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The Department of Psychology Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual supplements and complements the Auburn University Faculty Handbook and College of Liberal Arts guidelines. Since the basic and fundamental review of faculty takes place within the department, the purpose of these guidelines is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria and guidelines for faculty assignments, faculty evaluation, and promotion and tenure at the departmental level. Department guidelines are intended to conform to those of the Auburn University Faculty Handbook (revised 6/17/11) and the College of Liberal Arts. Therefore, it is important for faculty to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in these guidelines and in the University and College documents. In event of conflict among documents, their precedence is University, College, Department. Any reference to the Faculty Handbook in this document refers to the current version.

The Psychology department’s faculty evaluation process is intended to: guide faculty toward enhanced success; clarify faculty goals; inform annual assignments that reflect the short and long-term vision of the department; include faculty in discussions and decisions; and provide consistent and clear criteria for promotion and tenure recommendations, as applicable.

The faculty evaluation process in the College of Liberal Arts includes several components, among them the letter of appointment, annual workload assignment, and annual performance reviews and feedback. Tenure track and Clinical track positions include provision for promotion review. Tenure track faculty are subject to a third-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, research, outreach, and service (as applicable to the faculty member’s assignment) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance at any time before tenure. The focus of the third-year review for clinical track faculty is the faculty member’s progress toward achieving promotion to associate clinical professor, yet still recognizing that clinical faculty are on continuing appointments that necessitate annual contract renewal. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in assigned areas of performance (such as clinical teaching, clinical outreach, service, scholarship, professional development) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance, effective at the conclusion of the annual contract in force.

Reference to “Tenure track” faculty in this document includes tenured faculty, unless otherwise noted.

The Appointment Letter

The appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to teaching, research, outreach, and service. Examples of appointment letters may be found at the following URL: https://sites.auburn.edu/academic/COLA/CLA_Dean/cladeptguidelines/SitePages/Home.aspx

Annual Workload Assignment

Annual faculty assignments reflect that faculty members working in various disciplines contribute in different ways. Annual assignment plans reflect collaborative discussion between faculty and department chair. They provide opportunity to review progress, set goals, guide faculty toward success, and clarify metrics of evaluation. All Tenure track faculty, Clinical track faculty, Non-Tenure track faculty, Instructors, and Lecturers should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

The College of Liberal Arts Workload Guidelines state:

Initial workload assignments for tenure-track faculty (TTF) are negotiated upon hire, and are distributed across all areas of responsibility; teaching, research/creative scholarly works, outreach, extension and service. Occasionally, administrative duties may also be included as a percent of a faculty member’s workload if it is part of their normal assignment. Workload assignments may be adjusted on an annual basis during the annual review process to reflect any changes in a faculty member’s assignment for the following year. The department head/chair meets with each faculty member during the faculty annual
review process to discuss and negotiate anticipated workload changes. The faculty member signs the
annual review which includes the stated workload assignment for the following year to assure that every
faculty member is aware of his/her responsibilities. The original signed annual review is to be kept in the
departmental personnel file. Three copies are to be submitted to the Office of the Dean (one copy will be
kept on file in the Dean’s Office, one copy will be placed in the CLA’s faculty personnel file and one copy
will be delivered to the Office of the Provost).

Description of Types of Faculty Positions

Tenure Track Faculty (TTF)
The “typical” annual teaching assignment for “research active” TTF is 5 courses1 (or department FTE
equivalent) equaling 62.5% per year. Consistent with university guidelines, all research active TTF are
assigned a minimum 25% research/creative/scholarly outreach2 workload for promotion and tenure
purposes. The annual teaching assignment for “highly productive” research TTF is 4 courses3 (or
department FTE equivalent) equaling 50% per year. The status of highly productive research TTF
requires the approval of the Dean. In situations where a tenured associate professor or professor is not
fulfilling a 25% requirement for scholarly activity, the department chair will provide a memorandum of
understanding (MOU) to ensure that a tenured faculty member has a 100% workload. In this case, the
faculty member would be assigned a differential workload with a minimum of 10% research, in order to
stay current in the field for teaching purposes. It is expected that the faculty member will receive an
increase in the teaching load, with the understanding that he/she cannot be promoted just on
research productivity will be considered over a 3 year period. If a faculty member is not
research productive for 3 years, then there will be an increase in the teaching load proportionally. During
that 3-year period, if he/she does becomes productive and demonstrates that he/she can be productive
for 3 years in research, then there will be a reduction in the teaching load to acknowledge the increase in
research.

Clinical Track Faculty (CTF)
CTF are generally assigned teaching loads ranging from 5-8 courses a year (or department FTE
equivalent). There is not a minimum research workload requirement. According to AU guidelines4 the
clinician title series is a professional series for appointment of appropriately qualified individuals who
contribute to the university’s academic mission by participation in activities which (1) predominantly
involve clinical practice, (2) are of contractually specified duration, and (3) operate under contracts,
grants, generated income, or other designated funds. Note, however, that CTF are expected to teach in
the clinical setting.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF)
NTTF may be assigned some teaching; but it cannot exceed one course per semester and three courses
per year.

Instructors/Lecturers will be assigned 100% teaching loads of 8 courses per year. Any exceptions will
need approval by the Dean. In addition to the definition of teaching stated in the Faculty Handbook,
teaching in CLA includes: holding regular office hours, mentoring and advising students, keeping current
in the field, attendance of departmental meetings relevant to teaching, participating in departmental life
and the engagement of students.

Appendix 1 outlines the university’s expectations for teaching, research, outreach, and service.

Workload adjustment for sabbaticals and leaves. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave
related to teaching would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% teaching appointment for leave

---

1 A course is defined as a 3 contact hour course.
2 "In terms of your questions, it is my understanding that the former Provost said that a tenure track faculty member on hire must
have a minimum of 25% research, scholarship of pedagogy or outreach, or creative activity. Therefore, I will continue that tradition."
- Email from Dr. Mazey sent to Paula Bobrowski 5/10/2009.
3 Ibid.
4 http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/clinician_positions.html#appointment
extending across the evaluation period. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave related to research would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% research appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. A similar allocation may apply for other types of leave. In any case, the evaluation metrics must add up to 100% and factor in the faculty member's regular appointment during the portion of the review period not on leave.

See Appendix 2 for Departmental Workload Guidelines.

Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status.

All faculty receive annual evaluations. All Tenure track faculty, Clinical track faculty, Non-Tenure track faculty, Instructors, and Lecturers should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

Performance Descriptors. The annual review of performance in each area to which one is assigned will be assessed a performance score of 4 - Exemplary (characterizing performance of high merit), 3 - Exceeds Expectations (characterizing performance of merit), 2 - Meets Expectations (characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure), 1 – Marginal (characterizing performance that may not be sufficient to justify continuation) or 0 – Unacceptable (characterizing performance not sufficient to justify continuation).

See Appendix 3 for Workload Distribution and Performance Review Chart.

The annual review normally covers performance for the preceding calendar year. Research productivity will be considered over a 3-year period. Evaluative statements from previous years will be consulted to determine response to previous suggestions for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and tenure, if applicable, to their appointment.

See Appendix 4 for Departmental Annual Review Guidelines.

Written evaluation report

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

The unit head shall prepare a written report summarizing the major points of the conference. A copy of the report shall be provided to the faculty member within a month of the conference. If there are no objections, the faculty member shall be asked to sign it as confirmation of having seen it. If the faculty member does not agree with the material in the report, he or she may write a response to be appended to the report. A copy of the signed report and response, if there is one, is to be retained for the faculty member's departmental personnel file; another copy is to be given to the faculty member; a third copy is sent to the Office of the Provost. To the extent permitted by law, the report is to remain confidential, available only for the use of the concerned faculty member and any University officials who have supervisory power over the faculty member.

Third-Year Review

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Each department shall conduct a third year review of all its probationary faculty members. This shall take place no later than 32 months after initial appointment, normally before April 30 of the faculty member's third year. The head shall request a current vita and any supporting material the head or the faculty member deems appropriate prior to the review. The particular focus of this review is the faculty member's progress toward achieving tenure. The review therefore must address the criteria for tenure set forth in this document. To be maximally useful to the candidate and the department, the review shall involve the
entire tenured faculty. In order for it to accurately reveal the judgment of tenured faculty, it shall conclude with a vote on whether or not, in the judgment of the tenured faculty, the candidate is making appropriate progress toward tenure. The result of the vote shall be announced at the meeting. Faculty should understand that this vote is not a commitment to grant or deny tenure in the future.

The head shall prepare a written report covering the findings of the review, and characterizing the nature of the vote. The procedure described above for the report on the yearly conference shall be followed, with the difference that this report may be consulted by the tenured faculty when the faculty member is a candidate for tenure; otherwise, the report is to remain confidential [to the extent allowable by law].

See Appendix 5 for Departmental Third-Year Review Guidelines.

Promotion and Tenure Review

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Promotion is based on merit. A candidate for promotion should have acceptable achievements in the areas of 1) teaching and/or outreach and 2) research/creative work. He or she is further expected to demonstrate over a sustained period distinctive achievement in one of these areas or achievement in both areas comparable to that of successful candidates in the discipline in the past five years. In addition, he or she is expected to have contributed some service to the University. Candidates covered by Provost approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines will be evaluated accordingly. For candidates not covered by Provost approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines, the criteria for teaching, research/creative work, and outreach described below [see Appendix 1] shall be considered by the faculty in the evaluation of a candidate’s performance and achievement. The candidate’s employment conditions and academic assignments shall determine which criteria are most emphasized, and standards for promotion are based on the weights of each performance area as described in the letter of offer and subsequent annual evaluations. Credit shall also be given for contributions above and beyond specifically assigned duties.

Appendix 1 outlines the university’s expectations for teaching, research, outreach, and service.

Regarding tenure, the AU Faculty Handbook states:

Auburn University nurtures and defends the concept of academic tenure which assures each faculty member freedom, without jeopardy at the department, college or school, or University level, to criticize and advocate changes in existing theories, beliefs, programs, policies, and institutions and guarantees faculty members the right to support, without jeopardy, any colleague whose academic freedom is threatened. Tenure establishes an environment in which truth can be sought and expressed in one’s teaching, research/creative work, outreach work, and service. In addition to demonstrating quality in the areas of 1) teaching, 2) research/creative work, 3) outreach and 4) service as described above under Promotion Criteria and, where applicable, in approved departmental guidelines, the candidate for tenure must also demonstrate potential to contribute as a productive and collegial member of the academic unit in all relevant areas.

Candidates for promotion and tenure should carefully read the Promotion and Tenure policies found in the AU Faculty Handbook. A timeline for the candidate’s submission of materials for evaluation for promotion and tenure will be established each year by the Office of the Provost.

See Appendix 6 for Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

Post-Tenure Review

Tenured faculty at Auburn are subject to post-tenure review as outlined on the Provost’s website at the following URL: http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/policies/2009-11_post-tenured-review-policy.pdf
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Auburn University’s Expectations for Teaching, Research, Outreach, and Service

Teaching
The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Since a primary activity of the University is the instruction of students, careful evaluation of teaching is essential. Because of the difficulty of evaluating teaching effectiveness, faculty members are urged to consider as many relevant measures as possible in appraising the candidate. These include consideration of the candidate’s knowledge of the subject and his or her professional growth in the field of specialization; the candidate’s own statement of his or her teaching philosophy; the quality of the candidate’s teaching as indicated by peer and student evaluations and teaching awards; performance of the candidate’s students on standardized tests or in subsequent classes; the candidate’s contributions to the academic advising of students; the candidate’s development of new courses and curricula; the quality of the candidate’s direction of dissertations, theses, independent study projects, etc.; and the quality of pedagogical material published by the candidate.

Research/Creative Work
The AU Faculty Handbook states:

A faculty member engaged in research/creative work has an obligation to contribute to his or her discipline through applied and/or basic research, through creative endeavors, or through interpretive scholarship. To a large extent, each discipline and each department must determine how much and what quality of research/creative work is appropriate for promotion (and/or tenure) and judge its candidates accordingly. In appraising the candidate’s work, faculty members should consider the quality and significance of the work, the quality of the outlet for publication or exhibition, and, in cases of collaborative work, the role of the candidate.

Research and creative work ordinarily can be documented by a candidate’s publications or performances/exhibitions. Publication subjected to critical review by other scholars as a condition of publication should carry more weight than publication that is not refereed. Nevertheless, all forms of publication, including articles intended for a non-academic audience, should be considered provided they are of high quality in relation to the purpose intended. Scholarly papers subjected to peer review and delivered at a regional or national conference and creative work subjected to peer review and performed or exhibited on a regional or national level should carry more weight than work done only on a local level.

Successful efforts in obtaining extramural support for research/creative work (as well as for teaching and outreach programs) should also be positively considered in evaluation of the candidate.

Outreach
The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Outreach refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university and unit missions. A faculty endeavor may be regarded as outreach scholarship for purposes of tenure and promotion if all the following conditions are met: 1) there is a substantive link with significant human needs and societal problems, issues or concerns; 2) there is a direct application of knowledge to significant human needs and societal problems, issues, or concerns; 3) there is utilization of the faculty member’s academic and professional expertise; 4) the ultimate purpose is for the public or common good; 5) new knowledge is generated for the discipline and/or the audience or clientele; and 6) there is a clear link/relationship between the program/activities and an appropriate academic unit’s mission. Outreach is not expected
of all faculty. Participation in this function varies from major, continuing commitments, as is the case with the Alabama Cooperative Extension System, through intermittent engagement for individual faculty as needs and opportunities for a particular expertise arise, to no involvement at all.

The commitment of faculty time to outreach is a decision to be made by the faculty member with the approval of the department in which the faculty member will seek tenure and/or promotion. It may be accomplished in the initial appointment, as is typically the case for Extension faculty, in annual work plans, or during the year in response to unexpected needs. In any case, this decision should be made with due consideration to the professional development of the faculty member, the expected public benefits of the outreach activities, and mission of the department and/or other supporting units. Departmental approval carries a commitment to assess and appropriately weigh outreach contributions in salary, tenure, and promotion recommendations.

Demands for quality in outreach are the same as in teaching and research/creative work; however, outreach activities are different in nature from other activities and must be evaluated accordingly. See Appendix 1 of Faculty Participation in Outreach Scholarship: An Assessment Model, which is available along with other publications on the assessment of outreach under "Outreach Publications" on the University web site. Department heads should request any material necessary from the candidate to facilitate faculty assessment of the type, quality, and effectiveness of the candidate's involvement in extension activities and evaluation of any resulting publications.

Service
The AU Faculty Handbook states:

University service includes participating in departmental, college or school, and University governance and committee work, assisting in the recruitment of new faculty, and developing and assisting in the implementation of new academic programs. Faculty should note particularly distinctive contributions to University life on the part of the candidate, including service to the candidate's profession, such as offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies; and editorships and the refereeing of manuscripts.
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Departmental Workload Guidelines
These workload guidelines are intended to follow the workload guidelines developed by the College of Liberal Arts (CLA). The CLA workload guidelines define workload expectations for the 9-month academic year. The guidelines defined in this document are for the 9-month academic year and are not used by the department during the summer sessions.

Workload expectations must total 100% effort for an individual faculty member. There are three basic categories of faculty teaching workloads. Research Active faculty members meet departmental expectations for research (See Appendix 4 for the definition of departmental expectations for the three categories described in this paragraph). These individuals have a 2-3 course load (62.5% workload allocation to teaching) with 37.5% of their effort available for other activities. Highly research productive faculty members may have a 2-2 course load (50% workload allocation to teaching) with 50% of their effort available for other activities. Research Inactive faculty members do not meet departmental expectations for research. These individuals have at least a 3-3 course load (75% workload allocation to teaching) with 25% of their effort available for other activities. Untenured tenure track faculty and research faculty must maintain a minimum allocation of 25% effort to research.

I. DEPARTMENTAL FTE COURSE EQUIVALENCIES

The CLA workload guidelines state “The “typical” annual teaching assignment for “research active” TTF is 5 courses (or department FTE equivalent) equaling 62.5% per year.” The remainder of this document lists FTE course equivalencies in the Psychology Department.

The Psychology Department, by nature of its undergraduate and graduate missions, has several FTE course equivalencies which are used to equate effort across a wide range of instructional activities within the department. Each FTE course equivalencies represents extra allocation of effort to teaching that may not be covered by the standard definition of a 2-3 course load. Each faculty member may request that 12.5% of their teaching load be defined by any one of these course equivalencies listed in points 1-11 at the annual performance review with the department chair for the upcoming academic year. No more than one course equivalency (in points 1-11) may be used in one academic year.

These equivalencies represent the Psychology Department’s equating effort across a wide range of disparate course types that must be taught to satisfy both the undergraduate and graduate teaching missions of the department. These include:

1. Large Undergraduate Classes. The Psychology Department has established that any class exceeding 100 students will be the equivalent of one course and one FTE course equivalency for the teaching load of the faculty member.
2. **Undergraduate Courses with Intensive Writing Components.** These classes typically have more than 30 students, require research proposals or research papers of substantial length and these papers are developed by an iterative process. The Psychology Department has established that a class exceeding 30 students and having such a writing component will be the equivalent of one course and one FTE course equivalency for the teaching load of the faculty member.

3. **Large Graduate Content Seminars.** The Psychology Department has Ph.D. content courses which typically exceed the normal size expectations for size (i.e., 5-10) for a Ph.D. seminar in Psychology. The large size in these Psychology courses has arisen because the Psychology Department provides support to other departments and colleges (e.g., the Counseling Psychology Program in the College of Education). The Psychology Department has established that a Fall or Spring Ph.D. seminar exceeding 10 graduate students will be the equivalent of one course and one FTE course equivalency for the teaching load of the faculty member.

4. **Large Graduate Statistics Classes.** The Psychology Department has Ph.D. courses that exceed the normal size expectations for size (more than 20) for a Ph.D statistics course in Psychology. The large size in these Psychology courses has arisen because the Psychology Department provides graduate statistics courses to other departments and colleges (e.g., the Management Department in the College of Business). The Psychology Department provides a two graduate course sequence in statistics for Ph.D. students in the Fall and Spring semesters of the academic year. The Psychology Department has established that one faculty member, teaching both courses in this sequence in statistics and having more than 20 students in each class, will have two classes plus one FTE course equivalency counted towards their workload for these two classes.

5. **Clinical Practicum.** Faculty members teach Psych 8910: Clinical Practicum as part of their teaching assignment. Each section Psych 8910 has between 5 and 9 students. This course requires meeting with students in a group on a weekly basis for 1.5 to 2 hours. These meetings involve formal didactics, training exercises, and case discussion. In addition, faculty member’s hold meeting with each student on a weekly basis (5-9 hours) for individual supervision of their caseload and related matters; reviewing their therapy or assessment tapes, and editing their therapy material. Also, comprehensive reports must be reviewed from the group (2-3 times) (5-9 hours/week); and the faculty member is also responsible for addressing crisis situations and impromptu case needs. Therefore, the time investment for such essential graduate mentoring and apprenticeship is 15-20 hours per week per semester. Faculty members are assigned their section of 8910 for the entire school year. In summary, we The Psychology Department proposes that a faculty member completing a 1-year assignment to 8910 that meets the
minimum enrollment criterion (5 or more students) receive a course equivalency to equate the additional workload of such courses.

6. **Undergraduate Mentoring.** Psychology faculty members provide undergraduate mentoring for students at Auburn University. This mentoring generates hours in courses such as a) Psyc 3910 Supervised Research Experience; b) Psyc 3940 Experiential Learning; c) Psyc 4910 Human Service Practicum; (d) Psyc 4930 Directed Studies and other courses related to the University Honors College and Auburn University Undergraduate Research Fellowships. In each of these courses a faculty member provides one-on-one mentoring to undergraduate students. The number of hours generated by these courses will be tallied by the department chair. When 45 hours (based on the minimum undergraduate student number necessary for a class to make (15) times three hours for a standard class) are accumulated, the faculty member will be able to use this as an FTE course equivalency.

7. **Tenure-Track Faculty and Graduate Student Mentoring.** Tenure-track faculty members are given one FTE course equivalency for having a Ph.D. student as an advisee until till their third-year review. This FTE equivalency allows both junior faculty members and graduate students to develop a collaborative relationship from the earliest possible moment. This FTE course equivalency will be granted through the third-year review process. After the third-year review, each tenure-track faculty member’s eligibility for this course equivalency will be determined by the same metric that tenured faculty members are expected to meet as described below in point 11 of this section.

8. **Master’s Student Mentoring.** Faculty members assigned to the Applied Behavior Analysis master's program teach an intensive one-year, 42-credit graduate program while on a 9-month contract. Apart from courses, faculty are involved in extensive mentoring (e.g., weekly meetings), ongoing clinical supervision, and frequent liaising with practicum sites; faculty members are unpaid for these efforts. A FTE course equivalency is defined by the Psychology Department as having six (6) students assigned to the faculty member acting as primary advisor.

9. **Directorship of the MA Program in DD/ABA.** The directorship of our MA program requires substantial time to coordinate the contract acquisition with external funding agencies used to support MA students in that program. This process of coordinating contracts occurs across the entire 12-month year. The Psychology Department defines this position as equivalent to one FTE course equivalency.

10. **Ph.D. Practica supervision.** Faculty devote time to supervising students placed in practica settings requiring supervision by licensed psychologists. Many of these contracts have benefitted the department's outreach mission and service to the university and region. Moreover, these placements provide ICRE funds. In addition, these contracts also allow the department to maintain a larger graduate
enrollment by funding most clinical students after their first year. These placements require uncompensated work from the faculty of the Clinical Psychology Ph.D. Program. The time devoted to these activities range from 3-9 hours/week based on supervising one to three doctoral students in each placement. This *pro bono* supervision allows the department to save money because there is no need to pay overloads or to hire adjunct professors to provide this supervision. The Psychology Department has established that a faculty member completing two years of pro-bono supervision to support outreach or supplemental training activities, be eligible to receive a course equivalency.

11. **Ph.D. Student Advising.** The mentoring process for Ph.D. students requires that a faculty member provide the guidance and feedback which allows the Ph.D. student to meet the requirements for the Ph.D. degree. The Psychology Department has established that Ph.D. students, for which the faculty member is the advisor, will count as three (3) FTE course equivalencies during the time is a student here.

A. To insure that this mentoring process is ongoing and that Ph.D. students are making adequate progress towards a degree, the course release will be received in the semester after the student’s completion of a) the Masters’ thesis; b) the doctoral preliminary examinations and c) the Ph.D. dissertation.

B. Only one FTE course equivalency per year is allowed under this guidelines option. Therefore, having multiple students making adequate progress will not lead to having multiple teaching FTE course equivalencies within one semester.

C. While having multiple students will not generate more than one FTE course equivalency per semester, having multiple students often occurs. Therefore, the FTE course equivalencies from multiple students may be “banked” by the faculty member. This means that if a faculty member has two students complete their Masters’ thesis (both of which meet the requirements for adequate performance), then one FTE course equivalency may be used for the next year’s course release. The second FTE course equivalency may be used in another year as desired by the faculty member.

**II. VOLUNTARY, UNPAID OVERLOADS**

Unpaid, voluntary course overloads may be necessary because of departmental teaching needs which arise because of several factors (e.g., sudden illness of faculty members or instructors of record) beyond the control of the department and/or may arise because of the need to teach a course with less than the required class size to insure that undergraduate or graduate students maintain their pace towards graduation.

There are several examples of the way in which this may occur. First, a faculty member may have a teaching allocation of 62.5% for an academic year. Sudden illness of another faculty member requires that someone else teach a three hour course. A faculty member volunteers to teach this course (which means the teaching effort is actually 75% for the year). The faculty member doing this course may request that the chair provide credit for teaching this overload course in the next academic year. Second, the department has one-hour courses which must be taught (e.g., Psyc 2020). The faculty member may teach this one-hour course for three semesters as a voluntary, unpaid overload. The
faculty member may then receive a course release for this work. Finally, a faculty member may teach an additional course which does not meet the official class size for a class type (e.g., 3 students in a Ph.D. class instead of 5 students). If this was done twice, (e.g., if the faculty member did this twice with two classes of 3) this would be six Ph.D. students and these two classes would be considered equivalent of 1 full Ph.D. class (based on that the minimum enrollment necessary to “make” equals five for a Ph.D. class).

Faculty members may volunteer to take on a voluntary, unpaid overload from time to time to meet critical teaching needs within the department. This voluntary, unpaid overload may be used at a later time to replace a departmental course for the same number of student contact hours. Faculty members teaching unpaid, voluntary course overloads may use one course equivalency from points 1-11 under Departmental FTE Course Equivalencies as well. These course equivalencies will be documented by the faculty member and the department chair. Final approval of this course release will require the approval of the Dean of CLA.

III. SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

Initial Course Load for Tenure-Track Faculty

The expectation at Auburn University is that a tenure-track faculty member will, by the time of applying for tenure, have begun to develop a national and/or international reputation as a scholar. The department wishes to attract researchers productive researchers with the ability to acquire research grants. It may be necessary to offer a 1-1 teaching load for the first year to be comparable to other research-oriented, Ph.D. granting Psychology Departments. This course load will be determined by discussion between the Dean of CLA, the department chair of Psychology and the new faculty member. Final approval for this must be given by the Dean of CLA.

Faculty Assignment to Psych 7120 (Teaching of Psychology)

Psych 7120 (Teaching of Psychology) is designated a two hour course. The faculty member assigned to this course is expected to coordinate the graduate students acting as GTAs for Psych 2010 (Introduction to Psychology). Therefore, the department considers this to equivalent to a three hour course. Several departmental courses are four hour courses. These additional contact hours will be used to balance the departmental workload for this.

Administrative Service

The Psychology Department has two internal administrative positions receiving course releases for administrative work. These positions are the Undergraduate Program Director and the Director of Clinical Training for the Clinical Psychology Ph.D. program (DCT). These positions require substantial administrative work over Fall, Spring, and Summer sessions. The Undergraduate Program Director receives one (1) course release and the DCT receives two (2) course releases. The effort percentages for these course releases are allocated to Administrative work on these two individuals’ workload.
allocation and on their annual review for performance evaluation. These individuals may still use one FTE course equivalency as well in the determination of their teaching workload.

**Course Buyouts**

Faculty members receiving funding from external sources may allocate a portion of their funding to buying course release time. The purchase of a course release for federal grants and contracts is 12.5% of the nine month salary of a faculty member per course release. The amount per course may vary with the funding source. For example, course buyouts by other University units (e.g., the Honors College) may be less than 12.5% of a faculty member’s salary. However, the amount will always be at least equivalent to the current amount received by a part-time instructor for teaching a course for the Psychology Department (currently $5000).

**Service as Departmental Chair**

The administrative workload of department chairs will curtail their research activity. This puts those individuals serving as a department chair in the position of having to revitalize their research activity anew at the end of their service as chair. Therefore, for each term as department chair, a department chair will receive one year of 2-2 course workload when they return to the classroom. At the end of this period, the former department chair’s eligibility for a research course release will be determined by the same metric that tenured faculty members are expected to meet. This course load must be approved by the Dean of CLA.

**IV. RESEARCH INACTIVE STATUS AND REMEDIATION**

Research Inactive status will be discussed by the faculty member and the department chair during the Spring semester performance evaluation meeting. These individuals will have the option of a) developing a remedial plan, in conjunction with the department chair, for improving their research productivity within one year and retaining their 2-3 course load or b) going to a 3-3 course load immediately. The department chair will be responsible for providing the Dean a list of individual faculty members’ plans to improve research productivity in by April 1st of the academic year prior to which changed workloads occur. Final approval of these plans must be given by the Dean of CLA. Untenured tenure-track faculty cannot be research inactive. They must maintain a minimum allocation of 25% effort to research. Research inactive tenured faculty must maintain a minimum allocation of 10% effort to research.

**V. AMENDING PROCESS**

These guidelines will be reviewed periodically by the Psychology Department as (1) changes in workload guidelines occur at university or college level and/or (2) as internal, departmental issues arise. Changes to the guidelines made within the Psychology Department will not go into effect until approved by the Dean of CLA.
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Workload Distribution and Performance Review Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Outreach</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Workload %</td>
<td>Performance Score</td>
<td>Workload %</td>
<td>Performance Score</td>
<td>Workload %</td>
<td>Performance Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. X</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Score/Criteria

0  Unacceptable
1  Marginal
2  Meets expectations
3  Exceeds expectations
4  Exemplary
Appendix 4

Departmental Annual Review Guidelines
The Psychology Performance and Evaluation Guidelines are intended to fairly and equitably allocate compensation (e.g., raises and bonuses) to faculty members for their contributions to the research, teaching, service, outreach and administrative missions of the department. In addition, the Performance and Evaluation Guidelines are designed to provide feedback on individual performance to the faculty members of the department. This document is considered a living document. The Psychology Department will re-evaluate the allocation of points to different activities and departmental expectations as needed. Such changes to the guidelines made within the Psychology Department will not go into effect until approved by the Dean of CLA.

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

There are two basic categories of faculty workloads. Research Active faculty members meet departmental expectations for research as outlined below. These individuals have a 2-3 course load (62.5% workload allocation to teaching) with 37.5% of their effort available for other activities. Highly research productive faculty members may have a 2-2 course load (50% workload allocation to teaching) with 50% of their effort available for other activities if departmental workload is met. These two categories are modeled in each section below to show how expectations in each area will differ based on the percentage of workload allocated to teaching and research. It is assumed that 12.5% of effort is allocated to service for these examples.

These are not the only possible models. These two models are most common and serve as exemplars by that other, more individualized workloads may be assessed. For example, Research Inactive faculty members do not meet departmental expectations for research. These individuals have at least a 3-3 course load (75% workload allocation to teaching) with 25% of their effort available for other activities. The departmental expectations would be altered on the teaching criterion, for example, to establish base performance upon a 75% allocation of work effort to teaching (instead of 50% or 62.5%). The expectations will match the percentages allocated to each criterion in this way.

The Annual Review Process follows guidelines based on the Psychology Department’s Annual Review Guidelines agreed to by the Psychology Department faculty in February, 2006. Changes from these guidelines are in italics. An unfavorable annual review for tenure-track faculty may result in the issuance of a letter of non-continuation at any time prior to tenure.

A. General Introduction

The following recommendations are made for the process of yearly review of all tenured and untenured tenure track professors in the department.
B. Review period

The review period will consist of the preceding three years (January in year 1 through December 31 of year 3). This rolling window will allow individuals to count publications and presentations occurring from January through December in the first calendar year of the review period. It will also allow individuals to include teaching evaluations for Spring year 1, Fall year 1, Spring year 2, Fall year 2, Spring year 3, and Fall year 3. *Summer evaluations may be included as supporting evidence of teaching effectiveness but the primary evaluation will be of Fall and Spring courses.*

C. Review materials and timeline

1. Materials should conform to the most current version of the "Annual Report for Faculty Evaluation and Development" and should be provided to the department no later than March.
2. *In addition, each faculty member may supply a memo describing special circumstances related to research; teaching; outreach and/or service that they wish the committee members to consider. This information will be included in the evaluations made by the Annual Review Committee.*
3. The evaluation committee will meet before April 1.
4. The chair-faculty feedback meeting will be conducted before the end of the Spring semester, defined as the last day of classes, in that the evaluation is being conducted.

D. Evaluation committee

1. The committee will consist of six (or seven) voting members with equal standing.
2. Each area (Clinical, Experimental, I/O, Undergraduate Program) will select (as they see fit) a representative from the tenured faculty. There will be one committee member elected at large from the tenured faculty. *In addition, the untenured faculty members will elect a representative for this committee if there are eligible untenured faculty members. Faculty members who have had their 3rd year pre-tenure review are eligible to serve on this committee.* The sixth/seventh member will be the Psychology Department chair or a suitable representative chosen by the chair.
3. *If the Psychology Department chair is present, the chair will conduct the meeting. If the Psychology Department chair chooses a faculty representative, the Annual Review committee will select a member to preside at the meeting.*
4. *Untenured faculty members may not be the chair of this committee.*
5. All terms will be for one year with no term limitations.
6. Any selected member agrees to review before the meeting is conducted all submitted material for each faculty member.

E. Goals of the Evaluation Committee

1. The committee is charged with evaluating each of the faculty member's materials and providing quantitative ratings of each on research, teaching, and service. Outreach
efforts are evaluated through a goal-setting process between the faculty member and the chair. Therefore, this committee will not evaluate Outreach. Outreach activities that are not being allocated to a workload percentage for Outreach will normally be considered under the service dimension but might occasionally fit the research or teaching dimension.

2. The committee will also provide qualitative feedback on shortcomings or points of emphasis for faculty development.

F. Evaluation process

1. Each member of the committee will review materials and provide an independent rating of each faculty member on research, teaching, and service prior to group discussion.

2. For each dimension, the ratings should be conducted on a five-point rating scale. This five-point rating scale will use the anchors provided by the university. The anchors for this rating scale are currently:

   4 = Exemplary Performance
   3 = Performance Exceeds Expectations
   2 = Performance Meets Expectations
   1 = Marginal Performance
   0 = Unacceptable Performance

3. These ratings should reflect the evaluators' expert opinion based on the materials provided by each faculty member.

4. Each member will then report their scores for a given faculty member to the committee at large.

5. General discussion will follow to allow members to discuss discrepancies in their ratings of that particular faculty member.

6. Each committee member will then provide a final score on research, teaching, and service for that faculty member.

7. There are no rules on consensus.

8. An average score for each of the three dimensions will then be computed across committee members.

9. Finally, the committee will agree on and record any qualitative feedback to be reported to the faculty member by the Psychology Department chair.

10. The chair or the representative of the chair is responsible for giving special attention to job-relatedness, fairness and documentation in accordance with legal guidelines and principles and any current guidelines and principles set forth by the university or college.

G. Evaluation committee materials to be completed during review

1. For each faculty member, a standardized feedback form should be completed providing the individual's average score across the committee members for research, teaching, and service.
2. This feedback form should also report the departmental average, median, and complete distribution for each dimension.
3. Finally, this feedback form should report verbatim any qualitative feedback deemed important by the committee.

**H. Dimension weights**

1. The dimension weightings for research, teaching, and service will be mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and the chair during the previous year’s review.  
   *During the current review period, these allocations will be agreed upon for the upcoming year.*
2. Workload allocation will follow current university and CLA guidelines.
3. The overall score (score for each dimension multiplied by appropriate weights) should be reported on the feedback form along with departmental average, median, and distribution of scores.

**RESEARCH CRITERION**

The Psychology Department, as a whole, produces many research publications and has a history of acquiring research grants and contracts that fund individual faculty members’ research and help fund graduate students assistantships.

Table 1 provides the performance expectations for the Psychology Department in terms of the number of research points (RP) produced by a faculty member. An RP represents the value attached to research products of the faculty in the Psychology Department at Auburn University. Column 1 is Auburn University’s performance evaluation scale’s anchors. Columns 2 and 4 describe the RP production level necessary to reach each scale anchor for .25 and .375 research loads. The .25 and .375 levels of research were chosen because they represent the level of research expected for research active (2-3 course load) and highly productive (2-2 course load) faculty members according to the College of Liberal Arts Workload Guidelines. Columns 3 and 5 provide the total number of research points required for the .25 and .375 levels of research during the rolling three year evaluation period used by the Psychology Department. **These numbers will be adjusted for other research percentages as required.**
Table 1: Research Performance Expectations for Psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE RATING</th>
<th>.25 RESEARCH (AVERAGE/YEAR)</th>
<th>.25 RESEARCH (3 YEAR TOTAL)</th>
<th>.375 RESEARCH (AVERAGE/YEAR)</th>
<th>.375 RESEARCH (3 YEAR TOTAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.00 RP</td>
<td>9 RP</td>
<td>4.5 RP</td>
<td>13.5 RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0 – 2.99 RP</td>
<td>6.0-8.99 RP</td>
<td>3.00 – 4.49 RP</td>
<td>9.00-13.49 RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0 – 1.99 RP</td>
<td>3.0-5.99 RP</td>
<td>1.5 – 2.99 RP</td>
<td>4.5-8.99 RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1- 0.99 RP</td>
<td>0.1-2.99 RP</td>
<td>0.1- 1.49 RP</td>
<td>0.1-4.49 RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 RP</td>
<td>0 RP</td>
<td>0 RP</td>
<td>0 RP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Psychology Department has established weights for evaluating research productivity that are based on the research points (RP) that each faculty member produces. The basis of the definition of a RP is that one refereed published article/book chapter equals one RP.

Table 2 provides the weights for different research activities based on this definition of a RP. There are three tiers of publication for refereed publications. These are Psychology Top-Tier; Area Top-Tier; and all other publications. Publications in each tier receive a differential weighting related to the above definition of RP. All other research products (e.g., non-refereed book chapters, grant work, proceedings; conference presentations) are scaled relative to the definition of 1 RP.

The order of authorship is an important aspect to consider, as this ordering grossly corresponds to the amount of effort invested by the faculty member and his or her intellectual contribution in a research activity. The order of authorship is represented by the multiplier 1/oa, where oa is equal to the faculty member’s placement in the order of authorship. This value is the multiplied by the point value associated with a particular activity to obtain the points allotted to the faculty for each research activity. Table 3 presents the order of authorship multiplier to be used for multiple authored research activities. Table 3 also present the order of credit given for grant work (e.g., Principal Investigator (PI); Co-PI and Consultant).

Research activities with collaborators will be weighted based on the number and types of authors. Student author(s) from Auburn University are omitted from the byline. Student collaboration with research is an important part of the role of a faculty member. Such collaborations involve a heavy mentoring component and the omission of Auburn University students is intended to recognize this effort.

An example of this is:
AU Graduate Student, Non-AU Faculty, AU Undergraduate Student, AU Faculty, 2010

The AU Graduate Student and AU Undergraduate Student are removed from the authorship list leaving an authorship list of—Non-AU Faculty, AU Faculty, 2010. The AU Faculty would receive credit for a second authorship in this example.

Authorship may be determined by means other than individual contributions of the faculty member. For example, authorship may be determined by alphabetical order or coin flips in some cases. In addition, authorship may be determined by disciplinary norms (e.g., in medical journals the last author is often the primary contributor. If this is the case, the faculty member should describe this arrangement in the memo he or she provides the Annual Review committee. Documentation should also be provided (e.g., the cover page of an article with a footnote noting this determination of authorship).

Each faculty member will use the attached worksheet (Annual Report for Faculty Evaluation and Development) to generate the list of their ARPs over the last three year period. There is no limit to the amount of points that a faculty member may generate from research activities.

**Table 2: Weights for Research Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External grant (Federal research grant/ contract)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Life of grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External grant (External non-federal grant/ contract)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Life of grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal competitive grant</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Life of grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Support for GRAs</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td># of GRAs</td>
<td>Life of grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof of External Grant Submission</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof of Revision of prior external grant submission</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Top-Tiered Paper/ Book Chapter (these publications would be</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely read by any member of APA or APS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Top-Tier Refereed Paper/ Book Chapter (these publications would be</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely read by any member of the APA division (s) comprising an area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for one the graduate programs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refereed Paper/ Book Chapter (these publications would be likely read</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by smaller groups within the APA division (s) comprising an area for one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the graduate programs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book (non-textbook)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edited Book</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-refereed Paper/ Book Chapter</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encyclopedia Entry</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. *Order of Authorship Multiplier*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorship/Grants</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; &amp; 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;/ Principal Investigator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; &amp; 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;/ Co-PI</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-X&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;/ Consultant</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEACHING CRITERION**

Teaching is a major activity of the Psychology Department, and constitutes a major percentage of faculty effort in almost all cases. The primary teaching activities of the Psychology Department are related to a) teaching undergraduate and graduate courses and b) mentoring undergraduate and graduate students.

The Psychology Department has established criteria for evaluating teaching that is based on the number of teaching points that each faculty member produces. These numbers are shown in Table 4. Table 4 provides the performance expectations for the Psychology Department in terms of the Teaching Points (TP) per year during the rolling three year period in that Psychology Department evaluates faculty members’ performances.

Table 4 provides the performance expectations for the Psychology Department in terms of the number teaching points (TP). A TP represents the value attached to teaching products of the faculty in the Psychology Department. Column 1 is Auburn University’s performance evaluation scale’s anchors. Columns 2 and 4 describe the TP production level necessary to reach each scale anchor for .50 and .625 teaching loads. The .50 and .625 levels of teaching were chosen because they represent the level of research expected for research active (2-3 course load) and highly productive (2-2 course load) faculty members according to the College of Liberal Arts Workload Guidelines. **These numbers will be adjusted for other teaching percentages as required.** Columns 3 and 5 provide the total number of teaching points required for the .50 and .625 levels of research during the rolling three year evaluation period used by the Psychology Department.

The expectations are based on the primary teaching activities (i.e., courses taught and undergraduate and graduate mentoring. The teaching expectations were derived from the base
number of courses taught for the .50 or .625 loads (4 and 5 respectively) and on the expected number of undergraduate or graduate students per faculty member (1).

Table 4: Teaching Performance Expectations for Psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE RATING</th>
<th>.50 TEACHING (AVERAGE/YEAR)</th>
<th>.50 TEACHING (3 YEAR TOTAL)</th>
<th>.625 TEACHING (AVERAGE/YEAR)</th>
<th>.625 RESEARCH (3 YEAR TOTAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&gt;= 35 TP</td>
<td>&gt;= 105 TP</td>
<td>&gt;= 43.75 TP</td>
<td>&gt;= 131.125 TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27 – 34.9 TP</td>
<td>81-104.9 TP</td>
<td>33.75-43.70 TP</td>
<td>101.25-131.10 TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19 -26.9 TP</td>
<td>57- 80.9 TP</td>
<td>23.75- 33.70 TP</td>
<td>71.25- 101.20 TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 – 18.9 TP</td>
<td>33-56.9 TP</td>
<td>13.75- 23.70 TP</td>
<td>41.25-71.20 TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt; 11 TP</td>
<td>&lt; 33 TP</td>
<td>&lt; 13.75 TP</td>
<td>&lt; 41.25 TP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEACHING ACTIVITIES

The teaching activities of the Psychology Department are related to a) teaching undergraduate and graduate courses and b) mentoring undergraduates and graduates in individual projects. The point allocations for these activities are described in the next sections.

University Approved Student Evaluations Per Class
(Median for Items 1-4 on Evaluations).

Auburn University has adopted a class evaluation system. This system is used to compare individuals within the department and departments at Auburn University. Each faculty member should use the appropriate forms for this evaluation for each class taught. Therefore, for each class you teach you can accumulate points if evaluation form is completed for Fall and Spring Semesters only.

There are two special cases for this portion. First, if a faculty member is using a full-time course equivalency (see workload guidelines), they will have their highest score from their teaching evaluations used for this equivalency. Second, if no evaluation is conducted for any class, the departmental average will be entered for each faculty member the first year this occurs. For the next year this occurs for a faculty member, the departmental average minus one will be entered; for the third year, the departmental average minus two will be entered and so on till zero is reached.
Auburn University reports the median scores for Items 1-4 for each evaluation form used in this system. Points will be accumulated as follows:

- 8 pt  Exemplary (median scores ≥ 4.5)
- 6 pt  Exceeds Expectations (median scores ≥ 3.8 and < 4.5)
- 4 pt  Meets Expectations (median scores ≥ 3.0 and < 3.8)
- 2 pt  Marginal (median scores ≥ 3.0 and < 1.5)
- 0 pt  Unacceptable (median scores < 1.5)

**Additional Teaching Activities**

There are additional ways to generate points for teaching. Each faculty member should record their accomplishments related to these activities on their Annual Report for Faculty Evaluation and Development worksheet.

**Mentoring Undergraduate and Graduate Students (Thesis, Prelims, and Dissertations)**

**Chair**
- Each 4997 Honors thesis (chaired) completed = 3 pt
- Each Prelims (chaired) completed = 3 pt
- Each MAP (chaired) completed = 3 pt
- Each Masters Thesis (chaired) completed = 4 pt
- Each Dissertation (chaired) completed = 5 pt
- Serving as Faculty Advisor for MA (nonthesis) Students (n x 1 pt)

**Committee**
- Each Masters Thesis (not chaired) completed = 1 pt
- Each Prelims (not chaired) completed = 1 pt
- Each MAP (not chaired) completed = 1 pt
- Each Dissertation (not chaired) completed = 1 pt

**Peer evaluation**

Completed evaluation = 4 pt

**Teaching Awards and Honors (these items cannot also be counted in research, must choose one area)**

1. Titled Professorship Based on Teaching = 6 pt (3 pts first three years held; 1 pt each year held after that)
2. Academic Discipline Award = 4
3. National Award = 4
4. State Award = 3
5. University Award = 3
6. College Award = 2
7. Department Award = 1
From these three courses you can a maximum of 12 points per semester

Each 3910 student supervised = 1 pt
Each 3940 student supervises = 1 pt
Each 4930 student supervised = 2 pt

New course

Each new course developed = 8 pt
Each new course preparation = 6 pt

**SERVICE CRITERION**

Service is another activity to that the Psychology Department faculty members allocate effort to at the department, college or university levels or in a professional capacity. Table 5 provides the performance expectations for the Psychology Department in terms of the Service Points (SP) per year during the rolling three year period in that Psychology Department evaluates faculty members’ performances. **These numbers will be adjusted for other service percentages as required for individual faculty member’s allocation of effort to service based on the numbers in Table 5.**

Table 5 provides the performance expectations for the Psychology Department in terms of the average number SPs (SP). An SP represents the value attached to service products of the faculty in the Psychology Department. The typical allocation of effort to service is between .05 and .10 of the workload of a faculty member and Table 5 uses these two levels as examples. Column 1 is Auburn University’s performance evaluation scale’s anchors. Columns 2 and 4 describe the SP production level necessary to reach each scale anchor for .05 and .10 teaching loads. Columns 3 and 5 provide the total number of service points required for the .05 and .10 levels of service during the rolling three year evaluation period used by the Psychology Department.

**Table 5: Service Performance Expectations for Psychology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE RATING</th>
<th>.05 SERVICE (AVERAGE/YEAR)</th>
<th>.05 SERVICE (3 YEAR TOTAL)</th>
<th>.10 SERVICE (AVERAGE/YEAR)</th>
<th>.10 RESEARCH (3 YEAR TOTAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6 SP</td>
<td>18 SP</td>
<td>12 SP</td>
<td>36 SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4-5.99 SP</td>
<td>12- 17.99 SP</td>
<td>8-11.99 SP</td>
<td>24-35.99 SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-3.99 SP</td>
<td>9-11.99 SP</td>
<td>6-7.99 SP</td>
<td>18-23.99 SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1- 2.99 SP</td>
<td>3-8.99 SP</td>
<td>2- 5.99 SP</td>
<td>6- 11.99 SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt; 1 SP</td>
<td>&lt; 3 SP</td>
<td>&lt; 2 SP</td>
<td>&lt; 6 SP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Psychology Department has established criteria for evaluating service that is based on the number of Service Points (SP) that each faculty member produces. These activities include:

- **Activities Meriting Six Points**
  - Serving as Program Director

- **Activities Meriting Five Points**
  - Serving as editor of a journal

- **Activities Meriting Four Points**
  - Chairing a university search committee
  - Organizing a regional, national, or international conference
  - Receives national award for advising
  - Receives national award for service
  - Serving as an associate editor of a journal
  - Serving on a grant review board

- **Activities Meriting Three Points**
  - Chairing a departmental search committee
  - Serving as an officer or member of the executive board of a regional, national, or international professional organization;
  - Organizing a student trip to an out-of-town learning event;
  - Organizing a state conference
  - Receives state award for advising
  - Receives state award for service
  - Receives university award for advising
  - Receives university award for service
  - Editing a journal special issue
  - Serving as a grant reviewer

- **Activities Meriting Two Points**
  - Serving as a University Senator
  - Membership on a departmental search committee;
  - Serving in a substantial ad hoc capacity to the department, the college, or the university;
  - Nominating a student for a major college, university, or national honor or award;
  - Serving as faculty advisor to an honor society or student organization;
  - Creating an internship (Number of students x 2),
  - Chairing a departmental committee
  - Organizing a panel at a regional, national, or international conference;
  - Organizing a lecture series or other departmental function involving students or colleagues;
- Organizing a series of special departmental professional activities;
- Arranging for a speaker of national or international reputation to present a campus-wide lecture;
- Membership on the editorial board of an academic journal;
- Consultant to an academic press having reviewed at least one book manuscript;
- Receiving an award specifically for service from a professional organization;
- Creates or revitalizes a professional university, department or college level organization
- Conducts program evaluation (i.e., develops instrumentation; collects, analyzes, and interprets data to address hypotheses concerning program effectiveness) for the university;
- Writes technical report for university documenting the methodology, instrumentation, procedure, data analyses, results, and conclusions for the evaluation of any university guidelines or program;
- Conducts program review for academic programs outside the department;
- Presents a workshop within the university based on area of professional expertise;
- Provides leadership for non-university boards, committees, and organizations;
- Provides organizational consulting to organizations in education, business, industry, military or government;
- Giving a lecture at another university.
- Conducts a workshop for national or regional conferences;
- Receives college award for advising
- Receives college award for service

**Activities Meriting One Point**

- Serving as a committee member in a regional, national, or international organization;
- Nominating a colleague for a major college, university, or national honor or award;
- Receives departmental award for advising
- Receives departmental award for service
- Membership on a departmental, college, or university committee;
- Serving as a peer reviewer for evaluating teaching of a fellow faculty member;
- Reviewing a tenure and/or promotion dossier at another academic institution;
- Maintaining an internship for a student (Number of students x 1);
- Mentoring students in the context of a specific program, such as themed learning communities or interdisciplinary studies;
- Organizing a special departmental professional activity;
- Serving as an ad hoc reviewer for an academic journal
- Serving as a reviewer for professional meetings

Activities listed above may count for additional points if faculty members can provide compelling reasons for doing so in their annual reports in the form of evidence that in the
particular instance being reported the service activity involved substantially more than the typical quality, responsibilities, time requirements, or significance for that kind of activity. This information should be included in the memo provided with the Annual Report for Faculty Evaluation and Development.

**OUTREACH CRITERION**

Outreach refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university and unit missions. Consult the *Faculty Handbook* for specific guidelines of what constitutes outreach for promotion and tenure consideration.

As opposed to service, outreach scholarship relies profoundly on expertise and represents focused and coordinated efforts toward planning and achieving a specific outreach program. Generally, outreach serves an external non-academic audience as opposed to an academic association. "External non-academic audience" may refer to a geographic region, such as a city, county, or state, or may refer to a social or professional community, such as "high school teachers" or "media professionals." For the purpose of outreach, a specific "audience" must be served. But what constitutes an "audience" should be viewed broadly.

Outreach is also unique in that it is not part of each Psychology faculty members workload allocation. For all faculty members who have Outreach workload allocations, the Chair and the faculty member should establish goals for performance for the upcoming year at the annual performance review.

These goals should be commensurate with the allocation of effort to Outreach proposed by the faculty member. As part of this goal-setting process, the faculty member and chair will jointly establish performance expectations for Exemplary/ Exceeds Expectation/ Meets Expectations/ Marginal/ and Unacceptable Performance. The evaluation of Outreach will be based on the faculty member’s reaching these goals during the next year’s evaluation period.

**Please note that any activity used to meet Outreach goals may not be used as evidence of Research, Teaching, or Service for purposes of Annual Evaluation. Each activity may only be counted once by a faculty member here (Scholarly outreach publications, however, may be cross-listed in Promotion and Tenure dossiers). Also note that activities listed here may be used under Service if no Outreach percentage is being allocated by the faculty member.**

Examples of Outreach activities include but are not limited to:

- **Activities Meriting Four Points:**
  - Creating an outreach program,
  - Obtaining a university-wide, state, national, or international outreach award;
  - Administers/coordinates (PI, co-PI) externally funded outreach project;
  - Supporting Graduate Students on Outreach Grants (n x 4 points)

- **Activities Meriting Three Points.**
Creating a website for the purpose of sharing professional expertise with the public;
Serving as an officer or member of the executive board of a local, state, national, or international non-academic organization requiring professional expertise.
Outreach article in a top-tier outreach journal;
Author of an outreach-oriented book by a respected publisher (MIT Press, Cambridge University Press, etc.);
Editor of an outreach-oriented book by a respected publisher (MIT Press, Cambridge University Press, etc.);
Submission of an outreach-oriented proposal for external funding;
Receives internal funding for an outreach program (faculty research grant, summer fellowship, etc.);
Receives external funding for an outreach program;
Supports student engagement in outreach-oriented research funding activities by mentoring students to obtain funding for their research projects;

Activities Meriting Two Points:
- Making a presentation based on the faculty member’s expertise to an out-of-town group;
- Teaching off-campus (such as at a high school) or to a non-university audience (such as for Elderhostel or the National Election Center);
- Maintaining a website that was created for the purpose of sharing professional expertise with the public;
- Consultation with local, state, or national government or non-academic organizations requiring professional expertise;
- Outreach-oriented chapter in an edited book by a respected publisher (MIT Press, Cambridge University Press, etc.);
- Article in a practitioner publication (e.g., journal, trade magazine, etc.);
- Outreach-oriented presentations at national or international meetings outreach-oriented presentations per year at regional, national or international meetings;
- Involved in data collection for an outreach project;
- Obtains donations or "in-kind" contributions to support outreach-oriented research program (donations of equipment, consumable materials).

Activities Meriting One Point:
- Making a presentation to a local group;
- Service to a high school activity requiring professional expertise;

Activities listed above may count for additional points if faculty members can provide compelling reasons for doing so in their annual reports in the form of evidence that, in the particular instance being reported, the outreach activity involved substantially more than the typical quality, responsibilities, time requirements, or significance for that kind of activity. This information should be included in the memo provided with the Annual Report for Faculty Evaluation and Development.
ADMINISTRATIVE CRITERION

Administration refers to activities that require additional effort from faculty members that are specific to the day-to-day functioning of the department. These individuals must often be present in an administrative capacity 12 months a year. The Psychology Department has two internal administrative positions receiving course releases for administrative work. These positions are the Undergraduate Program Director and the Director of Clinical Training for the Clinical Psychology Ph.D. program (DCT). These positions require substantial administrative work over Fall, Spring, and Summer sessions. The Undergraduate Program Director receives one (1) course release and the DCT receives two (2) course releases. The effort percentages for these course releases are allocated to Administrative work on these two individuals’ workload allocation and on their annual review for performance evaluation.

Administration is also unique in that it is not part of each faculty member’s workload allocation in the Psychology Department. For all faculty members who have administrative workload allocations, the Chair and the faculty member should establish goals for performance for the upcoming year at the annual performance review.

These goals should be commensurate with the allocation of effort to Administration for the faculty member. As part of this goal-setting process, the faculty member and chair will jointly establish performance expectations for Exemplary/Exceeds Expectation/Meets Expectations/Marginal/ and Unacceptable Performance. The evaluation of administrative work will be based on the faculty member’s reaching these goals during the next year’s evaluation period.
ANNUAL REPORT
for
Faculty Evaluation and Development

Three-year span: January 1, 2008 through December 31, 2010

Please note that under each item below, you are asked to cover a three-year span, from January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2010. Use the forms below- If you need to add extra rows to a table, please do this. Faculty who joined us after the beginning date of this form should include a listing from the start of their appointment, and include earlier items within this time frame if they wish.

If you wish to provide a memo providing evidence that your activities involved substantially more than the typical quality, responsibilities, time requirements, or significance for that kind of activity, please attach this memo to the back of this form.

Finally, please attach an updated copy of your Curriculum Vita to this form.
## Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Authorship Weight</th>
<th>Point Value X Multiplier X Authorship Weight</th>
<th>Points Per Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TEACHING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>POINT VALUE</th>
<th>MULTIPLIER</th>
<th>POINT VALUE X MULTIPLIER</th>
<th>POINTS FOR ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>POINT VALUE</th>
<th>MULTIPLIER</th>
<th>POINT VALUE X MULTIPLIER</th>
<th>POINTS FOR ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OUTREACH

**PERCENT OF WORKLOAD ALLOCATED TO OUTREACH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS (JAN 1, 20XX TO DEC 31, 20XX)</th>
<th>MET/ NOT MET?</th>
<th>IF NOT MET, LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE REACHED</th>
<th>POINT VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

### ADMINISTRATION

**PERCENT OF WORKLOAD ALLOCATED TO ADMINISTRATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS (JAN 1, 20XX TO DEC 31, 20XX)</th>
<th>MET/ NOT MET?</th>
<th>IF NOT MET, LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE REACHED</th>
<th>POINT VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**
Appendix 5

Departmental Third-Year Review Guidelines
The Third-Year Review Guidelines of the Department of Psychology follow the guidelines and procedures set forth in the Faculty Handbook. It is highly recommended that the third-year review dossier follow the Promotion and Tenure format contained in the Faculty Handbook.

An unfavorable third-year review may result in the issuance of a letter of non-continuation; however, a letter of non-continuation may be issued at any time prior to tenure.

The Psychology Department follows this procedure with the following departmental emphases. First, the faculty member using the third-year review is asked to provide their supporting materials using the process used to create the Tenure and Promotion packet. Second, a third-year review committee is jointly formed with input from the third-year review candidate and the department. This committee reviews the supporting materials provided by the candidate to summarize these supporting materials for the departmental discussion. Finally, the individual acting as chair of this third-year review committee presents the committee’s summary in a meeting of the faculty eligible to vote on this decision. This individual also facilitates the discussion. Voting of the full faculty then occurs. The reporting of results to the department and the candidate follows the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook.
Appendix 6

Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Department of Psychology
Standards for Promotion and Tenure

General requirements for appointment or promotion to the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are outlined in the Auburn University Faculty Handbook (§3.8): A candidate for promotion should have acceptable achievements in the areas of research, teaching, and outreach (if part of the job expectations for the faculty member).

The Department of Psychology weighs research heavily. The successful candidate is expected to demonstrate performance which meets the expectations of the field for research universities for this criterion, and to meet all departmental expectations for teaching, over a sustained period of achievement. The criteria for outreach will also be considered for those faculty members who have outreach outlined in their original employment contract or who have negotiated this as part of their workload during the annual evaluation period with the Department Chair. Outreach will be considered as a separate dimension for faculty who have it as part of their workload. The successful candidate will have met all departmental expectations for outreach over the time period in which outreach has been performed.

In addition, achievement in these areas comparable to that of successful candidates in the discipline in the past five years will be considered. Finally, he or she is expected to have contributed some service to the Department of Psychology, College of Liberal Arts, and/or the University.

The timing of the applications for promotion and for tenure is set by the university. Faculty members should consult the Faculty Handbook for requirements of time in service. Probationary faculty who do not have prior service at another institution of higher education generally come up for promotion and tenure in their fifth year at Auburn. Although this is not a requirement and faculty may seek tenure and promotion at any time before their sixth year if they have met departmental promotion and tenure standards, they must come up for tenure and promotion by their sixth year of appointment (except in the case of documented FMLA leave or leave without pay, as described in the Faculty Handbook).

As further clarification of its standards for promotion and tenure, the Department of Psychology adopts the guidelines below. Decisions on promotion to associate professor, on promotion to professor, and on tenure depend on the candidate’s sustained work of high quality in the areas of teaching, research, and service. (If outreach is assigned as a percentage of the candidate’s effort, then it too should show evidence of high quality, and should be presented as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.) Faculty members are responsible for maintaining their own records and files of evidence, except when the responsibility is specifically assigned to the Department Chair.
Promotion to Associate Professor

a. Research

Research components are the most important criteria for most faculty members in psychology. The candidate should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of research to advance the mission of the department, college, and university. Research involves both a quantity and quality component. Given the diversity of areas within psychology, and the different pathways of research leading to achievement in those areas, these two components must be balanced. Both quantity and quality together will be used to assess the emerging national reputation of the candidate for associate professor.

Quantity

Quantity relates to the volume of publication. This is one necessary component of the evaluation of the research of a faculty member in psychology. Joy (2006) analyzed the productivity of psychology faculty at different types of universities. This document proposes two classifications of doctoral granting universities. These are (a) research universities and (b) doctoral granting universities grouped with elite liberal arts colleges. The former classification refers to universities where teaching loads for incoming tenure-track faculty (e.g., no teaching in the first year) are 2-2 or less. The latter classification defines doctoral granting universities that also emphasize teaching. The Department of Psychology at Auburn University is more akin to the second category. The range of publications of faculty members per year at these doctoral granting universities with a large teaching component for a career age of 1-5 years was 1.5-2 publications. It is expected that candidates for promotion to associate professor in the Department of Psychology will approach this rate of publication in the years preceding their application for promotion and at least half these publications must be peer-reviewed. There must also be a clear record of data collected at Auburn University. Successful extramural grant awards (e.g., DOD, NIH, NSF) as PI (or CO-PI) will count as a peer-reviewed article for each year of funding.

Quality

A candidate for associate professor in the Department of Psychology is expected to show strong evidence of work in national contexts and venues, thus demonstrating that he or she is building toward a national reputation within his or her field, and is likewise expected to demonstrate the potential for continued growth as a scholar in national and international contexts.

The primary evidence of emerging national reputation exists in the quality and substance of the candidate’s published work, as detailed below, and as evaluated by members of the psychology faculty eligible to vote on the candidacy.
• External grants and fellowships
• Reputation of journals publishing the candidate’s work
• Reputation of presses publishing the candidate’s work
• Evidence of the influence and citation of the candidate’s work
• Prizes, honors, and awards for published work

Secondary evidence of potential national reputation must include at least three confidential outside reviews assessing the candidate’s work. (See below.) Additionally, secondary evidence of the candidate’s emerging national reputation may include any of the following:

• Internal grants
• Invited work by the candidate, when based on the candidate’s stature, accomplishments, or continuing work in the field
• Invited lectures at other universities and conferences
• Response of nationally-known scholars to the candidate’s requests (e.g., for contributions to an edited volume, for conference papers or lectures)
• Editorial or advisory board positions on journals or other publications
• Translation or reprinting of the candidate’s published work
• Presentations at regional and international conferences
• Candidate’s work as an external reviewer or judge (of manuscripts, of contests, of grant proposals, of tenure and promotion cases at other institutions, etc.)
• Candidate’s leadership (in the specific field or in the profession) as signaled by positions of responsibility
• Prizes, honors, and awards from national and international groups (e.g., associations, societies)
• Through avenues other than those listed above that are noted in the Annual Review Criteria for Research in the Department of Psychology

Balancing Quality and Quantity

The quantity and quality of these publications will both be evaluated and used in the promotion decision for a candidate.

The candidate for promotion to the rank of associate professor in the Department of Psychology’s research should present strong evidence of work in national contexts and
venues, thus demonstrating that the candidate is building toward a national reputation within his or her field, and demonstrating the potential for continued growth as a scholar in national and international contexts.

Evidence from the list above may contribute to an emerging national reputation, but it is understood that candidates for associate professor will have had limited opportunities to distinguish themselves on the national and international levels. The letters from outside reviewers may provide stronger indications of the candidate’s current and potential impact within the field. The primary evidence of an emerging national profile, however, should be found in the substance and quality of the candidate’s published work as evaluated by members of the psychology faculty eligible to vote on the candidacy.

The diversity of pathways to achievement in psychology makes it hard to generalize, but all areas in psychology are in agreement on the importance of several key issues with regard to candidates’ research:

- **Grantsmanship:** Successfully funded grants are valued. Extramural grants are valued more than internal grants.
- **Peer-reviewed publication:** Published work not subject to peer review is valued, but never as highly as peer-reviewed work.
- **Publications of substance:** Book-length projects and scholarly are valued more highly than small projects (conference proceedings, brief essays, etc.).
- **Significant individual or lead authorship:** Evidence of independent or lead authorship is important (as defined by percent contribution).
- **Coherent programs of research:** Each candidate should articulate a program of continued effort and potential impact within his or her area of specialization, and the voting faculty should be able to discern evidence of progress and pattern in the candidate’s publications. (The voting faculty are aware that these patterns of publication may still be emerging in the work of candidates for promotion to associate professor.)
- **Interdisciplinary Work:** The Department recognizes the special promise as well the special cost of interdisciplinary work, and values research programs that engage in such work. Cross-disciplinary publication, when appropriately explained in the candidate’s research, is valued at the same level as publication within the candidate’s area.

The pathways are diverse, and thus different areas in psychology have different preferences, and their candidates exhibit different profiles. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to fully explain these profiles in his or her letter about the candidate for promotion in consultation with the associate professors and professors in the Department of Psychology.

In addition to providing copies of relevant publications for review, the candidate will prepare a *Description of Scholarly Program* of research that outlines the candidate’s prior research and plans beyond promotion. The voting faculty will consider all of the candidate’s publications, including those published prior to initial appointment at Auburn University, as well as in press articles.
In examining the available evidence, the voting faculty members evaluate the candidate’s work as a scholar, considering issues of quality, substance, and integrity, as well as issues of reputation, venue, and potential for continuing impact in the field.

**Outside Reviews**

Credentials of candidates for associate professor must be supplemented by three outside reviews. Outside reviewers will be selected in accordance with the Provost’s guidelines found at: http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/guidelines.html

**b. Teaching**

Teaching is a major activity of the Department of Psychology, and constitutes a major percentage of faculty effort in almost all cases. The candidate should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of teaching to advance the mission of the department, college, and university. For this reason, candidates for promotion to associate professor must demonstrate a high level of performance as teachers. (Sustained quality of teaching is also addressed through annual reviews and the third year review.)

Evidence of teaching effectiveness *must* include the items listed below. The candidate should maintain appropriate documentation of teaching activities. The Department Chair is responsible for working with the candidate to arrange appropriate peer evaluations of teaching, as well as for providing the peer evaluations and teaching effectiveness surveys to the voting faculty.

- Statement of teaching philosophy and self-evaluation in terms of his or her stated values
- Three peer evaluations assessing the candidate’s (typically in each of the three preceding years):
  - Knowledge of subject matter
  - Course materials
  - Conduct of class session(s)
- Syllabi, handouts, and examinations from three different courses, taught in the preceding three years, may be provided to demonstrate the range of the candidate’s teaching for the internal, departmental evaluation of the candidate.
- Grade distributions from each course used to demonstrate teaching effectiveness in the Promotion and Tenure dossier should be submitted.
- Teaching effectiveness surveys including students’ written comments (from the same courses, if possible)

Evidence of teaching effectiveness may be demonstrated by the candidate’s contributions (or by the additional items listed in the Annual Review Criteria for Teaching in the Department of Psychology).
• In work with master’s and doctoral students, whether as major professor, committee member, outside reader, or examiner
• In developing new courses and curricula
• In significant new preparations or redevelopments of courses taught
• In work as a mentor or lead teacher, as a research supervisor, or as director of undergraduate research projects
• In the scholarship of teaching, whether through textbooks, articles, or the publication of high quality teaching materials (which will be assessed on the criteria outlined for research)
• In earning grants, honors, and awards related to teaching (these contributions will be assessed on the criteria outlined for research)
• Through participation in teaching/learning conferences and symposia
• Through avenues other than those listed above that are noted in the Annual Review Criteria for Teaching in the Department of Psychology

In examining the available evidence, the voting faculty evaluate the candidate’s overall effectiveness as a teacher, considering issues of quality, rigor, and integrity, along with issues of innovation, continuing development, and student engagement.

**c. Outreach**

Outreach is the application of academic expertise for the direct benefit of external audiences. Consult the *Faculty Handbook* for specific guidelines of what constitutes outreach for promotion and tenure consideration.

It is important that the faculty member and the Department Chair agree that the planned activity is outreach, and that the faculty member maintain appropriate records (of outreach activities, scholarship, and impact on external audiences). Faculty are encouraged to confer with the Department Chair before undertaking significant tasks in outreach. Appropriately arranged and documented efforts in outreach will contribute to a candidate’s promotion case as do their equivalents in research: major outreach publications or administration of major programs will be highly valued; brief panels or presentations will have modest value. Those candidates with effort allocated to outreach should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of outreach to advance the mission of the department, college, and university.

**d. Service**

Academic and professional service generally occupies the smallest percentage of effort in a faculty member’s workload, but the Department of Psychology expects a candidate for promotion to perform service tasks at a high level of quality. The candidate should
work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of service to advance the mission of the department, college, and university.

In general, candidates for promotion to Associate Professor are expected to have performed limited service on the department level and very little, if any, service at the college or university level. Modest professional service beyond the university is also reasonable, but candidates at this level should consult with the Department Chair before taking on demanding service roles. Successful performance of service roles, for any level of the University or the profession, is demonstrated over a sustained period by any of the following:

- Service as chair or member of standing committees, or ad hoc committees
- Service as evaluator, reviewer, or judge (e.g., manuscripts, grants, contests, etc.)
- Service on journal editorial boards
- Service on grant panels
- Sponsorship or organization of professional conferences
- Sponsorship or organization of visiting speakers or events
- Grants, honors, or awards for meritorious service
- Scholarship of service, whether through editing books, articles, or the publication of other high quality materials related to service (these contributions will be assessed on the criteria outlined for research.)
- Other contributions to service as noted in the Annual Review Criteria for Service in the Department of Psychology

Appropriate documentation of service activities should be maintained by the candidate. In evaluating candidates, the voting faculty will consider the above aspects of their service, as well as initiative, effectiveness and attitude toward and engagement with the service activity.

**Promotion to Professor**

**a. Research**

Research components are the most important criteria for most faculty members in psychology. The candidate should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of research to advance the mission of the department, college, and university. Research involves both a quantity and quality component. Given the diversity of areas within psychology, and the different pathways of research leading to achievement in those areas, these two components must be balanced. Both quantity and quality together will be used to assess the existing national and international reputation of the candidate for promotion to professor.
Quantity

Quantity relates to the volume of publication. This is one necessary component of the evaluation of the research of a faculty member in psychology. It is expected that candidates for promotion to professor in the Department of Psychology will continue to approach the 1.5-2 publication rate per year in the years preceding their application for promotion and at least half these publications must be peer-reviewed. There must also be a clear record of data collected and published at Auburn University. Successful extramural grant awards (e.g., DOD, NIH, NSF) as PI (or CO-PI) will count as a peer-reviewed article for each year of funding.

Quality

A candidate for professor in the Department of Psychology is expected to show strong evidence of work in national contexts and venues, thus demonstrating that he or she has established a national reputation within his or her field, via demonstrated scholarship in national and international contexts.

National Reputation

A candidate for professor in the Department of Psychology is expected to demonstrate a respected national and international reputation within his or her field, along with evidence of continuing growth as a scholar in national and international contexts. The primary evidence of emerging national reputation exists in the quality and substance of the candidate’s published work, as detailed below, and as evaluated by members of the psychology faculty eligible to vote on the candidacy.

- External grants and fellowships
- Reputation of journals publishing the candidate’s work
- Reputation of presses publishing the candidate’s work
- Evidence of the influence and citation of the candidate’s work
- Prizes, honors, and awards for published work

Secondary evidence of potential national and international reputation must include at least three confidential outside reviews assessing the candidate’s work. (See below.) Additionally, secondary evidence of the candidate’s emerging national reputation may include any of the following:

- Invited work by the candidate, when based on the candidate’s stature, accomplishments, or continuing work in the field
- Invited lectures at other universities and conferences
• Response of nationally-known scholars to the candidate’s requests (e.g., for contributions to an edited volume, for conference papers or lectures)

• Editorial or advisory board positions on journals or other publications

• Translation or reprinting of the candidate’s published work

• Presentations at regional and international conferences

• Candidate’s work as an external reviewer or judge (of manuscripts, of contests, of grant proposals, of tenure and promotion cases at other institutions, etc.)

• Candidate’s leadership (in the specific field or in the profession) as signaled by positions of responsibility

• Prizes, honors, and awards from national and international groups (e.g., associations, societies)

• Through avenues other than those listed above that are noted in the Annual Review Criteria for Research in the Department of Psychology

The candidate for promotion to the rank of professor in the Department of Psychology will demonstrate continued accomplishment in all areas of effort, but the candidate’s research, in particular, should meet the requirement of national and international reputation specified by the Faculty Handbook. That is, a candidate for professor in the Department of Psychology is expected to demonstrate a respected national reputation within his or her field, along with evidence of continuing growth as a scholar in national or international contexts.

Secondary evidence of national and international reputation must include at least three confidential outside reviews assessing the candidate’s work. Other secondary evidence of national reputation (from the list above) is also important in the evaluation of the candidate for promotion to professor. But the primary evidence of the candidate’s national reputation should be found in the substance and quality of the candidate’s published work as evaluated by members of the Department of Psychology faculty eligible to vote on the candidacy.

The diversity of pathways to achievement in psychology makes it hard to generalize, but all areas in psychology are in agreement on the importance of several key issues with regard to candidates’ research and creative work:

• **Grantsmanship:** Successfully funded grants are valued. Extramural grants are valued more than internal grants.

• **Peer-reviewed publication:** Published work not subject to peer review is valued, but never as highly as peer-reviewed work.

• **Publications of substance:** Book-length projects and scholarly are valued more highly than small projects (conference proceedings, brief essays, etc.).

• **Significant individual or lead authorship:** Evidence of independent or lead authorship is important (as defined by percent contribution).
• **Coherent programs of research:** Each candidate should articulate a program of continued effort and potential impact within his or her area of specialization, and the voting faculty should be able to discern evidence of progress and pattern in the candidate’s publications.

• **Interdisciplinary Work:** The Department recognizes the special promise as well the special cost of interdisciplinary work, and values research programs that engage in such work. Cross-disciplinary publication, when appropriately explained in the candidate’s research, is valued at the same level as publication within the candidate’s area.

The pathways are diverse, and thus different areas in psychology have different preferences, and their candidates exhibit different profiles. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to fully explain these profiles in his or her letter about the candidate for promotion in consultation with the professors in the Department of Psychology.

In addition to providing copies of relevant publications for review, the candidate will prepare a *Description of Scholarly Program* of research that outlines the candidate’s prior research and plans beyond promotion. The voting faculty will consider all of the candidate’s publications, including those published prior to initial appointment at Auburn University, as well as in press articles.

In examining the available evidence, the voting faculty members evaluate the candidate’s work as a scholar, considering issues of quality, substance, and integrity, as well as issues of reputation, venue, and potential for continuing impact in the field.

**Outside Reviews**

Credentials of candidates for professor must be supplemented by three outside reviews. Outside reviewers will be selected in accordance with the Provost’s guidelines found at: http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/guidelines.html

b. **Teaching**

Teaching is a major activity of the Department of Psychology, and constitutes a major percentage of faculty effort in almost all cases. The candidate should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of teaching to advance the mission of the department, college, and university. For this reason, candidates for promotion to Professor must demonstrate a high level of performance as teachers. (Sustained quality of teaching is also addressed through annual reviews.)

Evidence of teaching effectiveness *must* include the items listed below. The candidate should maintain appropriate documentation of teaching activities. The Department Chair is responsible for working with the candidate to arrange appropriate peer evaluations of teaching, as well as for providing the peer evaluations and teaching effectiveness surveys to the voting faculty.

- Statement of teaching philosophy and self-evaluation in terms of his or her stated values
- Three peer evaluations, conducted over the preceding years, assessing the candidate’s:
  - Knowledge of subject matter
- Course materials
- Conduct of class session(s)

- Syllabi, handouts, and examinations from three different courses, taught in the preceding three years, may be provided to demonstrate the range of the candidate’s teaching for the internal, departmental evaluation of the candidate.

- Grade distributions from each course used to demonstrate teaching effectiveness in the Promotion and Tenure dossier should be submitted.

- Teaching effectiveness surveys (from the same courses, if possible)

Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness may be demonstrated by the candidate’s contributions

- In work as a program coordinator or administrator, including study abroad
- In work with master’s and doctoral students, whether as major professor, committee member, outside reader, or examiner
- In developing new courses and curricula
- In significant new preparations or redevelopments of courses taught
- In work as a mentor or lead teacher, as a research supervisor, or as director of undergraduate research projects
- In the scholarship of teaching, whether through textbooks, articles, or the publication of high quality teaching materials (which will be assessed on the criteria outlined for research and creative work below)
- In earning grants, honors, and awards related to teaching
- Through participation in teaching/learning conferences and symposia
- Through avenues other than those listed above that are noted in the Annual Review Criteria for Teaching in the Department of Psychology

In examining the available evidence, the voting faculty evaluate the candidate’s overall effectiveness as a teacher, considering issues of quality, rigor, and integrity, along with issues of innovation, continuing development, and student engagement.

**c. Outreach**

Outreach is the application of academic expertise for the direct benefit of external audiences. Consult the *Faculty Handbook* for specific guidelines of what constitutes outreach for promotion and tenure consideration.

It is important that the faculty member and the Department Chair agree that the planned activity *is* outreach, and that the faculty member maintain appropriate records.
(of outreach activities, scholarship, and impact on external audiences). Faculty are encouraged to confer with the Department Chair before undertaking significant tasks in outreach. Appropriately arranged and documented efforts in outreach will contribute to a candidate’s promotion case as do their equivalents in research: that is, major outreach publications or administration of major programs will be highly valued; brief panels or presentations will have modest value. Those candidates with effort allocated to outreach should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of outreach to advance the mission of the department, college, and university.

**d. Service**

Academic and professional service generally occupies the smallest percentage of effort in a faculty member’s workload, but the Department expects a candidate for promotion to Professor to perform service tasks at a high level of quality. The candidate should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of service to advance the mission of the department, college, and university.

Candidates for professor, unlike candidates for Associate Professor, are expected to have performed well at more significant and more diverse service roles in the Department and at other levels. Service to professional organizations, especially as it builds toward the candidate’s establishment of national reputation, is also appropriate. Successful performance of service roles, for any level of the University or the profession, is demonstrated over a sustained period by any of the following:

- Service as program coordinator, administrator, or responsible officeholder
- Service as chair or member of standing committees, search committees, or ad hoc committees
- Service as evaluator, reviewer, or judge (manuscripts, contests, etc.)
- Service on editorial boards
- Sponsorship or organization of professional conferences
- Sponsorship or organization of visiting speakers or events
- Grants, honors, or awards for meritorious service
- Scholarship of service, whether through books, articles, or the publication of other high quality materials related to service (that will be assessed on the criteria outlined for research.)
- Other contributions to service as noted in the Annual Review Criteria for Service in the Department of Psychology

Appropriate documentation of service activities should be maintained by the candidate. In evaluating candidates, the voting faculty will consider the above aspects of their service as well as leadership, initiative, effectiveness, and attitude toward and engagement with the service activity.
Tenure

The criteria for attainment of tenured status are described in the Faculty Handbook. Candidates for tenure in the Department of Psychology are normally considered at the same time for promotion to the rank of associate professor; however, separate votes are taken for promotion and for tenure, with the vote on promotion taken after the vote on tenure.

Procedure

Faculty members who consider their credentials appropriate for departmental review for tenure and promotion have the privilege of self-nomination. Faculty members should consult the Faculty Handbook for requirements of time in service. Probationary faculty who do not have prior service at another institution of higher education generally come up for promotion and tenure in their fifth year at Auburn. Although this is not a requirement and faculty may seek tenure and promotion at any time before their sixth year if they have met departmental promotion and tenure standards, they must come up for tenure and promotion by their sixth year of appointment (except in the case of documented FMLA leave or leave without pay, as described in the Faculty Handbook). Potential candidates are encouraged to discuss their readiness for promotion not only with the Department Chair, but with their mentors and with other senior colleagues in the Department.

Upon the candidate’s self-nomination, the Department Chair will follow the guidelines for the tenure and promotion procedure found in the Faculty Handbook.

Revision of Standards

The present document will be reviewed every five years after its adoption, upon revision of the Auburn University Faculty Handbook, or as judged necessary. Revision of this document requires a two-thirds vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Department of Psychology.

Addendum

Patents are not relevant in regard to tenure and promotion for the Department of Psychology. There have been no patents in the history of the Department of Psychology at Auburn University.
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