Department of Psychology Statement on Criteria for Faculty Promotion/Tenure

A. General Procedures

An annual written evaluation containing the strengths and/or weaknesses of each non-tenured faculty member is prepared by a committee of all tenured faculty. Evaluation of Assistant Professors for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor is made by a committee of all Associate and Full Professors. A committee of Full Professors evaluates both the Associate Professors for promotion (to Full Professor) as well as retiring faculty members for Emeritus status. All committees submit their recommendations to the Department Chair who formulates the departmental recommendations. Departmental recommendations are then reviewed by the Department Advisory Committee. In each of the above evaluations the following are considered and will be discussed in detail in later sections.

B. Teaching

Faculty members at all ranks must be effective at both graduate and undergraduate teaching.

Relevant Data for Assessment

Student Evaluations: If so desired, the non-tenured faculty members may submit course evaluations during their annual evaluations. At the time of the tenure decision additional student evaluations are actively solicited by the tenured faculty from past and present Graduate and undergraduate students.

Faculty Evaluations: The tenured faculty have opportunities to directly evaluate the non-tenured faculty during departmental activities such as lectures, paper presentations, seminars and student discussion groups.

Expectations

The Department regards effectiveness in teaching as a critical goal to be achieved by a candidate for tenure or promotion to Associate Professor. Promotion to Professor requires clear indications of continuing development in teaching. To be recommended for Emeritus status the individual must have demonstrated at least ten years of effective teaching at TCU.
C. Research

Research productivity is evaluated in the following areas with each area being given approximately equal weight.

Relevant Data for Assessment

Publications in nationally recognized professional journals; scholarly books; chapters in scholarly books; publications of technical reports of research.

Presentations of original papers at international, national, or regional meeting of recognized professional societies.

The submission of proposals for extramural support of the candidate's research program resulting in positive reviews and/or funding.

The supervision of theses and dissertations.

There is no set number of required publications or presentations because each subfield has its own journals and professional societies and because the time required to complete research projects varies dramatically among subfields. Quality is more important than mere quantity.

Expectations

The candidates for tenure or promotion to Associate Professor must have accomplishments in each of the above listed areas to receive favorable evaluation. Candidates for Professors are expected to have established an international or national reputation as suggested (but not limited) by offices held in professional organizations, invited lectures, membership on national committees, editorships, proposal reviewing, awards, honorary degrees and other similar professional activities. Recommendation for Emeritus status requires that the individual must have demonstrated at least ten years of quality research productivity at TCU.

D. Service

Each faculty member must donate time and talents in service to the university and/or community.
Relevant Data for Assessment

Evidence of service will consist of membership on departmental, college, and university committees; participation in relevant community programs; academic advising; professional consulting, and similar activities.

Expectations

Faculty of all ranks are expected to participate in service activities. Promotion to Professor requires evidence of leadership and sustained service.

E. Advising

All faculty are expected to advise and counsel undergraduate or graduate students; this include graduate students whose research the faculty are supervising.

F. Professional Development

Faculty members are expected to remain current in professional knowledge, skills, and developments within their disciplines and fields of specialization. They should actively pursue programs of study and self-development related to their principle subjects of instruction and research and should continue to cultivate their interests and professional competency.

Department of Psychology
Procedure for Five-Year Assessment of Tenured Faculty Members

Purpose

An internal assessment is part of the Psychology Department's continuous appraisal of its purposes, policies, and programs. The five-year assessment of tenured faculty members contributes to setting departmental goals, developing departmental plans, and evaluation departmental effectiveness. The assessment is conducted on a rotating schedule that provides a review of each tenured member of the department every five years.
This review of faculty members is not related to the awarding of permanent tenure and does not affect permanent tenure. Only faculty members with tenure are included in this assessment.

The five-year assessment differs from annual merit reviews in its focus on departmental planning. The assessment procedure allows the department chair to address with each tenured faculty member the faculty member's strengths and role within the department's programs. By using each faculty member's strengths, different tenured faculty members will be able to contribute to the department's goals in different ways.

Procedures

1. The department chair designates approximately one-fifth of the tenured faculty to be evaluated during the spring semester of each academic year. Each tenured faculty member is evaluated once during five academic years.

2. In preparation for the review, each tenured faculty member submits to the department chair a current TCU vita, a description of accomplishments over the past five years, and a projection of accomplishments for the next five years.

3. The evaluation is conducted and written by the department chair.

4. The faculty member (s) who are evaluated receive a copy of the chair's evaluation.

5. Faculty members who accept the chair's evaluation simply acknowledge having received a copy of the evaluation. Faculty members who disagree with the chair's evaluation may submit a proposed revision of the evaluation to the chair.

6. If the chair accepts the faculty member's proposed revision (or if no revisions are requested), the department advisory committee reviews the evaluation, with the sole purpose of determining whether the chair followed correct procedure and adequately addressed the criteria specified below.

7. If the chair does not accept the faculty member's proposed revision, both the chair and the faculty member submit written defenses of their proposed evaluations to the chair of the department advisory committee.
8. The department advisory committee (minus the faculty member being considered if that faculty member happens to be on the advisory committee) decides on the exact wording of the final evaluation.

9. When it is the department chair's turn to be evaluated, the department advisory committee conducts and writes the evaluation. As part of evaluating the department chair, the advisory committee considers both the chair's record as a faculty member and the chair's performance as department chair. The department chair, like any other faculty member, may suggest a revision of his or her evaluation to the advisory committee. The committee considers the proposed revision and decides on the exact wording of the final evaluation.

Criteria

1. The chair's evaluation addresses five areas: a) teaching, b) research, c) service, d) advising, and e) professional development. Criteria for each area of evaluation are consistent with those described in the department's current document on tenure and promotion.

2. The "professional development" section of the evaluation a) assesses professional development over the previous five years, and b) includes a forward-looking component that describes future performance expectations.