

Department of Psychology
Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Regulations
Approved by the department faculty: April 20, 2018

Departmental recommendations for reappointment, promotion, and tenure must accord with the standards, guidelines, and regulations of the College and the University. Accordingly, the departmental guidelines and regulations are supplementary to College and University documents governing reappointment, tenure, and promotion. In the case of any conflict, the College and University documents take precedence. All members of the department are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the relevant documents (including the College's "Best Practices in Promotion and Tenure").

Application of the University and College standards to individual cases requires an understanding of the prevailing expectations, standards of achievement, and practices in the candidate's discipline. Therefore, the department will provide a written description and explanation of these standards and expectations as part of recommendations for promotion. Consistent with university regulations and the department's desire to provide timely feedback to faculty, all faculty below the rank of Professor receive annual written feedback on their progress toward promotion and/or tenure. The purpose of the review and the letters is to provide the faculty member with constructive and formative feedback to help guide progress toward promotion and/or tenure. This feedback will be based on an annual review conducted by the Head in conjunction with all tenured members of the department senior in rank. The feedback letters will be prepared by the Head and reviewed by tenured faculty who are senior in rank.

The review will be based upon the faculty member's detailed CV, updated annual report, student and peer evaluations of teaching, and other materials as provided by the faculty member or as deemed relevant by the reviewing faculty. For faculty who are not scheduled for mandatory review, the outcome of the annual review meeting may include a decision by the faculty and the Head to initiate a formal promotion and/or tenure review.

Reappointment Review

The review of tenure-track Assistant Professors for reappointment takes place during the third-year of their initial four-year probationary term. The review will be conducted by the Department Head and all tenured faculty at a meeting during November or early December. The Department Head is responsible for assembling and making the relevant materials available for review; these materials are the same materials that are reviewed during the annual review. The recommendation for reappointment by the faculty will be determined by secret ballot. The Reappointment Review report form will be completed by the Department Head, signed by the candidate, and submitted to the Dean.

Promotion and/or Tenure Review

A. Procedures

For each promotion and/or tenure case, the candidate's Departmental Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee will consist of all tenured faculty members above the candidate's rank. The following is a typical timetable for the review process, beginning in the spring term before the review year.

April

Mandatory reviews of faculty for promotion and/or tenure occur on a timetable and under conditions described in the University Regulations. In some cases, faculty may be reviewed for tenure and/or promotion at a time and/or under conditions that would not prompt a mandatory review. The decision to initiate a non-

mandatory review will be made by the Head in consultation with tenured faculty senior in rank to the candidate as part of the annual process of faculty review and after consultation with the Dean. In addition, candidates in and beyond their 6th year with tenure can authorize a non-mandatory review for promotion to Professor.

The Department Head will call a meeting of all members of a candidate's P&T committee but will not attend the meeting. Instead, the Head will appoint a meeting chair, who will be responsible for managing the process of electing a chair of the candidate's P&T committee and the sub-committee of faculty members who will be responsible for writing the research, teaching, and service faculty-evaluation sections of the Faculty Deliberations Meeting report. Under exceptional circumstances in which no agreement can be reached regarding the assignment of a member of the candidate's P&T committee to serve as committee chair, the Head may consult with the Dean regarding the appointment of an individual who is not an existing member of the P&T committee to serve as chair of the committee. The rights and responsibilities of an external chair are described in the College Regulations.

The Department Head will set the date for the Faculty Deliberations Meeting (during the following August or September) and will establish the dates when other aspects of the review procedure must be completed in accord with the College and University regulations.

In all review cases, the Department Head will request from the faculty member: (1) a narrative summary of the candidate's scholarship in a form suitable for inclusion in the package of materials sent to the external reviewers, and (2) a detailed CV that includes a brief summary of the nature of the candidate's contributions to multi-authored publications, grants, and other projects completed since the last promotion. The candidate will also select up to five representative publications to be sent to external reviewers. Most, if not all, of the selected publications must reflect work done during the candidate's time in rank at UNCG except when the candidate was hired with an explicit agreement that prior work be considered.

May

The Department Head will begin the process of soliciting letters of evaluation from external reviewers (although only 3 letters are needed, it is departmental practice to solicit initially at least 4) to assess the quality of the candidate's scholarly contributions. Materials (detailed CV, research statement, and up to five publications as described earlier) will be sent to reviewers by early June.

Potential reviewers may not include individuals with conflicts of interest as described in Section 3 of the University Regulations and Section VI of the College Regulations. Reviewers will be selected by the Department Head. The Head will ask the candidate to list at least four potential reviewers. As noted in the College Regulations, the candidate may also request that certain individuals not be asked to provide a review. After receiving the candidate's list and the optional request for exclusion of particular individuals, the Department Head will independently create a second list of at least four additional potential reviewers; this list will be created through consultation with faculty senior in rank to the candidate and/or through other means (e.g., solicitation of names from journal editors). The Department Head will use both lists to generate the names of reviewers to contact, ideally by selecting an equal number of reviewers from each list, but necessarily including at least one name submitted by the candidate.

In addition to the external reviewers who are contacted to assess the candidate's scholarship, the Head, in consultation with the candidate and the chair of the candidate's P&T Committee, may solicit letters from one or more of the candidate's research collaborators to provide feedback regarding the candidate's contributions to multi-investigator research projects. The Department Head will also work with the candidate to ensure that letters are available to provide feedback regarding the quality of a candidate's service.

The Department Head will solicit letters from the candidate's current and former students to assess the candidate's teaching and mentorship. The candidate will be asked to provide a list of at least four graduate students, including all students for whom the candidate has served as an advisor during time in rank at UNCG, and at least three undergraduates. The Head will contact as many of these students as possible to request feedback regarding the candidate's teaching.

The Head will inform the candidate of the need to prepare narrative summaries of the candidate's teaching, research, and service for inclusion in the dossier. The Head will also inform the candidate of the need to assemble other relevant materials (e.g., peer evaluation reports of teaching, letters attesting to the candidate's contributions to various service activities, student communications related to the candidate's teaching). All materials for the candidate's dossier must be assembled and uploaded to the online portal by Aug. 15.

August/September

The candidate's entire package of materials (including letters from external reviewers) will be made available by the Head for review by the candidate's P&T Committee according to the timetable established the previous spring.

At a meeting chaired initially by the Head, the candidate's P&T Committee will convene to review the factual material in the dossier. The Department Head will then leave and the Chair of the candidate's P&T committee will preside over a discussion and evaluation of the candidate, after which a vote by secret ballot will be taken. Usually, a faculty member must be present to vote. As per the University guidelines on who can vote:

'Assembling' refers to the actual physical presence of the tenured faculty. However, if there are extenuating circumstances that prevent a particular tenured faculty member from being physically present, then that faculty member may participate by real-time electronic means, such as speakerphone or video conference, with prior approval of the Dean. Such use of electronic means for participation during the deliberation process does not modify any other requirements for the vote.

Also, under special circumstances explicitly outlined in advance (e.g., the person is present for most of the discussion but must leave before the committee as a whole is prepared to vote) and approved by the Head, a written ballot may be left with the Chair and counted as a valid vote.

The teaching, research, and service evaluation sections of the report will be written by the respective subcommittee members, and initial drafts of the evaluation will be circulated prior to the meeting. The final versions of these sections of the report must be written after the Faculty Deliberations meeting and must fairly represent any diversity of views presented during that meeting. The Chair of the candidate's committee will also prepare a general summary of the Faculty Deliberations meeting. For candidates seeking promotion to Associate Professor, the chair's summary should include a discussion of the future directions of the candidate's research activities and the candidate's promise for eventual promotion to Professor. Drafts of the evaluation sections and the chair's summary prepared after the Faculty Deliberations meeting must be circulated to all members of the P&T Committee for comment prior to the preparation of the final version of the report that becomes part of the candidate's dossier. The report is complete when all faculty believe that the opinions of all faculty members are represented in the document. The P&T Committee Chair is charged with preparing the final version of the Faculty Deliberations meeting report (including the evaluative summaries) for inclusion in the dossier and is also responsible for including in the dossier the results of the vote taken at the Faculty Deliberations meeting.

The entire dossier, including the Faculty Deliberations meeting report, will be submitted to the Department Head by the chair of the P&T Committee according to the timetable prepared the previous spring. The

Department Head will write a separate evaluation, make his or her own recommendation and upload the entire package into the online portal according to the College calendar.

B. Expectations

The department evaluates faculty for promotion and/or tenure in terms of accomplishment in the three areas of Teaching, Research, and Service, but not in terms of the optional fourth area, Directed Professional Activity. In general, the department expects effective and committed teaching, an ongoing program of original and important scholarship, and consistent and effective service. Given these premises, we have adopted the following guidelines for promotion and tenure review.

Scholarship

Scholarship must include the development and dissemination of a meaningful program of research. The discipline of psychology is diverse in the topics it studies, the methods it uses, and the aims of its research. The department values this pluralism and recognizes that it precludes a one-size-fits-all approach to evaluating scholarship. For example, rates of publication, availability of grant funding, and audiences for research vary greatly within psychology. When evaluating scholarship, the department seeks to do so in light of the candidate's area of research, scholarly goals, and scientific methods.

The department acknowledges the value of Community Engaged Scholarship (CES) as defined in the College and University Guidelines. Candidates who expect to present CES as a significant component of their record of scholarly achievement and who anticipate that their documentation of CES achievements will involve forms of evidence other than those described below (i.e., other than, for example, publication in peer-reviewed scientific journals) should consult with the Department Head as soon as possible to discuss appropriate forms of documentation of CES achievements.

The department expects all faculty members to show evidence of a successful and ongoing program of active scholarship that leads to the publication of original work. Evidence of active scholarship also includes the presentation of scholarly papers at professional conferences.

Candidates for reappointment are expected to have instituted an identifiable program of research at UNCG that shows promise of producing scientific publications, presentations, and grant submissions.

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor are expected to have established a successful and influential research program for which they have provided intellectual leadership. The department expects that the candidate will have published scientific results in important professional outlets, presented at professional conferences, and applied for external grant funding. Furthermore, candidates' research programs and accomplishments should show promise of sustained excellence over time.

Three areas demonstrate the development of a successful program of research and dissemination of information:

1. Publications

The typical candidate will primarily have published peer-reviewed articles in scholarly journals. Books, while valued, are relatively uncommon in psychology and are not expected for promotion and/or tenure. Chapters in edited books can be evidence for a successful research program in light of the nature of the contribution and the published book, but they are typically given less weight than peer-reviewed articles and books. Non-peer-reviewed contributions are usually less important than peer-reviewed scholarly articles and books when judging the significance of a candidate's body of work.

Candidates must show evidence of intellectual leadership for an independent program of research, and this is shown by serving as lead author on a substantial number of their publications. Lead-authored publications are particularly important for pre-tenure candidates. Because mentoring graduate and undergraduate students in research (see Teaching, below) is challenging, time-consuming, and central to our research mission, publications in which a student is lead author reflect well on the candidate's research program. (The convention in Psychology's journals is that the first author is the lead author. If a journal has different authorship conventions, the candidate should explain it in his or her statement.)

The department recognizes that psychology's subareas vary in their typical rates of publication (e.g., the number of articles published per year), the length of a typical article, the venues that are seen as significant and prestigious for that community, and the average citation rates and impact factors for a field's journals, and it evaluates the quality and productivity of a research program in light of the candidate's area of research.

2. External Research Funding

Faculty are expected to apply for external research funding. The department certainly values successfully funded applications, but it does not require candidates to successfully obtain external funding for them to be promoted and/or tenured. The number of applications is evaluated in light of the nature of the research program and the sponsors, which vary in their funding cycles, opportunities to submit and resubmit, and so forth. Developing grant proposals takes substantial time and effort that would ordinarily be spent on other research activities (e.g., writing articles), so the department takes grant submissions into account, and the faculty member's role and effort in the proposal submission, when evaluating the productivity of published work.

External funding, such as from private foundations and federal and state agencies, is valued substantially more than internal funding from UNCG sources. The department recognizes that the amount of funding available and the nature of the relevant sponsors vary across the fields of psychology (e.g., more money is available for some topics, and it is more common to seek funding from private foundations and community groups in some fields).

3. Presentations

Faculty are expected to present their work to audiences of their peers. The most common forms are presentations at scholarly conferences and invited presentations at other academic institutions. In psychology, large national and international conferences are not necessarily more prestigious than smaller meetings focused on an area of scholarship. The department expects candidates to choose the meetings that will allow them to build their reputations and disseminate their work to appropriate audiences.

Many psychologists also give presentations to the media and non-academic groups, often as part of spreading psychological science to the public and building relationships with the community. Although such presentations are not required, they are valued by the department.

Teaching

Teaching is a primary goal of the department. Teaching activities take place at both the undergraduate and graduate level. The standard course load in the department is two courses per semester. Successful candidates for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion must show evidence of effective teaching. Evidence

of effective teaching should include a body of peer observations, letters from current and former students, and student evaluations. In addition to standard classroom activities, contributions to teaching may include (but aren't limited to):

- training post-doctoral associates
- mentoring graduate student research (including serving on graduate student thesis and dissertation committees)
- mentoring undergraduate research
- attending continuing education in teaching (e.g., conferences and workshops)
- training others in teaching
- conducting research on pedagogy
- developing and successfully teaching new courses
- writing textbooks
- creating innovative classroom techniques
- using techniques that increase students' writing and communication skills
- using innovative information technology

Service

Service is defined as non-teaching and non-research activities that the faculty member undertakes within

- the Department of Psychology
- the College of Arts and Sciences
- the University
- the profession of psychology
- the community at large

The Department Head will seek to protect Assistant Professors from an undue service burden that might interfere with the successful development of their program of research at UNCG, and will advise and assign service assignments to ensure an appropriate level of service. Service to the community that is not related to the discipline or the University mission is not considered relevant for tenure and/or promotion.

Examples of service to the profession include serving as an ad hoc reviewer for academic journals, reviewing grants for external funding agencies, serving as reviewer for academic conference submissions, reviewing book proposals and manuscripts for publishers, serving on a journal's editorial board, serving as editor or associate editor for an academic journal, organizing an academic conference, serving as an external evaluator of promotion and tenure dossiers, conducting external reviews of programs and departments, and serving in the leadership of academic societies. These aspects of service to the profession also provide evidence related to the candidate's level of national or international reputation for scholarship.

Clinical Licensure Requirement

For faculty hired in the clinical psychology program who start employment July, 2018 or later, licensure in the state of North Carolina as a Health Services Provider Psychologist (HSP-P) will be needed to achieve promotion and tenure.

Promotion to Professor

Initiation of Formal Review of a Candidate for Promotion to Professor

The process of formally reviewing an Associate Professor candidate for promotion to Professor begins with the solicitation of letters of evaluation from external reviewers. In all cases, this process cannot proceed without the consent of the candidate. The decision to initiate the formal process of review for promotion may occur in three different ways:

1. The formal review of an Associate Professor for promotion to Professor may be initiated by a vote by a majority of the department's Professors (excluding the Department Head).
2. The Department Head may decide to initiate the process at any time during a candidate's time in rank as an Associate Professor. In the Department of Psychology, the Department Head generally does not initiate the formal promotion review process but instead defers to the recommendations of the majority of the Professors in the department.
3. Candidates themselves may formally request a review by submitting a request in writing to the Department Head, following procedures described in the *UNCG Regulations (section 3.E.iii.b.)*. Candidates in their 6th year at rank with tenure will automatically be reviewed in this circumstance. In the Department of Psychology, candidates requesting review without 6 years of tenure still require the Head's endorsement or a majority vote by the Professors.

Review of a candidate for promotion to Professor is not a mandatory review; the candidate can choose not to request a review and may decline the Head's or senior faculty's decision to seek a review. The candidate's decision not to request review does not preclude a candidate from choosing to be reviewed in any subsequent year.

Once a formal review has begun, the candidate may withdraw his or her portfolio at any time. If a review is unsuccessful or if the candidate withdraws his or her portfolio after a negative recommendation at the College or University levels, the candidate may next request a review during the third (or any subsequent) year of service following notice of the unsuccessful bid. However, the department can still initiate a review prior to that time.

Role of Time in Rank

Although there is no specified minimum time in rank as an Associate Professor that is required for promotion to Professor, time in rank is a salient consideration. The quantity and impact of accomplishments accumulate during time in rank as an Associate Professor, and it is these accomplishments during time in rank that form the primary focus of promotion reviews for Associate Professors.

The question of when an Associate Professor is considered by the Department Head and/or by the department Professors to be ready for a formal promotion review is discussed as part of each faculty member's annual review, and annual review letters provide feedback to the faculty member regarding progress toward formal review for promotion.

Standards for Promotion

In the area of research, candidates must, at a minimum, have maintained as an Associate Professor a significant and sustained program of original scholarship that has led to important publications (see *Section B, Expectations, Scholarship* above for a more extensive discussion of forms of scholarship recognized by the department). Scholarship conducted during the Associate Professor period is the primary basis for evaluating research accomplishments for candidates seeking promotion to Full Professor.

As with promotion decisions for Assistant Professors, the department recognizes the broad diversity in the topics, methods, and aims of scientific research in psychology, so variation across subfields in rates of publication, authorship order, and so forth will be taken into consideration. Like Assistant Professors, Associate Professors will usually have different patterns and trajectories in their research programs, which often develop and evolve during the Associate Professor period. For example, some might develop lines of work that involve large collaborative teams, in which they play a secondary role in many projects; others might focus on fewer-but-larger projects; and still others might follow the same path as the Assistant Professor period. The department acknowledges and values the many trajectories of research and emphasizes the overall quality, significance, and impact of a candidate's research program when evaluating the candidate for promotion to Full Professor.

The department expects a sustained program of scholarship throughout the Associate Professor period. Typically, a sustained program would be reflected in a consistent rate of publications, presentations, and grant applications that is at least as high as the expectations during the Assistant Professor period. The department recognizes, however, that a candidate may shift his or her scholarly focus (e.g., taking on larger, more ambitious projects that take more time to yield scholarly publications). All candidates should describe the sustained quality of their research so it can be evaluated appropriately.

Receiving external grant funding is not required for promotion to Professor, but all candidates must have a record of seeking and/or holding external grant support during their time as an Associate Professor.

In the area of teaching, candidates must, at a minimum, have a demonstrated record of effective teaching as an Associate Professor.

In the area of service, candidates for promotion to Professor are expected, at a minimum, to have participated significantly in departmental service activities and College/University service activities in ways that reflect leadership in service and a commitment to UNCG's mission. Candidates are also expected to have a record of substantial service to the profession.

Balance of Teaching, Research, Service

Significant and sustained contributions in each of the areas of teaching, research, and service are expected of all candidates for promotion to Professor. Beyond that, **the combination of accomplishments across the three areas must lead to an overall judgment by the department's Professors that the candidate has excelled and deserves promotion.** In many cases, such overall excellence may be demonstrated through leadership and excellence in at least one of the three areas along with (at a minimum) significant and sustained contributions in the other two areas. Each faculty member's unique combination of skills and accomplishments allows for considerable variation in the credentials that might qualify for promotion to Professor. Nevertheless, the department places significant weight on sustained contributions to research during the Associate Professor period.

All Associate Professors should discuss their progress toward becoming a candidate for promotion with the Department Head each year.