primary areas of focus for promotion and tenure. Although not every faculty member can be expected to excel in all three areas, in all instances the candidate's teaching must be judged as acceptable or better. Further, candidates must provide sufficient evidence of

accomplishment in each area to warrant a positive tenure and/or promotion decision.

1.1.5. The department's Tenure and Promotion (T&P) Committee is required to make recommendations about its faculty members in four contexts: (a) the granting of tenure, (b) promotion to an associate professor rank, (c) promotion to a professor rank, and (d) evaluation at mid-tenure. Relevant supporting materials need to be included in tenure/promotion dossiers and considered in the evaluation of candidate teaching, scholarship, and service.

1.1.6. Just as hiring decisions are in part prognostic statements about faculty members' likelihood of gaining tenure in the department, tenure decisions should be predictive of future promotion decisions. A recommendation for tenure indicates both demonstrated worth to the department and an assessed potential for promotion. Thus, tenure recommendations should be evidence of satisfactory performance since hiring to the present and also of anticipated professional growth.

1.1.7. A decision to recommend a candidate for promotion is made in recognition of an appropriate level of professional development; that is, more than the passage of time separates the ranks. Therefore, somewhat different levels of criteria are employed in the decision to recommend promotion to Associate Professor than are used to recommend promotion to Professor. The minimum expectations for appointment to each rank are described in the university's Faculty Handbook and later in this document.

1.1.8. During promotion decisions, committee members employ individual concepts of the levels of criteria that should apply to each rank based on varying admixtures of what is and what ought to be. To achieve some congruence in the application of final criterion levels, candidates and committee members should keep the following points in mind:

1.1.8.a. Professional growth in maturing faculty is particularly valued as it contributes to the mission of the department, the college and the university.

Professional development should enhance, not conflict with the academic roles of faculty.

1.1.8.b. The professional development of faculty should demonstrate qualitative as well as quantitative growth.

1.1.8.c. Faculty growth should occur in areas of weakness as well as areas of strength. Faculty who are promoted to an associate rank are encouraged to strengthen identified areas of weakness as part of their ongoing professional development. Although it may be unreasonable to expect faculty to excel in all areas, all faculty are expected to contribute meaningfully in all areas.

1.1.8.d. Rank beyond the assistant level carries with it the expectation of professional contributions that extend beyond the confines of the university. Although excellence is not measured in geographic units, work that is of substantial and lasting value will be recognized outside the university community, whether at local, regional, national, or international levels.

1.1.8.e. In arriving at their decisions, T&P Committee members consider the guidelines for each rank specified in the university's Faculty Handbook and those in this document.

1.2. General Guidelines

1.2.1. The University of Memphis uses an online dossier submission process. All materials to be included are uploaded by the candidate, the T&P Committee chair, and the department chair at different stages of the process. The areas listed below in [Section 2: Demonstrating Performance](#) serve as examples that could attest to the candidate's qualification for tenure, promotion, or satisfactory progress during the mid-tenure review. However, the format to be followed is that specified in the dossier submission instructions provided online by the Office of the Provost.

1.2.2. Faculty who wish to apply for promotion or tenure or are scheduled for the mid-tenure review should begin to prepare a dossier of professional activities and accomplishments in a timely fashion, keeping in mind the procedures and dates

specified by the College of Arts and Sciences. Candidates have primary responsibility for providing convincing evidence of their performance, although committee members and candidate subcommittees may provide assistance as requested or as deemed necessary.

1.2.3. Any evidence in any form that the candidate deems appropriate or relevant to demonstrate excellence in their performance should be included in the dossier, except where specifically prohibited within this document (e.g., letters of recommendation from current students). The university's Faculty Handbook also suggests areas of documentation that may be provided for each category.

1.2.4. In the final analysis, candidates should strive to provide irrefutable evidence of excellence in each of their expected performance areas. The suggested items in the following section are all possible indications of candidate excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The list is not intended to be exhaustive, and candidates should be aware that individual committee members will assign different weights to all aspects of evidence in the candidate's dossier. It is therefore in the candidate's best interest to ensure that the dossier includes all credible evidence of excellence in each of the expected areas of performance.

1.2.5. Non-tenure-track faculty (professor of teaching, research professor, and clinical professor ranks) applying for promotion are evaluated primarily in the areas of academic responsibility (teaching, research, and/or service) specified in their appointment document and the university's Faculty Handbook.

1.2.6. The weighting of criteria for promotion review of faculty holding joint appointments is governed by the memorandum of understanding for the position as specified for joint appointments in the university's Faculty Handbook.

Section 2: Demonstrating Performance

2.1. Teaching and Mentoring (Teaching)

Excellence in teaching and mentoring can be inferred from the performance of the learner, as well as the nature and delivery of course content. Means for

demonstrating excellence in teaching and mentoring can be accomplished in part by addressing student outcomes and evaluations. Additionally, candidates for tenure and promotion should strive to demonstrate that course content has been current, comprehensive, and appropriately delivered. Assessing excellence in teaching and mentoring is difficult given disparate course content, class sizes, instructional styles, imperfect assessment devices, and related limitations; however, the candidate for promotion and/or tenure should consider the following means of demonstrating excellence in teaching and mentoring:

2.1.1. Course syllabi. Course syllabi should be placed in the candidate's dossier for every class taught during the probationary period in tenure decisions, and for courses taught during the post-tenure period for promotion decisions. Syllabi should describe in detail the breadth and nature of the course (e.g., goals, objectives, learning experiences, assignments, content coverage, methods of student evaluation, reading lists).

2.1.2. Criterion-related assessments. Candidates can demonstrate student content or skill mastery and the extent to which the instructional goals have been achieved in part by presenting the results of comprehensive criterion-related examinations or describing students' culminating class experiences.

2.1.3. Pre-post student gains. Gains in student competence or knowledge can be demonstrated by candidates through the administration of objective student evaluations early in the term, followed by the administration of an alternate form of the evaluation at the end of the term.

2.1.4. Classroom visitations. Candidates may request that the department chair arrange invited class visitations by colleagues for the purpose of peer teaching evaluations. The reports of observers can be used as documentary material for teaching evaluation. Prior to class visitations, the candidate and observers should clarify the parameters of the class visit and teaching evaluation.

2.1.5. Video-recorded teaching critiques. Video recordings of instruction may be used in support of excellence in teaching.

2.1.6. Innovation in teaching. All teaching-related activities can be used as partial evidence for excellence in teaching. Faculty should document the development of new instructional units or materials; implementation of new instructional technologies or methods; participation in unique teaching programs (e.g., honors courses, adult education); and any activities that enhance the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

2.1.7. Questionnaires to graduates. Faculty may solicit teaching evaluations from past students who have since left the university (e.g., graduates).

2.1.8. Performance of students on internship. Candidates may wish to add to their dossier evaluations that their students have received while on internship. Documentation that the student has gained special recognition or expertise that is in part attributable to the candidate should be highlighted.

2.1.9. Standard student questionnaires. The university's Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE) rating system is routinely used by the department. Supplemental questionnaires also may be used by candidates to assess teaching excellence. The content of supplemental questionnaires might assess such factors as the instructor's relationship with students, classroom administration, facilitation of student participation, classroom presence, organization and presentation of material, professional bearing, and interest in teaching.

2.1.10. Preparation of teachers in graduate training. Because one goal of graduate education is the preparation of future college teachers, the candidate's commitment to the preparation of graduate students for college teaching provides one possible index of teaching commitment. Such commitment can be demonstrated by the participation of candidates in unique teacher-training roles (e.g., team-teaching, supervised teaching experiences) or the presence of the candidate's students in specialized departmental teaching programs.

2.1.11. Preparation for professional practice/applications of psychology. An important teaching role includes acquainting graduate students with current methods in the professional practice of psychology. One index of a candidate's commitment to professional training is provided by anonymous student

evaluations of the faculty member as a supervisor of research and/or clinical practica, placements, or internships. In cases in which such data sources are used, all due precautions will be taken to protect student anonymity and confidentially.

2.1.12. Preparation for research and scholarship. An important component of graduate education is providing training in the skills, techniques, and professional behaviors appropriate to the academy and the profession. Professional training of this sort is imparted by candidates who serve as good role models to students in research practica and seminars; in the supervision of graduate student theses and dissertations and undergraduate honors theses; in the production of jointly authored journal articles and papers with students; and so on. Faculty should identify instances in which such scholarly activities have contributed meaningfully to their effectiveness as teachers or to the education of their students.

2.1.13. Out-of-class teaching, tutoring, and advising. An important component of graduate education is providing training in the skills, techniques, and professional behaviors appropriate to the academy and the profession. Professional training of this sort is imparted by candidates who serve as good role models to students in research practica and seminars; in the supervision of graduate student theses and dissertations and undergraduate honors theses; in the production of jointly authored journal articles and papers with students; and so on. Faculty should identify instances in which such scholarly activities have contributed meaningfully to their effectiveness as teachers or to the education of their students.

2.2. Research and Scholarly/Creative Activities (Research)

Many behaviors, products, and/or events can be used as evidence of one's scholarship; candidates are urged to include in their dossier all information that reflects the quantity and quality of scholarship. Candidates should be aware that both the quantity and quality of their scholarship will be considered during tenure and promotion deliberations. Examples of traditional means of

documenting scholarship are presented below; however, because it is the candidate's responsibility to document excellence in scholarship, candidates should include in their dossiers all pertinent or relevant information that supports their claim of excellence.

2.2.1. Research. As research is a primary index of scholarship, it is important that candidate tenure and/or promotion dossiers address the nature and scope of their research programs. Candidates should be aware that progress toward organized and well-integrated research programs provides stronger evidence of scholarship than a number of unrelated, unfruitful, short-term, or single-effort projects. Both funded and unfunded research are important to document. Consistent with the departmental evaluation guidelines, both funded and unfunded research are important in the evaluation and tenure and promotion process.

2.2.2. Independent research programs. Candidates should provide evidence of independence in their research programs. That is, candidates for tenure and/or promotion should document the extent to which their research has been under their own direction and influence. In instances of collaborative work, candidates should document the extent and importance of their contributions to the research projects.

2.2.3. Publications: books, journal articles, conference proceedings, technical reports. Because all publications are not of equal merit, differential weight is ascribed by individual committee members to publications according to perceived importance and contribution to the profession. Generally, refereed, national-level journal articles and in some cases conference proceedings have more professional import than local, state, or regional journals, newsletters, or organizational house publications. Candidates should document the quality, scope, influence, and importance of their publications to assist committee members in their evaluation of each work. A full citation of each entry is to be provided in American Psychological Association (APA) reference style, including the digital object identifier (DOI) component for all published work.

2.2.4. Presentations: professional meetings, invited addresses. The nature of the material and the type of audience to whom a candidate's work is presented are indicators of the level of scholarship associated with that work (e.g., an invited address to an international symposium is generally more prestigious than a presentation to a local audience). Candidates should document the nature of their presentations (e.g., invited, peer reviewed, automatic inclusion) and the audience to whom presentations were made (e.g., international, national, regional, local).

2.2.5. Editorial appointments. Invitations to serve as editors, associate editors, editorial board members, or occasional reviewers for publications are partial indications of the candidate's expertise in a field. Candidates should identify all publication outlets to which they are invited to provide editorial assistance. Further, candidates should indicate the scope of the publication (e.g., national-level refereed journal, local newsletter) and describe the nature and amount of work performed for the publication.

2.2.6. Research proposals and grant awards. Preparation of research/grant proposals is an indication of the candidate's ability to organize, assemble and submit scholarly work; a grant award is an even greater indication of the candidate's scholarship. The scope of proposed research, the granting agency to which proposals were submitted, whether the proposals were granted and the amount of money awarded, are all elements considered when evaluating the candidate's granting efforts and awards. Candidates should describe and/or include copies of proposals, reviews when available and awards in their dossiers.

2.2.7. Scholarly performance of students. Candidate scholarship may be reflected in part by the work of their current and past students. Information concerning any current students (or past students) who are successful and who were trained by or who are closely associated with the candidate should be presented. Candidates should distinguish the ways in which the students' contributions were unique and separate from the contributions of the faculty.

2.2.8. Appointments, awards, consultantships. Any award or recognition that has been bestowed upon candidates should be identified and documented in their

dossier. Awards and personal recognitions include, but are not limited to, having been awarded a chair of honor; prestigious lectureship; invitations to serve on advisory boards or steering committees; appointments to research or working groups; consultantships to corporations or service agencies; special recognition of accomplishments by professional organizations (e.g., organizational awards, diplomate status, fellow status).

2.2.9. Evidence of broad impact of research and scholarship. The ultimate value of research and scholarship is evidenced by the extent to which it influences the work and thoughts of others. Evidence for such broad impact may be furnished in the form of being cited in others' works; invitations to contribute to or participate with others in their work (e.g., invited symposia participation, invitations to contribute to edited books); reprint requests; book reviews; reproduction of work in volumes of collected works; adoption of the candidate's books by other universities; numbers of people served directly or indirectly by the candidate's contributions.

2.2.10. Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer. The value of research can also be evidenced through the development of unique intellectual property and products of potential commercial value. Inventions accepted by the Office of Technology Transfer for patent application, licensing or other forms of protection are considered to demonstrate the impact of research and scholarship and are valued in a manner similar to publications, presentations and grant activity.

2.3. Professional Service (Service)

The concept of service includes all beneficial activities that are not considered to be part of the candidate's teaching or scholarship responsibilities. In the broadest sense, service is the provision of assistance to students, the department, college, and university, as well as the community, state, region, and nation. Service is a responsibility of all faculty by reason of professional, academic, and state-employee identification. Service can be dichotomized as (a) activities undertaken within the university organization (e.g., department, college, university structures), and (b) activities that benefit organizations outside the university

(e.g., local, regional, and/or national organizations; other universities). Following is a sample of service activities and the contexts in which they might occur.

2.3.1. Departmental committees. Meaningful contributions to departmental committees enhance the overall well-being of the department; therefore, candidates should document their departmental committee work as evidence of service to the department. Also, because increased responsibilities typically are assigned to committee chairs, candidates should identify when they served as committee chairs to be properly credited.

2.3.2. Administrative load sharing. Departmental administrative assignments (e.g., director of the Center of Excellence; program directors) are additional means of service to the department and should be documented.

2.3.3. Departmental innovations. Candidate contributions to the revision, development, or initiation of departmental policies, programs or procedures should be noted in the dossiers.

2.3.4. Beneficial volunteer activities in the department's name. Candidates should document the extent to which they have participated in activities as a departmental representative, for the benefit of the department (e.g., participating in the annual "Phonathon", representing the department at local high school or college "career days").

2.3.5. Coordinating or participating in activities valued by the department. The candidate should identify all volunteer activities the candidate has performed that have benefited the department or the department's students (e.g., Psi Chi Coordinator; Coordinator of an undergraduate research competition).

2.3.6. Volunteer gestures of goodwill. At times, departmental needs are of an emergency nature and require someone to step forward to make an altruistic contribution (e.g., covering clinical supervision for an ill colleague; volunteering to teach a needed course as an overload; meeting with the parents of visiting prospective students; being available and willing to advise nonassigned or transfer students on an ad hoc basis).

2.3.7. College committees. Because the effectiveness of the various colleges across the university depends upon committees to influence their policies and function, candidates should identify how their service activities have benefited the various colleges. Candidates also should identify when they have served as chairs of college committees.

2.3.9. College-wide innovations. Candidate contributions to the development of innovative education practices or administrative policies that have college-wide influence should be noted in the dossier as additional evidence of candidate service contributions to the college.

2.3.10. University committees. Beyond the college, faculty members have a responsibility to serve various administrative committees of the university. The Faculty Senate, advisory Committees, task force, self-study committees are but a few of the areas that require faculty participation.

2.3.11. University-wide innovations. Candidate contributions to the development of innovative education practices or administrative policies that have university-wide influence should be noted in the dossier as additional evidence of the candidate's service contributions to the university.

2.3.12. Master's, doctoral, and undergraduate honors thesis committees. Serving as a member of master's, doctoral, and undergraduate honors thesis committees affords candidates the opportunity to improve the quality of graduate education throughout the university. Candidate participation on student committees, whether within or outside the Department of Psychology, should be summarized in their dossier. Candidates also should identify the committees on which they served as chair.

2.3.13. State professional groups. Faculty who are appointed or elected to the councils and boards of professional organizations within the state (e.g., state psychological or educational agencies, regulatory bodies, task forces, professional groups) make service contributions to the community at large. Candidates should describe in their dossiers the nature of the state-wide organizations they have served, as well as the services provided.

2.3.14. Regional, national, and international professional groups. Psychologists who are appointed or elected to the councils and boards of professional organizations in regional, national, and international professional associations and related groups (e.g., federal task forces) make service contributions to an even broader community. Candidates should describe in their dossier the nature of the regional and national organizations they have served, as well as the services provided.

2.3.15. Service to other universities. Candidates should document the extent to which they have served as external reviewers of candidates being considered for tenure and/or promotion at other institutions.

2.3.16. Appointment to study committees. Candidates should identify and describe their participation on study committees responsible for the evaluation of major programs and research efforts in psychology and related fields (e.g., institutional accreditations; institutional self-studies; professional or governmental task-forces).

2.3.17. Contributions to grant review panels. Candidates should document their appointment and service on grant review study panels.

2.3.18. Public advisory activity. Appointment or election to public advisory groups or service provided in a variety of capacities to community programs, governmental agencies, public and private social service agencies at local, state, national, and international levels should be documented in the candidate's dossier as further evidence of service to the greater community.

2.3.19. Evidence of professional expertise. Community service is the application of the candidate's psychological expertise to solve community problems. The ultimate value of community service of this sort lies in its impact on the lives of others. Evidence of the extent to which the candidate's professional expertise is sought after to solve community problems should be documented in the candidate's dossier.

Section 3: Tenure and Promotion Review (Tenure Track)

3.1. Mid-Tenure Review

3.1.1. Mid-tenure review of non-tenured tenure-track faculty is conducted according to guidelines and procedures from the university's Faculty Handbook and the College of Arts and Sciences. This review typically occurs in the spring term of the third year of the tenure-track faculty member's probationary period unless the faculty member has been granted an alternate probationary period.

3.1.2. The role of the departmental T&P Committee in the mid-tenure review is to (a) evaluate the faculty member's performance, (b) provide the faculty member with constructive feedback for making progress to the granting of tenure, and (c) submit a recommendation on retention.

3.1.3. Each candidate for the mid-tenure review must prepare an online dossier according to the format required by the university for tenure and promotion, with the exception that external letters of review are not required.

3.1.4. The calendar of dates for the mid-tenure review—including the deadline for dossier submission—is posted online by the College of Arts and Sciences.

3.1.5. Only tenured members of the T&P Committee are eligible to attend the mid-tenure review meeting.

3.1.6. The T&P Committee votes on whether each mid-tenure review candidate is making satisfactory progress toward the granting of tenure. If the committee does not approve a vote of satisfactory progress, a second vote is taken on whether the candidate should be retained. These mid-tenure review votes follow the same procedures and criterion of approval used for voting on tenure and promotion (see [6.4 Voting Procedures](#)).

3.1.7. Letters summarizing the deliberations and decisions regarding each mid-tenure review candidate are prepared and approved following committee procedures for preparing, approving, and submitting reports (see [6.5 Committee Reports](#)).

3.2. Service Requirement for Promotion

3.2.1. A tenure-track faculty member is eligible to apply for promotion to the associate rank after having served at the assistant rank for the minimum number of years specified in the university's Faculty Handbook or as determined by the provost.

3.2.2. A tenure-track faculty member is eligible to apply for promotion to the professor rank after having served at the associate rank for the minimum number of years specified in the university's Faculty Handbook or as determined by the provost.

3.3. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The university's Faculty Handbook identifies qualities expected for promotion to the rank of associate professor.

Consistent with these expectations, the department believes that promotion to the rank of associate professor requires clear and demonstrable evidence that the candidate has developed a program of teaching and scholarly activity, which is original and of high quality. The candidate should have the ability to supervise the training of students for scholarly inquiry. Candidates should be clearly recognized for their impact and effectiveness as a teacher and advisor. Candidates should show evidence of having mastered their discipline and the ability to carry out independent inquiry leading to high quality publications in peer-reviewed journals. Additional evidence shall include the information on competitively awarded grants and the publication of peer-reviewed books and book chapters and other scholarly activities. It should be noted that in reviewing an individual's scholarly activity, there should be evidence of sustained performance. Service is an important supplementary component of the candidate's activities for appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor and the significance of the candidate's service should be documented.

3.4. Criteria for Promotion to Professor

The university's Faculty Handbook identifies qualities expected for promotion to the rank of professor.

Consistent with these expectations, the department believes that promotion to the rank of professor implies advanced academic maturity and requires clear and demonstrable evidence that the candidate has achieved recognition as a national authority in the candidate's discipline through the development of an original program of teaching or scholarly activity. Candidates should be clearly superior in their teaching activity and there should be evidence of excellent performance and impact on the field by students whom the candidate has prepared for careers, professional and academic. The scholarly output of the candidate should be consistent and sustained and should have developed a theme or major area of expertise. There should be one or more outstanding publications with the particular stamp of the personality and contribution of the investigator who is a candidate for professorship. Additional evidence shall include the information on competitively awarded grants and the publication of peer-reviewed books and book chapters and other scholarly activities. Service is an important supplementary component of the candidate's activities and should have contributed significantly to major policy formation and have had a demonstrated impact in the candidate's field within the framework of professionally related community activities which contribute to department, college and university functions, professional organizations, and the local, state, national or international community.

Section 4: Promotion Review (Non-Tenure Tracks)

4.1. Service Requirement for Promotion

4.1.1. A non-tenure-track faculty member is eligible to apply for promotion to the associate rank after having served at the assistant rank for the minimum number of years specified in the university's Faculty Handbook or as determined by the provost.

[4.1.2.](#) A non-tenure-track faculty member is eligible to apply for promotion to the professor rank after having served at the associate rank for the minimum number of years specified in the university's Faculty Handbook or as determined by the provost.

[4.2. Promotion Review Process](#)

Promotion review of non-tenure-track faculty follows the same dossier submission, application review, and voting procedures used in the promotion review of tenure-track faculty.

[4.3. Criteria for Promotion](#)

The university's Faculty Handbook identifies qualities expected for promotion to the associate and professor ranks for non-tenure-track faculty. The areas of performance (teaching, research, and/or service) that are the primary focus of evaluation during the promotion review are determined by the areas of academic responsibility specified in the candidate's appointment document.

The department believes that performance of non-tenure-track faculty in their areas of academic responsibility (teaching, research, and/or service) should be comparable to the excellence in performance in the specified areas expected of department faculty in the tenure track (see [3.3. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor](#) and [3.4. Criteria for Promotion to Professor](#)). Similarly, demonstrating performance in the specified areas of academic responsibility (teaching, research, and/or service) should follow the suggestions for those areas in [Section 2: Demonstrating Performance](#).

[4.4. External Peer Review](#)

If research is specified as an area of academic responsibility in the non-tenure-track faculty member's appointment document, external letters of review are required for the promotion review.

Section 5: Application Process

5.1. Declaration of Candidacy

5.1.1. The department submits the names of candidates scheduled for mid-tenure review to the College of Arts and Sciences by the deadline specified on the mid-tenure review calendar posted online by the college.

5.1.2. Faculty members planning to apply for tenure and/or promotion must declare their intention in writing to the department chair and T&P Committee chair by the deadline on the tenure and promotion calendar posted online by the College of Arts and Sciences. At least one month before this deadline, the T&P Committee chair will announce the candidacy deadline to department faculty.

5.2. Candidate Subcommittees

5.2.1. Each candidate will be assisted in the preparation of a complete and representative dossier by a three-member subcommittee. Each member of the subcommittee must be eligible to vote on the candidate's application for tenure and/or promotion.

5.2.2. The candidate will select the subcommittee chair. The chair of the subcommittee shall be a person familiar to the extent possible with the candidate's work and his or her area of specialization. The remaining two members of the subcommittee shall be selected by the department chair with the approval of the subcommittee chair. These two members shall consist of one member from the Clinical/School Faculty and one member from the Experimental Faculty. For an Experimental Faculty candidate, the Experimental Faculty subcommittee member must be outside the candidate's area of specialization.

5.2.3. For mid-tenure reviews, the candidate subcommittee will be created at least three months before the deadline for submitting names of mid-tenure review candidates to the College of Arts and Sciences. For tenure and promotion reviews, the candidate subcommittee will be created as soon as possible after the candidate announces the intention to apply.

5.2.4. The subcommittee members are not necessarily advocates for the candidate. The purpose of the subcommittee is to try to ensure that the full T&P Committee has all of the data necessary to make an informed decision about the candidate. Members of the entire T&P Committee are encouraged to inform the subcommittee of any information or data they believe the candidate should address in his or her dossier.

5.3. Candidate Dossiers

5.3.1. Candidates must submit their dossier materials online according to university guidelines by the deadline specified on the tenure and promotion calendar posted online by the College of Arts and Sciences.

5.3.2. For the review of tenure-track faculty and non-tenure-track faculty whose academic responsibilities include research, candidates must identify and include in their dossiers three publications they believe reflect their best scholarly work.

5.3.3. The candidate may not include any letters of evaluation from persons currently under the candidate's supervision (e.g., students, advisees, graduate assistants, employees).

5.3.4. The chair of the candidate's subcommittee will screen the online dossier for completeness and appropriateness and provide feedback to the candidate. Guided by the subcommittee chair's review, the candidate may add or delete dossier materials up until the submission deadline posted online by the College of Arts and Sciences.

5.3.5. As soon as possible after the deadline for dossier submission, a candidate's dossier will be made available to members of the T&P Committee eligible to vote on that candidate. Members of the committee eligible to vote on a candidate are expected to study the candidate's dossier in preparation for a committee meeting.

5.3.6. A candidate for promotion can withdraw from consideration up to the point where the departmental T&P Committee vote has been taken and forwarded to the College of Arts and Sciences. Once the college receives the vote

and dossier, the candidate cannot withdraw from further consideration. Candidates for tenure, however, cannot withdraw from the process.

5.4. External Letters

5.4.1. Candidates for tenure or promotion who are in the tenure-track and candidates for promotion in a non-tenure track whose academic responsibilities include research must have external peer review letters included in their promotion dossier.

5.4.2. By May 15th, candidates requiring external peer review must submit a list of at least ten prominent potential external reviewers who are in a position to evaluate their work. The candidate will provide names, addresses, phone numbers, and email addresses for each person on this list. The candidate will also provide a description of any prior relationship with persons listed as potential reviewers on the candidate's list. The candidate may also provide a list of persons whom the candidate prefers not to be on the list of reviewers.

5.4.3. Each candidate's subcommittee will ensure that the candidate's list of potential reviewers is acceptable (e.g., reviewers possess sufficient expertise, are nationally visible) and will decide if potential reviewers are to be removed from the list due to conflicts of interest (e.g., prior relationships, former major advisor, research collaborator). The subcommittee will further identify a list of additional potential reviewers in consultation with faculty in the candidate's area. The candidate may not review the subcommittee's list.

5.4.4. When external peer review is required, a minimum of four external review letters must be included in the dossier. At least two letters will be obtained from potential reviewers on the candidate's list and at least two letters will be obtained from potential reviewers on the subcommittee's list.

5.4.5. The subcommittee chair will solicit the external review letters. Reviewers will be provided a copy of these guidelines, the candidate's vita, and a sample of the candidate's scholarly work. Reviewers will be asked to evaluate the candidate's scholarship, address the candidate's level of national visibility, and assess the candidate's professional contributions relative to other people in the

same field at the same level. The reviewer will also be asked to provide a specific recommendation for or against the candidate's application for tenure and/or promotion.

5.4.6. The ultimate responsibility for obtaining the external letters of review rests with the chair of the candidate's subcommittee and the chair of the department. The subcommittee chair is responsible for submitting the background information on each external reviewer as required by university guidelines for the dossier.

5.4.7. External reviewers will be assured that all possible steps will be taken to guarantee confidentiality of their letters. Although confidentiality can be assured at the departmental level of review, the authors of external review letters should be informed that in tenure and promotion appeal procedures, confidentiality of their letters cannot be guaranteed.

Section 6: Department Tenure and Promotion Committee

6.1. Composition

Meetings of the T&P Committee include tenured and non-tenure-track faculty at the associate and professor ranks in the department with the following considerations:

6.1.1. The departmental chair is not a member of the committee and may neither attend nor vote in committee deliberations of candidates for tenure, promotion, or mid-tenure review. However, annual evaluations of the candidate completed by the department chair may be requested by the chair of the candidate's subcommittee. The department chair may participate in meetings deliberating T&P Committee policies and procedures.

6.1.2. Committee members are not permitted to participate in T&P Committee deliberations or vote on candidates with whom they have an obvious conflict of interest (i.e., married faculty, other non-married relatives). When committee members perceive that a conflict of interest may exist between candidates and

individual committee members (i.e., intimate non-marital relationships), any committee member may request a vote on whether the committee member in question will be allowed to participate in the deliberations and vote on a candidate. The committee member in question may not vote to resolve his or her own conflict of interest issue. If the request for a vote on whether a committee member will be allowed to participate in the deliberations is seconded, the motion is discussed and put to a vote. Majority approval is required by the committee for the member in question to be allowed to participate in the deliberations and vote.

6.1.3. Tenured associate professors and professors may vote on candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor and for candidates undergoing the mid-tenure review. Only tenured professors may vote on promotion to that rank. Tenured associate professors may not sit in on the deliberations, nor vote following the deliberations, on candidates for professor. However, if the candidate is being considered for tenure *and* promotion to professor, all tenured members of the T&P Committee are eligible to deliberate and vote on the tenure decision, but only professors may deliberate and vote on the promotion decision.

6.1.4. All tenure-track associate professors and professors may vote on candidates for promotion to the non-tenure-track ranks of associate professor of teaching, research associate professor, and clinical associate professor. All tenure-track professors may vote on candidates for promotion to the non-tenure-track ranks of professor of teaching, research professor, and clinical professor.

6.1.5. Non-tenure-track members of the T&P Committee may vote only on candidates for the associate rank within their track (teaching, research, or clinical). Non-tenure-track members of the T&P Committee at the professor rank may vote on the promotion to that rank only for candidates within their track (teaching, research, clinical).

6.1.6. Candidates for promotion to professor may not be present or vote on other candidates also seeking promotion to the rank of professor. Candidates for

promotion to professor (if tenured) may participate and vote in all deliberations for candidates for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor.

6.1.7. According to college guidelines, the departmental representative to the College T&P Committee votes at the department level but must later recuse him/herself at the college level during discussion and votes on members from the Department of Psychology.

6.2. Selection of Committee Chair

6.2.1. The T&P Committee will elect one of its voting members by the end of the spring term to serve as its chair for a one-year term. The department chair may hold the election of the new T&P Committee chair by email vote.

6.2.2. The committee chair will assume responsibility for initiating and coordinating the activities of the committee for a one-year period beginning at the end of the spring term.

6.3. Meetings

6.3.1. Meetings may be called to review candidates or to conduct other T&P Committee business. Meetings to consider tenure, promotion, or the mid-tenure review shall be conducted using an in-person format except when circumstances require that departmental meetings be conducted via an online, virtual format. At the discretion of the T&P Committee, email votes may be taken to approve matters of policy and procedure.

6.3.2. Meetings for the review of candidates for tenure, promotion, or the mid-tenure review will be scheduled by the T&P Committee chair to allow sufficient time for written committee recommendations to be approved and submitted to candidate online dossiers by college deadlines.

6.3.3. Committee members are expected to keep T&P Committee deliberations and discussions confidential.

6.3.4. In meetings evaluating applications for tenure and/or promotion, candidates will be deliberated on by the committee in the following review order:

1. promotion to associate professor of teaching
2. promotion to research associate professor
3. promotion to clinical associate professor
4. promotion to associate professor
5. tenure and promotion to associate professor
6. tenure of associate professor
7. promotion to professor of teaching
8. promotion to research professor
9. promotion to clinical professor
10. promotion to professor
11. tenure and promotion to professor
12. tenure of professor

Within categories, candidates will be considered in alphabetical order from *A* to *Z* according to their last names.

6.3.5. In meetings in which multiple candidates for mid-tenure review are being evaluated, candidates will be considered in alphabetical order from *A* to *Z* according to their last names.

6.4. Voting Procedures

6.4.1. A quorum for meetings requires the presence of 2/3rds of eligible voting members of the committee. A positive recommendation requires that at least 2/3rds of those voting on a candidate vote in favor. In determining the 2/3rds requirement, *abstain* votes have the same effect as a *no* vote. Motions to alter policies and procedures will be determined by a majority.

6.4.2. The T&P Committee vote on each candidate will be by secret ballot. If the meeting is conducted online or virtually, the procedure must assure the confidentiality of each member's vote. Only those committee members present for the discussion of the candidate will be eligible to vote on the candidate. Absentee votes are not permitted.

6.4.3. During T&P Committee meetings in which decisions are to be made on more than one candidate, votes will be taken on all candidates but counts on individual candidates will not be conducted until all candidates have been discussed and voted on by the committee.

6.5. Committee Reports

6.5.1. For meetings involving tenure, promotion, or mid-tenure review, the T&P Committee chair will forward to the department chair the committee recommendation for each candidate along with a count of the votes on which each recommendation is based.

6.5.2. As soon as possible after a T&P Committee meeting involving tenure, promotion, or mid-tenure review, a letter summarizing the committee deliberations for each candidate will be prepared by the chair of the candidate's subcommittee and submitted to the T&P Committee chair, who will coordinate a vote on approval of each of these summary letters.

6.5.3. Only those persons present for the deliberation and voting on a candidate are eligible to participate in the voting process to approve the summary letter for that candidate. Approval of a summary letter requires that at least 2/3rds of the eligible committee members vote in favor. If this 2/3rds approval is not attained, the letter must be revised to reflect concerns and then resubmitted to the eligible members for additional votes until at least 2/3rds of eligible committee members vote in favor. Voting on summary letters may be conducted by online polling.

6.5.4. The T&P Committee chair will submit to the online dossier of each candidate the approved letter supporting the committee recommendation, be it positive or negative. In the case of a negative recommendation, the committee chair will also submit to the online dossier any additional forms required by university procedures.

6.5.5. If a candidate on the tenure track submits a written rebuttal to a negative T&P Committee recommendation of the candidate's application, the T&P Committee chair will oversee review of the rebuttal, committee revote, and

submission of additional dossier documentation as specified in the university's Faculty Handbook.

6.6. Modification of Guidelines

6.6.1. At least once each year the T&P Committee chair will call for a review of these guidelines.

6.6.2. If recommendations for modification of the guidelines are submitted, the T&P Committee chair will coordinate deliberations and voting on the proposed changes. At the discretion of the T&P Committee chair, deliberations and voting on guideline changes may be carried out using an online format.

6.6.3. All members of the T&P Committee along with the department chair are eligible to vote on guidelines changes. Approval of a change to the guidelines requires a majority vote in favor.