

Appendix A

Department of Psychology Primary Unit Criteria for Tenure-Track Faculty

Governing Rules and Policies:

1. Regent Policy 5D: Reappointment (to a tenure-track position), Tenure and Promotion
2. Administrative Policy Statement 1022: Standards, Processes and Procedures for Reappointment (to a tenure-track position), Tenure, Promotion, and Post-tenure Review
3. Campus Administrative Policy 1004: Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Review – CU Denver

Criteria and Evidence

In this section we outline the evidence on which we base our decisions in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarly or creative work, and leadership and service. We also outline the specific standards we use, or questions we ask, when determining if your professional performance is “meritorious” or “excellent.”

Research

The purpose of scholarly research and publication is to contribute to the science and profession of psychology. In doing so, we expect faculty members to engage in research and scholarly activities that will lead to progress in the establishment of a national reputation. Junior faculty members are expected to use their summers to enhance their research productivity.

Faculty members are expected to follow the APA Ethical Standards and university policies in their conduct of research. Violation of these standards is inconsistent with tenure.

Our specific criteria for research are reflected in the following questions:

1. Has the candidate established a program of research that shows promise of significant future scholarly/professional output?
2. Does the candidate work on problems judged significant by experts in their field?
3. What is the candidate’s research and publication record?
4. What is the candidate’s scholarly/professional reputation outside CU Denver?

We use the following evidence in our deliberations (these are listed in no particular order):

- A. Evidence of expertise and of a research program that is generative and sustainable, providing opportunities for continued research productivity and collaboration with other scholars and trainees.
 - A research program is considered generative if it facilitates the direct collection of novel data, data comparisons, or new thinking related to problems in the field of

Psychology. This may include sponsored and unsponsored laboratory, field, clinical intervention, or community-based research, archival research, literature reviews, or other appropriate activity, and may include unique contributions to collaborative projects with other scholars in the field. Note that while collaboration is encouraged, the review for tenure will include deliberation about the significance, uniqueness, and independence of your contributions, both to individual projects and to the field.

- A research program is considered sustainable if there is evidence that the candidate can support the research with grant funding or other relevant resources, where appropriate. You should seek multiple sources of funding, both internal and external to the university. However, you are expected to apply and be competitive for external sources of funds. Other evidence of sustainability may include the development of productive research networks, fruitful collaborative relationships, and the acquisition of funding for mentored undergraduate and graduate student research assistants.

B. Quality and quantity of publications in refereed journals or other refereed publication venues, including scholarly books.

- Although there is no one agreed-upon method for determining the quality of publications, evidence for quality can include published journal rankings and submission/rejection ratios benchmarked against journals in your sub-discipline, the regard that experts in the field (e.g., external reviewers) hold for the refereed journals and edited volumes published within your area of specialization, and the number and source of citations to your published work.
- Individual publication rates vary across sub-disciplines and methodologies in Psychology. Productivity also varies across Psychology departments, and this may reflect differences in institutional support for research (e.g., research space allocation, graduate and post-doctoral training programs and support) and the weight of competing responsibilities given to a candidate (e.g., teaching load). Candidates should be aware that although no minimum number of journal articles is specified here, a trend of increasing productivity is expected.

C. Evidence of engagement with your scholarly community.

- The quality and quantity of presentations (i.e., posters, data talks, symposia organization and participation) at professional meetings is the primary evidence we use to measure your engagement with your scholarly community. These presentations may be at local, regional, national, or international meetings. One measure of their quality will be the regard held for these events by experts in your sub-discipline (e.g., external reviewers). As a general rule, the Psychology department favors meetings that reach broadly the core of active scholars in your sub-discipline (e.g., national vs. local/regional meetings). No minimum number of

presentations is implied, given the shortage of travel monies. When relevant, you should strive for increasing participation as your career progresses.

D. Evidence of a good professional reputation outside CU Denver

- The primary measure of your reputation in your field will be the evaluations provided by qualified professionals in your field (i.e., external reviewers). Other indicators of reputation include, but are not limited to, scholarly positions of authority, such as journal editorships, invitations for contributions to edited volumes and monographs, symposia, and other invited addresses, and the number and places of citations of your scholarly work.

Your research will be designated as **meritorious** when the evaluation process performed by your peers within the department and your discipline (e.g., external reviewers) demonstrates that you have developed a generative and sustainable program of research at CU Denver, that the quality, quantity, and/or impact of your publications, presentations, grants applications and/or funding, and/or overall research program is judged as typical or expected for an individual with your workload distribution and institutional resources, and that you are engaged with and well regarded by professionals in your sub-discipline. Failure to meet some or most of these performance criteria will be grounds for a “not meritorious” evaluation in this area.

Your research will be designated as **excellent** when there is evidence in one or more of the categories above that demonstrates superior work. Superior work is work that is judged “above average” for an individual with your workload distribution and institutional resources by your peers within the department and your discipline. This may be evidenced by the number, quality, contribution, and/or impact of your publications, the extent of your participation in scholarly activities with your professional community, your success in obtaining grants or contracts, the reputation you hold in your field and its impact on the mission of the department and/or the University, or other recognition of superior performance.

Note that your accomplishments and promise in research are judged by peers, both within the Department and in your discipline (e.g., external reviewers).

Teaching

The Department and the University place a high premium on teaching, which is defined more broadly than classroom performance. Teaching comprises a large number of activities that involve faculty members interacting with students or working on behalf of their students’ education. In addition to classroom instruction, Psychology faculty members teach 1) through pursuing research projects with individual students or groups of students, 2) through discussion forum participation or when answering student e-mail messages, 3) during office hours and other scheduled help sessions, 4) in assisting students to prepare presentations, grants, and papers for broader audiences, 5) through supervision of graduate student clinical training and serving on

Clinical Competency Examination committees, 6) by chairing and serving on thesis and dissertation committees, and 7) by participating in formal and informal academic and career advising. Beyond these, faculty members contribute to the teaching mission of the department and university when they revise existing or develop novel courses or curricula, develop and/or employ novel teaching materials and methods in their courses, create inclusive classrooms and teaching practices, assess student learning outcomes for the purposes of course improvement and equity, interact with other professionals discussing and developing improved teaching practices, critique their peers' classroom teaching practices, and communicate their teaching-related practices and research findings through scholarly teaching journal publications or presentations at national meetings. Activities corresponding to this latter set are often referred to as the scholarship of teaching and learning. All of these activities, with the exception of publishing and reporting on the theoretical aspects of teaching, which more appropriately qualify as research scholarship, will be considered in evaluating teaching.

We expect you to continuously assess your classroom teaching, including a review of your course evaluations every semester. We expect you to make steady improvement in your classroom teaching skills, where relevant, as your career at CU Denver progresses, and to avail yourself of resources for improvement including those provided by the CU Denver Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL). We also expect you to engage undergraduate and/or graduate students in research activities. You are expected to follow the APA Ethical Standards and university policies in your relationships with students and colleagues. Violation of these standards is inconsistent with tenure.

Our specific criteria for evaluating teaching are reflected in the following questions:

1. Is the candidate knowledgeable about the subject matter of courses taught, and are courses kept current by incorporating new material?
2. Does the candidate continue to improve their pedagogy by learning about and incorporating effective and inclusive instructional methods?
3. Do the candidate's teaching activities help to strengthen the current curriculum and/or contribute to curricular development?
4. Does the candidate demonstrate teaching and/or supervisory effectiveness as evaluated by students and colleagues?
5. Does the candidate engage students in research and/or other professional activities outside the classroom?

We use the following evidence (per [APS #1009](#)), when relevant, in our deliberations (these are listed in no particular order):

1. The candidate's teaching philosophy.
2. Quality of course materials, including complete and clear syllabi, well-constructed assignments and assessments, and consistency between course materials and teaching

philosophy. Specific to courses that are required for students in the Clinical Health Psychology PhD program, adequate adherence to APA Accreditation Guidelines is an important course quality consideration.

3. Student judgments as expressed in quantitative FCQ ratings and narrative comments. Narrative comments may be solicited by both the candidate and the evaluation committee of the Department.
4. Evaluation of teaching by colleagues who have visited the candidate's classes.
5. Evidence of efforts to improve teaching, such as participation in teaching conferences, formal and informal collaboration with colleagues, evidence of the use of assessment results to make improvements in courses and/or curriculum, and teaching innovations.
6. Evidence of efforts to create inclusive classrooms and labs and using evidence-based practices to address inequitable outcomes.
7. Alumni evaluations of teaching, advising, mentoring, and supervision.
8. Student academic and career outcomes. Such evidence could include success of students in higher-level courses, undergraduate internships, academic programs, student performance on standard professional examinations, performance on clinical practica or other onsite experiences, and student scholarly presentations, publications, and/or fellowships.
9. Evaluation of the quantity and quality of individual instruction performed by the candidate including research supervision, mentoring, and clinical supervision, if appropriate.
10. Quality and quantity of student advising if appropriate.
11. Quality and quantity of course or curriculum development when appropriate.
12. Teaching awards, teaching-related grants, and other outstanding accomplishments in teaching.

Your teaching will be considered **meritorious** when the evaluation process demonstrates that you have made a positive and constructive impact on the intellectual development of students, especially in the context of formal course work. You are also expected to contribute to individual undergraduate and/or graduate student instruction, such as through research mentorship. You should provide evidence that demonstrates that you have a genuine commitment to quality classroom teaching, a respect for students, effectiveness as a research mentor, and that you are likely to continue this trend to ensure a meritorious distinction.

Page | 5

Approved by Faculty: February 2, 2020

Approved by Dean: May 29/2020

Approved by Provost: August 4, 2020

Effective Date: July 1, 2020

Your teaching will be considered **excellent** when the evaluation process demonstrates you have made a truly superior commitment to and have great success in teaching. *Regent Policy 5.D.2* states, in part:

(B) ... A recommendation for tenure based on excellence in teaching shall include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one's immediate instructional setting.

Candidates with excellent teaching records are thought of as outstanding teachers who meet and exceed the meritorious performance standards and who are recognized by both students and faculty as having a significant impact on teaching “beyond one’s immediate instructional setting,” which means beyond one’s own classroom, laboratory, clinic, and department at CU Denver.

Demonstration of excellence can take many forms, including (but not limited to):

1. Student Mentoring

- a. Assisting students to prepare presentations, grants, and/or papers for broader audiences
- b. Outreach efforts (public schools and other)
- c. Impact of clinical training, internships, or practica
- d. Mentoring students at other institutions
- e. Mentoring students outside department (undergraduate and/or graduate committee member)
- f. Mentoring undergrad and grad students at professional meetings
- g. Organizing service-learning activities
- h. CU Succeed activity

2. Intentional Improvement of Teaching

- a. Evaluation of teaching by external reviewers
- b. Interaction with other professionals discussing and developing improved teaching practices (Communities of Practice; workshops, CETL book clubs, AP reading; etc.)
- c. Documented discussion forum participation (list serves; etc)
- d. Contribution to the development of learning equipment, facilities, and/or instructional aids
- e. Contributions to creating more inclusive and equitable educational experiences
- f. Performing external reviews for teaching
- g. Teaching fellowships, explorer-positions or their equivalent
- h. UC DALI-type work to promote teaching skills, practice, promotion criteria

- i. Campus-level teaching/learning/curriculum committees
3. SoTL-Related Presentations/Publications
- a. Publications in journals that focus on teaching of psychology or pedagogy more generally
 - b. Communication of teaching-related practices and research findings through presentations at regional, national, or international meetings
 - c. Serving on curriculum/professional committees of professional organizations
 - d. Serving as external reviewer for an outside department's program evaluation
 - e. Guest lectures (with feedback) at other institutions (invited colloquia)
 - f. UE Symposium presentations – or others
4. Teaching Awards/Recognition
- a. Teaching or mentoring awards for activities beyond the department
 - b. External teaching grants
5. Other
- a. Authoring, co-authoring, and/or textbooks, chapters, and/or manuals
 - b. Reviewing textbooks and/or other educational material
 - c. Mentoring lecturers who teach at other institutions
 - d. Cross-institutional data collection

Service

Beyond teaching and research, the role of professors includes service to their department, college, campus, university, community, and profession. We do not expect new faculty to serve on committees outside of the Psychology Department during their first contract year. We do expect an increasing level of participation as faculty members approach tenure. We particularly encourage faculty to participate in professional activities intended to promote the development of the candidate's profession and the local community, whenever feasible.

Our specific criteria for service are reflected in the following questions:

1. What is the candidate's level of participation in Department, College, Campus, and /or University activities intended to improve the quality of programs, including facilitating the functioning of the university, campus, college, or department?
2. Does the candidate participate in professional activities intended to promote the development of the candidate's field?
3. Does the candidate participate in the community to strengthen University/community relationships when appropriate?

We use the following evidence in our deliberations:

1. Participation in activities serving the Department, College, Campus, or University.
2. Participation in activities serving the discipline/profession of the candidate.
3. Participation in activities serving the community, if appropriate.

Service will be considered meritorious if the candidate has, at a minimum, contributed to the mission of the primary unit through cooperative participation on necessary departmental committees and activities, and has, in addition, found an active participatory role in the university, the community, and/or the profession.

Service will be considered excellent when the extent of involvement and leadership in service at the above levels demonstrates a truly superior commitment. For tenured faculty and clinical teaching track faculty at the associate and full professor level, this would mean membership in a number of high-profile committees at multiple levels within our institution and may include as well superior service to the discipline and community. Senior faculty would be expected to do more than serve on a number of committees, however. They are expected to assume the added responsibilities of leadership and administration. Junior faculty working toward tenure and CTT assistant professors, within the parameters outlined above, would demonstrate excellence when they contribute significantly to developmentally appropriate activities at the department level and show a reasonable degree of activity outside the department.