

## **Procedures and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion in the Department of Psychology**

*Approved by UCTP November 14, 2012*

### DEPARTMENT MISSION

The mission of the Psychology Department is to promote and advance the discipline of psychology as a basic and applied science. This is achieved through (1) excellence in scientific research and scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; (2) the dissemination of psychological knowledge to students at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels; and (3) service to the university, community, and profession. In particular, the department stresses high quality undergraduate instruction and advising, graduate student professional development and mentoring, and the achievement of national prominence among its graduate programs.

The evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion is based on the candidate's record in all three areas: scholarship, teaching, and service. Scholarship and teaching are weighted most heavily in the tenure and promotion decision. Because the department seeks to maintain and extend its national reputation in research, in most cases research excellence is given greater weight in the tenure and promotion decision than teaching. The department, however, does recognize that there may be individuals who are exceptionally noteworthy in teaching and have a sufficiently strong research record to qualify for tenure and promotion, provided that service performance is rated at least good. Service is considered a necessary but not sufficient condition for tenure. Time and accomplishments in a faculty position at another educational institution may be considered in evaluating a candidate for tenure or promotion. A minimum period of service at USC for faculty hired from another institution to be considered for tenure or promotion is not required. Candidates for faculty appointments may be recommended for tenure on appointment.

The Department's evaluation of a candidate will be consistent with the general criteria incorporated in the Faculty Manual. The general criteria are as follows:

The university is committed to achievement in research (including scholarship, creative activity in visual and performing arts), teaching, and service. This commitment extends to interdisciplinary research, teaching, and service. Collectively, the faculty profile of the university and of any academic unit should reflect performance consistent with that of major research universities.

Criteria for all tenure and promotion decisions shall require a record of accomplishment indicative of continuing development of the faculty member in research, teaching, and service, and appropriate progress toward development of a national or international reputation in a field. Criteria for tenure at any rank must require evidence of consistency and durability of performance.

The criteria for tenure and promotion and the factors considered in evaluating the three areas are described in I. below.

#### MOVEMENT OF FACULTY BETWEEN TENURE AND NON-TENURE TRACKS

The following actions may not be taken without approval of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the affected unit: (1) movement of a non-tenure track faculty member to the tenure track without a competitive search; or (2) movement to a non-tenure track faculty position of a tenure-track faculty member who withdraws from the tenure track during the penultimate year without applying for tenure. For purposes of this section, a tenure-track faculty member who achieves tenure is referred to as a tenured faculty member.

#### JOINTLY APPOINTED FACULTY

Jointly appointed faculty are faculty members whose tenure home is in one unit (the “primary unit”) and who have a part time appointment, with some combination of teaching, research, and service obligations, in one (or more) other unit or program (the “secondary unit”). A joint appointment is formalized by a Memorandum of Understanding or Charter that specifies the responsibilities of the faculty member to the primary and secondary units.

#### NEPOTISM POLICY

The rules of conduct for public employees contained in the South Carolina Ethics, Government Accountability, and Campaign Reform Act prohibit a public employee from causing the employment, appointment, promotion, transfer, or advancement of a family member to a state or local office or position supervised or managed by the public employee. In addition, a public employee may not participate in an action relating to the discipline of the public employee’s family member.

#### I. DEPARTMENT CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

A faculty member may not be tenured at the rank of assistant professor. Tenure is not normally awarded at the time of initial appointment, but in some circumstances candidates may be recommended for tenure upon appointment. Consistency and durability of performance are relevant factors in evaluating faculty for tenure. Specific information about probationary periods for tenure can be found starting on page 20 of the Faculty Manual.

The department's evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion is based on the candidate's record in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The Faculty Manual mandates the use of the following adjectival standards (pp. 23-24):

Outstanding: The candidate’s performance is far above the minimally effective level. In regard to research and scholarship, output is of very high quality, and a national/international reputation is evident.

Excellent: The candidate significantly exceeds the minimally effective level of performance. In regard to research and scholarship, output is already of high quality, and a national/international reputation is clearly possible, if not likely.

Good: The candidate's performance is clearly above the minimally effective level. In regard to research and scholarship, he or she shows promise of high quality in the future.

Fair: The candidate meets the minimally effective level of performance.

Unacceptable: The candidate has accomplished less than the minimally effective level of performance.

The criteria for tenure and promotion and the factors considered in evaluating scholarship, teaching, and service are described below.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate should have a record of excellent performance usually involving both teaching and research. The candidate should demonstrate a sustained and continuing record of achievement in scholarship beyond the dissertation, principally in the form of publications. There should be evidence that the candidate has established a reputation among peers within the candidate's discipline as a productive scholar. Evidence of a reputation as a productive scholar will be indicated by a majority of external reviewers so indicating and by peer judgments of the scholarly activities listed in the section below labeled scholarship. Teaching should be evaluated as good or better. Effective teaching will be indicated by a majority of peer evaluations rating the candidate as good or better, and a majority of student evaluations that achieve an overall evaluation of good or better. There should be a record of service activities. All faculty are expected to contribute to the necessary service functions of the department, college, university, and/or professional community. Necessary service functions include attendance at faculty meetings, contribution in some form to at least one of the graduate training programs, and service for at least two years on a department, college or university committee. The faculty member is expected to hold the earned doctor's degree and must possess strong potential for further development as a teacher and scholar.

Promotion to Professor. The candidate should have a record of excellent performance, usually involving both teaching and research. Achievement in research is principally in the form of publications that have resulted in a substantial scholarly contribution to the field and a national reputation in the candidate's area of expertise. A substantial scholarly contribution and national reputation will be indicated by at least a majority of external reviewers so indicating and publication in nationally recognized peer-reviewed journals and other publication outlets. Nationally recognized publication outlets are normally those published by or officially endorsed by scientific and professional organizations. Teaching should be consistently evaluated as excellent or better, and there should be a record of service activities to the field of psychology at the regional, national, or international levels as well as continued service at the departmental and university levels.

**Faculty with Joint Appointments.** The criteria for granting tenure or promotion to a jointly appointed faculty member shall be those of the primary unit. For faculty holding joint appointments, each secondary unit must be given an opportunity to propose outside evaluators and to comment on evaluators proposed by the primary unit. Primary and secondary units should work together to obtain a suitable and representative group of evaluators. An evaluation must be solicited from at least one evaluator nominated or approved by each secondary unit.

Any department or program that is the secondary unit for one or more faculty members with joint appointments must have in effect a written statement of procedures, which must be approved by the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion, and by which the views of all faculty eligible to participate in evaluation of the candidate will be solicited and provided for inclusion in the candidate's file. In cases in which the secondary unit does not achieve consensus regarding a file, the secondary unit may submit two letters for inclusion in the candidate's file: A majority and a minority report. Any department that is the primary unit for one or more faculty members with joint appointments must include in its criteria processes for (1) involving each secondary department or program in the selection of outside evaluators; (2) making the candidate's file available to eligible faculty of each secondary unit; and (3) obtaining formal input from the eligible faculty of each secondary unit and placing it in the candidate's file at least five working days prior to the unit's vote on the application. Faculty who are members of both the primary and secondary unit can only vote in the primary unit.

A memorandum of understanding (MOU) must be in place for all faculty members holding joint appointments. The MOU should include (1) identification of the tenuring unit; (2) teaching load and split of teaching load between the primary and secondary units; (3) formula and criteria for sharing indirect cost return (IDCR) among the units; and (4) service responsibility load and split between the units. The MOU should include signatures of the jointly appointed faculty member, the unit heads of the primary and secondary units, the deans of the colleges in the units reside, and the provost. The teaching load for a joint appointment should not be greater than for a faculty member of the same rank in the primary unit. The service load for a joint appointment should be comparable to normal service load of a faculty member of the same rank in the primary unit. The MOU should be included in the candidate's file.

### Scholarship

Scholarly activity involves the formulation and dissemination of new knowledge. Scholarly activity will be judged in terms of the quality and quantity of contributions, principally in the form of publications, and the consistency of productivity. Scholarly writing may take any of a number of forms including reporting of new empirical data, critiques of existing paradigms, development of theory, and integrative research reviews. In consideration for promotion and tenure, there is the expectation that some scholarly writing will involve reporting of empirical work. The following items may serve as evidence of scholarly activity. This list is not exhaustive. It is not necessary that candidacy be supported by all the items listed.

- a) Authored books
- b) Edited books
- c) Monographs
- d) Refereed journal articles
- e) Book chapters
- f) Research grants from non-university sources
- g) Research training grants obtained on the basis of the PI's research competence
- h) Research grants from university sources
- i) Presentations at professional and scholarly meetings
- j) Colloquium presentations at universities
- k) Book reviews
- l) Non-refereed publications

Quality of scholarly activities may be judged by the following (the list is not exhaustive; items are listed in no particular order with regard to importance or weight; candidacy need not be supported by all items listed):

- a) publication of books, chapters and papers in publications that employ peer review. In general, books representing major scholarly contributions to the individuals' sub-specialty constitute evidence of greater scholarship than do textbooks, which in turn constitute greater evidence of scholarship than a book of readings.
- b) publication of articles in major journals in the specialty area that employ peer review
- c) citations of the candidate's work by other scholars
- d) grant support for the candidate's research from agencies that use peer review of proposals
- e) written evaluations of the quality and impact of scholarly activity from nationally recognized scholars, such as those provided by external reviewers of the candidate's work.
- f) research awards and other forms of recognition for scholarly contributions
- g) appointment as Editor of professional/scientific journal or edited book series
- h) appointment to editorial board of professional/scientific journal
- i) appointment as reviewer for professional/scientific journal
- j) appointment to a grant review panel.

## Teaching and Student Development

A record of effective teaching is required of all tenure and promotion candidates. As defined by the Department of Psychology, teaching and student development involves classroom instruction of graduate and undergraduate students, supervision of individual student projects, and advising of students. In addition, because the Department of Psychology combines the functions of a professional school and a traditional academic department, supervision of student clinical activities is of importance for faculty members in the School Psychology and Clinical/Community Psychology programs, as well as more traditional academic teaching and research supervision functions. The intensive and time-consuming nature of such supervision requires that it be recognized as a teaching activity. An effective teacher maintains up-to-date knowledge of the subject matter being taught, conveys content in a clear manner that students can readily follow, responds appropriately to students' questions, conducts evaluations of academic performance in a fair and appropriate manner, and structures teaching activities in an organized way that is conducive to learning.

The following activities fall within the area of teaching and student development (the list is not exhaustive; candidacy need not be supported by all items listed).

- a) Teaching of undergraduate courses
- b) Teaching of graduate courses
- c) Supervision of practicum and/or internship
- d) Supervision of theses and dissertations
- e) Supervision of other student research
- f) Supervision of graduate comprehensive projects
- g) Supervision of undergraduate independent study projects
- h) Supervision of postdoctoral students
- i) Preparation of new courses
- j) Willingness to teach core courses for undergraduate and graduate programs
- k) Student advising
- l) Consultant to faculty and students on research issues
- m) Obtaining funds for training
- n) Awards received by student mentees including grants, research awards and other competitive prizes

The Department requires student evaluations of all courses, graduate and undergraduate, and periodic peer evaluations at all ranks. The combined information from student evaluations, peer reviews, and other items below are presented along with a summary report of teaching effectiveness. This report is prepared by a senior faculty member selected by the candidate and approved by the department chair.

Effectiveness of teaching and supervision can be judged by the following (the list is not exhaustive):

- a) student evaluations of teaching or supervision performance from questionnaires and/or rating scales collected since the last change in rank which achieve an overall evaluation of at least “good”.
- b) peer evaluations of performance derived from class observations and curriculum review completed since the last change in rank in which a majority of peer evaluators rate the candidate as at least “good”. Peer evaluations should not be conducted during the last week of classes. The evaluations will take the form of letters addressed to the evaluators of the file; a letter to the candidate is not appropriate.
- c) course syllabi for all courses taught since the last change in rank rated by a majority of peer evaluators as appropriate to the breadth and depth of the course.
- d) number of completed theses, dissertations and other supervised student research projects judged by peers to be average or above for the specialty area.
- e) quantity and quality of publications resulting from student research judged by peers to be average or above for the specialty area.
- f) written statements from current and former students identifying the candidate as having made a significant contribution to their professional development.
- g) teaching awards
- h) student evaluations of advising derived from questionnaires or rating scales which achieve an overall evaluation at least “good”.
- i) awards for student advising.

A teaching summary will be prepared by a faculty member above the rank of the candidate. This person should not be a collaborator.

Exceptional Noteworthiness In Teaching. To make a case for being exceptionally noteworthy in teaching, a candidate needs to demonstrate teaching performance and impact that is well beyond the department’s average expectation for good teaching. Such performance and impact should be clearly documented. Exceptional noteworthiness in teaching can be demonstrated by receipt of a university, regional or national teaching award, placing in the top 10% of the department on student and peer teaching evaluations, and other demonstrations of exceptional quality in at least one of the following activities: functioning as a master teacher or effective teaching mentor for other faculty; favorable appraisal by independent experts; development of a special curriculum that receives national recognition; documentation of how the candidate’s teaching benefited students in their subsequent activities or career paths.

### Service

A record of sustained, effective service is expected of all faculty and is required of all tenure and promotion candidates. Service activities may be engaged in within one or more of the following settings: department, college, university, community and/or larger society, profession. Examples of service activities to each of these entities are provided below. The lists are not exhaustive. All candidates must be evaluated as at least good in service. An evaluation of good in service is achieved through evidence of

consistent and positive performance in at least a few of the realms listed below. It is not necessary that candidacy be supported by all the items listed.

Department:

Participant on or chair of Department committees  
 Director of department program, clinic or institute  
 Other administrative responsibilities

College and/or University:

Participant on or chair of committees  
 Faculty governance participation  
 Other administrative responsibilities

Community and/or Society:

Consultant to local, state or federal agency  
 Presentations to community groups  
 Participation as a function of expertise as a professional psychologist in groups that serve the community

Profession:

Officer of national, regional or state professional/scientific association  
 Committee chair or committee member for professional/scientific association  
 Organizer of professional/scientific conferences

Effectiveness of service can be judged by the following (the list is not exhaustive; candidacy need not be supported by all items listed):

- a) letters acknowledging the contribution of service activities from the groups affected
- b) documentation of committee accomplishments under the directorship of the candidate
- c) documented recognition of the Department, College, or University as a result of service rendered by the candidate
- d) location of national, regional, or community centers within the Department as a function of the candidate's contributions

## II. DECISION-MAKING PROCEDURES

All non-tenured faculty in the tenure track are considered for tenure, and all faculty members below the rank of professor are considered for promotion each year. A faculty member may request not to be reviewed except in the decision year for tenure. A faculty member may also prepare a vita and request that the record be reviewed but not formally voted on for promotion and/or tenure. In this case, unless it is the faculty member's decision year for tenure, the committee will review the record for feedback

purposes only. The results of this review will be communicated to the department chair who will incorporate this information into the regular annual feedback conference with the faculty member.

The Committee. Each tenure decision will be made by a committee of all tenured faculty members of rank equal to or higher than the candidate. Each promotion decision will be made by a committee of all tenured faculty members of higher rank than the candidate. Each year, all faculty members in the department will elect from among tenured full professors a tenure and promotion chairperson who will chair the committees for decisions to be made during that year.

The File. **Note that all tenure and promotion files must be submitted electronically, as described on the University's Tenure and Promotion website ([www.sc.edu/tenure](http://www.sc.edu/tenure)).** Candidates will submit their primary file in the prescribed electronic format, rather than printing a hard copy. New T&P forms have been developed to make it easier for candidates to create their files and for reviewers to review them. (Candidates can produce the files from existing forms if they so prefer.) External Reviewers will submit their reviews as electronic documents. (If necessary, letters can be scanned and converted to the appropriate format at the unit level.) Unit T&P Chairs will use appropriate software to append to the primary file all items received at the unit level (such as teaching summaries, external reviewer letters, and ballots), instead of working with paper files. Unit T&P Committee members will review a file by accessing it through a secure web-based program approved by the University. Ballots/vote justifications will be submitted in electronic format through a secure “double-envelope” process.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide to the department chair the information necessary for a complete electronic file. Procedures for preparing electronic files can be found at the University's Tenure & Promotion website: <http://www.sc.edu/tenure/index.shtml>. The file should consist of the following:

- a) A current vita which includes information on teaching history, publications, presentations, research supervision, clinical supervision, clinical activities, editorial activities, grant activity, service activities and other achievements and activities to be considered in the tenure and promotion review. The vita must conform to university and department format.
- b) A listing of teaching assignments since the last change in rank with course syllabi for each.
- c) A summary of student and peer teaching evaluations prepared by a member of the committee chosen by the candidate
- d) Copies of student teaching evaluations by course and student advising evaluation reports since the last change in rank.
- e) All peer teaching evaluations since the last change in rank.

- f) Letters from outside referees solicited by the Department Chair. Appropriate referees are those who are nationally recognized scholars in areas relevant to the candidate's published work, excluding a thesis or dissertation director, co-authors, or co-research investigator on a grant. The intent is to avoid any conflict of interest that would render the external judgment as suspect. At least eight referees will be sought by the Department Chair, who will ask potential reviewers if they have any prior relationship with the candidate that might appear to make the evaluation less than objective to other readers. Candidates are not allowed to choose any of the referees. Suggestions for referees will be provided by senior faculty and the Department Chair. Files will be sent only to referees who have confirmed that they will perform the review after being contacted by the Department Chair by phone or letter. The referee will receive a packet of information including the candidate's vita, selected reprints, personal statement, department tenure and promotion criteria, and an explanatory letter from the Chair. In turn, the referee will supply the evaluation and a brief resume. At least seven external evaluations and all that are received if more than seven are obtained will be placed in the file.

In the case of candidates wishing in addition to document exceptional noteworthiness of teaching, the Chair in consultation with senior faculty from the candidate's program should devise a method for procuring letters by appropriate outside referees to evaluate teaching noteworthiness. This type of outside evaluation, though optional, should parallel the process of obtaining outside evaluations of scholarship. A minimum of three outside evaluations of teaching are recommended if this option is undertaken. Examples of a teaching portfolio for the evaluators to review may include, but are not limited to, syllabi of all courses taught, copies of examinations, videotaped samples of teaching, vita with particular attention to teaching-related activities, summaries of peer evaluations, detailed distributions of student evaluations, uncensored student written comments, and evidence of the quality of performance for item examples listed above under Teaching and Student Development.

- g) Letters from co-investigators, co-authors and former students solicited by the Department Chair. In many cases letters from co-investigators and co-authors may be important in evaluating the level and significance of the candidate's contributions to published collaborative work. Confidential letters from former students commenting on the candidate's role in their professional development may be important in considering the candidate's role in student development. The Department Chair in consultation with senior faculty from the candidate's program will solicit confidential letters from individuals in this category relevant to the candidate's contribution to collaborative work and professional development. These letters will be included in the file, but they will be clearly distinguished from those in section (f) above.

- h) Citation Data. The candidate will collect citations, less self-citations, from the appropriate citation index and other relevant sources.
- i) Reprints of publications or other relevant evidence of scholarship.
- j) Each candidate is expected to give a departmental colloquium within a year prior to the faculty tenure/promotion vote with the primary purpose of providing information to the faculty about the candidate's current research and future directions.
- k) Other materials and support letters the candidate deems relevant.
- l) A list of all items in the file will be included and it will be signed by the applicant.
- m) A copy of the applicable Departmental criteria for tenure and promotion, signed by the candidate, will be included with the file.

The Vote. It is the responsibility of each committee member to carefully review the file prior to the committee meeting. The department chair will maintain a record of those faculty who have reviewed the file. The committee will meet to consider all materials contained in the file. Faculty will vote independently by secret ballot and submit vote and justification to the chair of the tenure and promotion committee within seven days of the committee meeting. Two conditions are necessary to recommend tenure or promotion: (1) a positive vote of a majority of those eligible to vote, and (2) a positive vote from at least two-thirds of the committee members **actually** voting, where actually voting is defined as casting a positive, negative, or abstention ballot. Abstention votes will be included in calculating the majority required to send a file forward. Absentee ballots from faculty members on leave who have reviewed the file and who have notified the Chair in writing of their intention to vote prior to the date of the vote will be included. Each vote must be accompanied by a written justification. The department chair is not eligible to vote in the committee balloting, but rather prepares a separate summary evaluation to the dean. The department chair is expected to attend the committee meeting for informational purposes.

### Timeline

Deadline for tenure decisions concerning probationary faculty. Before the end of the probationary period, a decision will be made to grant or deny tenure. If the decision is to deny tenure, notice will be given by letter dated and postmarked before the end of the penultimate year of the maximum probationary period. For faculty with a nine-month appointment with a tenure start date of August 16, the penultimate year ends on May 15. For faculty with a nine-month appointment with a tenure start dates of January 1, the penultimate year ends on December 31. For faculty with a twelve-month appointment, the penultimate year ends on August 15. If notice is not given in the time and manner stated above, the appointment of the faculty member will thereafter be a continuous (or tenured) appointment.

Non-reappointment in conjunction with denial of tenure in the penultimate year may be grounds for a grievance under the full provisions of the Academic Grievance Procedures. Calendars for tenure and promotion decisions are available through the provost's website and may change from year to year. The file should be available to faculty at least one week before the committee meeting. The committee members have one week to submit ballots after the meeting.

Follow-up. Following the committee vote, the chair of the committee will convey the decision in writing to the candidate. The Department Chair will forward the materials in the file including all votes and their written justifications, and in addition a Department Chair's summary evaluation, to the Dean.

A candidate may appeal a negative decision of the departmental committee and, upon written request to the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair, shall have his/her file sent through all appropriate channels (the originating committee, the Department Chair, the Dean, the Provost, and the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure) and finally to the President for action. The candidate's written request of appeal must be made to the departmental T&P Committee Chair before the file is officially due in the Dean's Office.

---

Approved by Psychology Department Faculty  
September 28, 2012  
Approved by UCTP \_\_\_\_\_